



CARLOS BENEDITO MARTINS

Reconfiguring higher education in Brazil: the participation of private institutions

Análise Social, 208, XLVIII (3.º), 2013

ISSN ONLINE 2182-2999

EDIÇÃO E PROPRIEDADE

Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa. Av. Professor Aníbal de Bettencourt, 9
1600-189 Lisboa Portugal — analise.social@ics.ul.pt



Análise Social, 208, XLVIII (3.º), 2013, 622-658

Reconfiguring higher education in Brazil: the participation of private institutions.

This article analyzes the participation of private institutions in the expansion of Higher Education in Brazil in the last five decades. The argument is that the private institutions created since 1964 differ from earlier ones. The great majority of those new institutions do not have links with religious foundations, and are structured as administrative organizations similar to enterprises. The article mentions the social conditions that have allowed the emergence of new private institutions, such as changes in the political system (1964), the implementation of the University Reform (1968), and legal measures taken by the Brazilian State in 1980 and 1990 that proposed the policies for the Higher Education system. The article also discusses certain characteristics of the configuration of current private Higher Education teaching.

Keywords: higher education; university reform; Brazilian education; public and private education.

A participação das instituições privadas na reconfiguração do ensino superior no Brasil.

Este artigo analisa a participação das instituições privadas na expansão do ensino superior no Brasil nas últimas cinco décadas. Argumenta que as instituições privadas criadas a partir de 1964 diferem das anteriores, pois, na sua maioria, não estão ligadas a fundações religiosas e estruturam-se como organizações administrativas semelhantes a empresas. O artigo aborda as condições sociais que viabilizaram a criação destas novas instituições, tais como as mudanças no sistema político (1964), a reforma da Universidade (1968) e as medidas legislativas implementadas pelo Estado brasileiro nos anos 80 e 90 do século passado relativas às políticas para o sistema universitário. Este artigo discute ainda algumas características da atual configuração do ensino superior privado.

Palavras-chave: ensino superior; reforma da universidade; educação brasileira; ensino público e privado.

Carlos Benedito Martins » carlosb@unb.br » Instituto de Ciências Humanas, Universidade de Brasília.

CARLOS BENEDITO MARTINS

Reconfiguring higher education in Brazil: the participation of private institutions

INTRODUCTION

Analysis of higher education systems in different societal contexts tends to show that they have occupied a strategic position in several contemporary societies, in both central and developing countries. International sociological production has contributed greatly to understanding higher education's position in contemporary societies. Several authors mention the complexity of relationships between higher education and the economic and scientific-technological process, as well as between higher education and the training of professionals for public and private administrative positions. At the same time, many authors stress connections to the growing demands of civil society that press for greater democratization, equality of opportunities and citizenship, and emphasize the centrality of higher education in the production, dissemination, and use of knowledge in contemporary societies. (Calhoun, 2009, 2006a, 2006b; Barber, 2006; Delanty, 2001, 2002; Enders, 2002; Gibbons, 1994).

One of the topics calling the attention of higher education authors concerns the process of *expansion of access* to higher education that has been taking place worldwide. Initially targeted at an exclusive clientele with economic and cultural capital, higher education began gradually incorporating, at an overall level, new social groups that had been at the margins of the system. One strand of the research emphasizes that as of the end of the Second World War higher education in central societies as well as in developing countries became one of the important paths to social mobility for certain groups of the population. At the same time, in several countries society increased its pressure for social opportunity, including access to higher education as a right and as one of the elements of citizenship (Roksa, 2008; Wells, 2008; Meyer and Frank, 2007; Dougherty, 2007; Meyer and Schofer, 2005; Burke and Johnstone, 2004; Kogan, 2000; Scott, 1998; Jarusch, 1983).

The organization of the Higher Education Systems in several contemporary societies shows considerable variety in institutional formats. In some countries a public system prevails and the state has the main role in the administration and financing of the institutions, as is the case in France. In other systems, a mixed model of institutional organization predominates, in which state-run universities coexist with privately-run schools, and non-profit universities, as in the United States. The reasons for the organizational differences reside in the differing national academic cultures and distinct ways of articulating the states and societies with the system of higher education. The historical, economic, political, and cultural modalities found across nations also influence the diversity of higher education systems (Musselin, 2009; Vasconcelos, 2006; Gurin, 2002; Altbach, 1999; Barnett, 2000; Charles and Verger, 1994; Lazuech, 1999; Lucas, 1994; Clark, 1983).

Some articles about higher education in the international arena have called attention to the meaningful presence of the private sector in the supply of educational services around the world, and is found in a great number of institutions. Some of these institutions are operated by religious organizations or by philanthropic entities, while others are operated as for-profit institutions. The historical, political, and economic modalities from one nation to another also play an important role in the training and development of different kinds of private university-level institutions (Torres, 2008; Marginson, 2007; Altbach, 2005; Guadilla, 2005a, 2005b; Altbach and Umakoshi, 2004).

This article addresses the specific situation in expansion and institutional diversification seen today in Brazil. We analyze the significant presence of for-profit private institutions that have emerged in that country since the end of the 1960s. We begin by mentioning the social conditions that enabled the creation of for-profit private institutions. We then examine some legal measures that govern the higher education system published by the Brazilian State in 1980 and 1990. At the end, we highlight some features of their current configuration. The article is supported by official documents from the Brazilian government, the bibliography concerning the theme that has been discussed, statistical data from the INEP (Institution for Educational Research), as well as data and thoughts about earlier works by the author of the present article. The article is based on the notion of *field* developed by Pierre Bourdieu, who considers the concept important for understanding the inclusion of for-profit teaching in the complex and heterogeneous system of Brazil's contemporary higher education.¹

1 On the basis of the notion of field, the aim is to carve out a social space with its own structure that is relatively autonomous *vis-à-vis* other social spaces, which is to say, in relation →

EMERGENCE OF NEW FOR-PROFIT PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR SOCIAL CONTEXT

In the last five decades Brazilian higher education has undergone revealing quantitative and qualitative changes. In the early 1960s there were approximately 100 institutions in Brazil. Most of them were rather small and they offered only undergraduate degrees. They aimed for the most part at training professional groups. Just a handful of institutions accomplished, at the same time, the activities related to teaching and research. Scientific investigation was undertaken in Research Institutions that were isolated from schools and, in general, had few academic and institutional links to the higher education teaching. The Research Institutions that existed were mostly concentrated in the southeast region of the country, mainly in the states of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. The professors in these institutions were not career professionals and were more often than not hourly-wage professors who rarely had post-graduate credentials. In those small institutions there were fewer than 1000 students. These were predominantly male and were closely connected to the economic, political, and cultural elite of the country. Until the mid-1960s there was a well-defined dual structure in the system of Brazilian higher education teaching. There were public institutions (federal, state, and municipal) and private institutions (Catholic and Protestant) that were not profit-seeking and counted on the financial support of the government (Fernandes, 2000; Schwartzman, 1997, 1979).

That situation clearly contrasts with the introduction of a broad, complex, and diversified system of higher education that gradually emerged after 1964. Today the system comprises thousands of institutions, absorbs millions of undergraduate students, and has a professional staff that is more trained and always has Masters and Doctoral Degrees. From 1964 on, an extensive national system of graduate courses *stricto sensu* has been created, offering Masters and Doctoral degrees in all areas. The national system of graduate courses is present in every region of the country, and scientific investigation is widespread throughout the country.

At present, the field of higher education introduces a diversity of academic institutions, comprising Colleges, University Centers, Universities, Federal

to other social fields. Although they maintain a relationship, the various fields are distinguished by specific objectives, thus ensuring that they have a particular logic in terms of functioning and structuring. It is typical for a field to have an internal hierarchy, structured spaces of positions, objects of dispute, and singular interests, which are impervious to the constitutive objects, struggles, and interests of other fields. The notion of field is taken from the many works of Pierre Bourdieu. For further references, consult the following sources: Bourdieu, 1980, 1982, 1987, 1992a, 1992b. See also: Martins (2002).

Centers of technological teaching, and Federal Institutes.² There are also public institutions (federal, state, and municipal), private (Catholic, Protestant), non-profit community institutions, and private institutions *stricto sensu* that were created after 1964³. According to the Constitution, the federal public institutions charge no tuition fees, nor do the majority of the state institutions. In the private institutions, community and for-profit ones, the students pay an annual fee. The sizes of institutions vary, have different organizational formats, and have distinct academic goals: some do not pursue research and are totally devoted to the professional training of the students, while others undertake both teaching and research. There is variation in the work and advising regulations pertaining to the teaching staff, as well as the academic requirements of professors. Other changes in Brazil's higher education in recent decades that stand out are the incorporation of a more socially differentiated public, a significant increase in the admission of female students, the entrance of students already working, and internalization of all those involved.

Among the changes that have occurred in the last decades is the entry of thousands of new private secular institutions, upsetting the dual structure of not-for-profit public and private establishments.

Until the mid-1960s, 58% of higher education students were enrolled in public institutions. Today the private sector accounts for 73% of undergraduate enrollment and 88% of establishments, and the very nature of the private sector institutions has changed. Until 1960, private higher education was organized largely by religious institutions in a manner very similar to public education, and was semi-government in nature. Note that at that time Catholic universities in Brazil had long depended on public sector financing to support their activities (Casali, 1995; Durham and Sampaio, 1995; Antoniazzi, 1975).

The private education that emerged in the 1970s was led by lay institutions and tended to be qualitatively different from the preceding period, in terms of its nature and goals. It was a completely different system structured by

2 In accordance with current Brazilian legislation, universities are multidisciplinary institutions that combine teaching, research, and continuing education. A third of the teaching staff must hold Masters and PhD credentials, and one third must be employed on a full-time basis. The universities are autonomous regarding teaching methods, administration, and financial management. Non-university institutions operate within a specific area of expertise or vocational training. They are made up of faculties, Federal Technology Centers (CEFET), Federal Institutes, and University Centers. The last enjoy the same autonomy as universities, with the ability to create and discontinue courses run on their premises. For further information, see: Neves (2002).

3 Decree 2.306/1997 created two categories of private institution: non-profit and profit. The text discusses this decree further below.

educational enterprises interested in economic profit and quickly catering to the demands of the education market. Business-style private higher education arose from a myriad of complex factors, among which we can highlight the changes that took place in the national political arena in 1964 and their impact on formulating educational policies. The for-profit institutions predominate in terms of numbers inside the private sector. In the 1980s and 1990s, certain legal measures taken by the Brazilian State favored the further expansion of the private institutions.

This is an opportune moment to observe that Brazilian higher education was late in developing, compared to European or Latin American systems. University institutions in Latin American countries were first established in the 16th and 17th centuries, and of course there were already several universities functioning in Europe. The first higher education schools in Brazil were founded only in the early 19th century, when the Portuguese royal family came to the Brazilian colony with the clear purpose of providing professional staff to perform the different courtly duties. At the end of the Empire the country had only six higher education schools.⁴ In 1900 there were a mere 24 higher education schools. The first universities in the country, including the University of São Paulo (1934) and the short-lived University of the Federal District (1935) were established in the mid-1930s (Cunha, 1980; Fávero, 1977).

Around the end of World War II, the system began growing slowly, and reached slightly more than 40,000 students. The industrialization surge that began after World War II and intensified in the 1960s awakened Brazil's society and government to the need for professionals with a university education who would be able to meet the challenges of the development process. The period between 1945 and 1965 was marked by the accelerated growth of public higher education. Enrollment jumped from 40,000 to 182,000 students. It was during this time that federal universities were established and began gradually spreading across all states of the federation. Private sector participation remained stable at 44% (Cunha, 2004).

Despite initiatives to increase enrollment in federal and state institutions, the public system as a whole was not able to accommodate the growing demand for higher education. Increasing enrollment and democratizing public higher education became prominent issues in student movement agendas and institution administrations during the 1960s.

In 1964 a military coup thrust Brazil into a military dictatorship that lasted until 1985. Initially the regime adopted repressive measures against student

4 For references on the creation of the first higher education institutions in Brazil, see: Fávero (1977) and Coelho (1999).

movements and kept professors under strict observation. Laws were drafted to extinguish the National Student Union, and severe sanctions were imposed on students, professors, and staff who carried out activities considered contrary to the military regime. Professors in several public universities were accused of contesting the regime and forced into early retirement (Fávero, 1995; Sanfelice, 1986; Fernandes, 1975, 1984).

Following the 1964 coup, students and professors grew dissatisfied with the elitist nature of higher education and with the existing university structure. Students mobilized against the inability of public education to accommodate all students who passed the public entrance exams. In 1960, 30,000 students were unable to enroll in university institutions despite having passed the entrance exams. This figure increased to 162,000 in 1969. This “excess” issue became a constant source of social tension between the students and the government. Pressure to expand the higher education system was linked to increasing enrollment in the secondary school system, which increased 4.3 fold between 1947 and 1964. At the same time, the process that began in the 1950s to concentrate property and income was intensified due to the economic policy adopted in 1964. This led the middle class to look toward higher education as a means to increase their social status (Cunha, 1975; Trigueiro, 1967).

In this scenario of constant social tension, the military government felt pressured to create policies to restructure higher education. They commissioned several studies with the goal of finding a way forward. Noteworthy among them is the document written by the American professor, Rudolph Atcon, the report by General Meira Mattos, and the report compiled by the Consulting Team on Higher Education, which was composed of Brazilian and American professors (Atcon, 1966; *Relatório Meira Mattos*, 1969 {Meira Mattos Report}; *Relatório da Equipe de Assessoria ao Planejamento do Ensino Superior*, 1969 {Report by the Consulting Team on Higher Education Planning}).

The diagnoses and recommendations presented in these documents agreed on most points. They stated that higher education should have practical objectives and adjust its content to the national development goals. They declared that the higher education system must stop catering to a restricted public, as had been the case until that time. These proposals for expansion were accompanied, however, by a lack of financial resources. As a result, these documents also introduced the principle of *expansion with cost containment*, to be reiterated in educational policies. The aim was to meet the demand to the maximum extent possible with a minimum of cost. Reformulating higher education was to be achieved by rationing financial and human resources, and applying the principle of organizational flexibility in order to avoid duplicating efforts for the same academic ends.

Recommendations for rationing resources included eliminating lifelong professorships and replacing them with departments, and introducing the basic cycle in the first year of university education. These measures were considered strategic for bypassing the pressure pertaining to the “excess” issue. The document drafted by the Consulting Team on Higher Education explicitly mentioned the participation of private education in the expansion process. It pointed out that the government should stimulate private universities and help ensure space for low-income students. (*Relatório da Equipe de Assessoria ao Planejamento do Ensino Superior*, 1969 {Report by the Consulting Team for Higher Education}).

Student movements that took place in several countries in 1968 took on different political nuances according to the social-historic context in which they occurred. In Brazil, besides struggling to restore democracy, students continued pressuring the military regime to restructure and expand higher education. In 1969 the government created the University Reform Task Force (TF) to seek out “realistic solutions” and “operational measures” aimed at making the system “efficient” and productive. The *Relatório do Grupo de Trabalho da Reforma Universitária* (Report by the University Reform) was to incorporate several recommendations contained in the documents mentioned above that included the principle of *expansion with cost containment* as well as the recommendation to fully use the material and human resources of university institutions. (Lipset, 1971; Wallerstein, 1971; Touraine, 1968; *Relatório do Grupo de Trabalho de Trabalho da Reforma Universitária*, 1969 {Report by the University Reform Group 1969}).

Although it did not mention private education in the expansion process, the TF created openings for future private participation in higher education. Whereas the TF determined universities as the “natural structure for higher education”, by allowing for “exceptional” non-university establishments, the TF created favorable conditions for the privatization process that followed, based on the creation of isolated establishments. An official statement that insisted on scarce financial resources later allowed for the “complementary” nature of the private education network in expanding the system. Note that the 1967 Federal Constitution provided financial resources and technical support for private education (Sousa, 2006; Horta, 1996).

In 1968 a University Reform was approved for fundamentally modernizing public institutions, particularly federal universities. The effects of the reform were paradoxical. On the one hand, it created favorable conditions for certain institutions to unite teaching and research activities under one roof, which until then had been conducted separately. Lifelong professorships were abolished, the department system was introduced, academic careers

were professionalized, graduate studies were institutionalized, etc. In the Reform of 1968 the graduate courses were created along the same lines, in general, as the North-American model, which included the Masters and Doctoral programs.

It is worth noting that the graduate studies system implemented in the country in the past four decades has become an essential tool in the renewal of higher education in the country. The graduate courses were first introduced in the public universities, especially in federal institutions and in the state universities of São Paulo. Today, these public institutions still concentrate the overwhelming majority of the existing graduate programs in the country. Implementation of the graduate courses made it possible to grant thousands of Masters and Doctoral degrees and later boosted a vigorous program of scientific research that has contributed to the academic training of new generations of researchers. It was by means of the graduate courses that research took on an institutional character in certain Brazilian universities (Velloso, 2000; Martins, 2002, 2003).

On the other hand, the University Reform was unable to keep up with the growing enrollment demand in public universities, especially in federal universities. This gave space for new private non-university institutions to emerge, answering to a repressed demand that sought to increase the chance of social mobility through higher education. These institutions were headed by businesspeople, focused on professional courses, and detached from research activities (Martins, 1988).

The argument of scarce resources did not prevent the military government from creating an efficient system to stimulate scientific and technological development aimed at producing qualified human resources. Initially the National Development Bank (BNDE), and later the Projects Financing Agency (FINEP), both federal government agencies, provided financial resources to public institutions. These agencies played an important role in the initial implementation of graduate-level education, which impacted the process of renovating Brazil's higher education. The federal universities received financial resources to build new campuses and laboratories, to institutionalize the teaching career, etc.

This was the moment when a doubly selective federal university model was structured: in the social arena, the vacancies were filled by a small group of students who possessed a reasonable amount of economic and/or cultural capital. In the academic arena, there was an attempt to reach a high standard of quality, based on aligning teaching and research, and graduate studies played a central role in this attempt. The underlying motivation of this model was to protect federal universities from being swamped by overwhelming numbers of students (Cunha, 2004; Ferrari, 2001).

It would be incorrect to state that public education did not grow. Between 1974 and 1980, enrollment went from 385,000 to approximately 500,000 (Table 3). However, this increase still did not provide sufficient access to higher education, and created a gap that favored the entry of private education. Note that Catholic universities at the time were reluctant to expand their network for meeting this demand, and instead held on to the concept of a university that reproduced local elite groups (Salem, 1982).

The participation of the Federal Education Council (CFE), an agency under the Ministry of Education, was one of the factors that enabled new private education to emerge. The Council was made up in its majority of people linked to the interests of private education who were inclined to accept requests for opening new private institutions. In 1969 the CFE began authorizing a growing number of new private institutions that would meet the minimum requirements of financial and human resources needed to create their establishments. Between 1968 and 1972, 938 requests for opening new courses, of which 759 received a favorable reply, were sent to the CFE (Horta, 1975). The requests for opening schools came from secular private institutions that were already present in the for-profit secondary school system. Because public universities were unable to increase the number of student openings at the necessary rate, secondary school owners seized the opportunity to invest their capital in higher education that would address the repressed demand. In its initial stage, which lasted from the late 1960s until the 1970s, the secular private sector expanded through the proliferation of small, non-university establishments located mostly in the urban centers. The institutions that were created by the owners of secondary schools occupied the same spaces that housed the secondary students in the morning and afternoon periods, with the new higher education classes being conducted in the evening. The initial public targeted by the for-profit private institutions was the middle urban tier comprising lower level employees of public and state institutions and workers in the trade industry, i.e. individuals who had completed their secondary education and entered the work market directly. This initial public was generally of a higher age bracket than the students in public establishments and denominational institutions (Martins, 1986).

The strong political control imposed by the military regime on the academic environment restricted movements against the proliferation of private education establishments and made defending public education unfeasible. These movements mobilized a considerable number of educators in the 1950s (Fernandes, 1975). Because the owners of these new establishments adhered to the values of the military regime and established political alliances with those who were in power, their businesses had advantageous conditions for growth.

The compliance of the owners of the new establishments with the authoritarian political regime of 1964 brought them material advantages, among which was the exemption from tax payments over their institutions. The Constitution of 1967, promulgated at a time when the post-1964 regime was hardening politically, assured financial support for such institutions and offered scholarships for their students (Horta, 1996). Besides introducing a business mentality to higher education, they also imported the same control behavior they exercised over teachers in their secondary schools and established strict ideological vigilance within their institutions, thus preventing critical thinking in their establishments (Tragtemberg, 1982).

As the business-style private higher education expanded, it distanced itself from the military regime support base and began taking on a life of its own in terms of performance within the system. The schools built powerful associations, such as the Brazilian Association of Maintainers of Higher Education (ABMES). These associations worked intensely to construct the institutional identity of their segment and to organize and defend their interests *vis-à-vis* the federal government and society (ABMES, 2002.).

GROWTH OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

In 1971 there were 619 institutions of higher education in Brazil. In 2010 the number stood at 2,378. Table 1 shows the growth of private institutions, which represent 88% of the total number of undergraduate establishments⁵. As mentioned above, over the past four decades a highly complex system was formed that interconnected a variety of institutions of different sizes and having different organizational structures. It is a heterogeneous system made up of 278 public institutions (99 federal, 108 State, and 71 municipal) and 2,100 private institutions (Table 2) that have different academic goals. There are differences in quality too, not only between the public and private segments, but also within each one. In general, institutional assessments conducted by government agencies indicate that public universities have the best undergraduate and graduate courses. These institutions, particularly the São Paulo state universities and some federal institutions, form the core of scientific and technological research. It is worth noting that most graduate courses in Brazil

5 Unfortunately, statistical data from the Ministry of Education of Brazil have failed to supply information about the different modalities of private institutions (denominational, community-based, and for-profit) and provide only aggregate data. Certain works indicate that for-profit private institutions represent approximately 70% of the total private establishments. For this, see Sobrinho and Brito (2008).

are concentrated in public universities. These institutions institutionalized the academic career, introduced fulltime teaching, and offer more degrees, according to the data in Table 8.

Non-university institutions account for 92% of the higher education system in Brazil. The 190 universities make up a small part, in numbers, of this complex field, while there are currently 101 public, and 89 private universities in the country (Table 2). Although the 58 federal universities are formally homogeneous at the institutional level, they are not so when it comes to the academic level. Differences in size, in the qualification of the faculty, and in the offer of graduate programs persist – that is, there are qualitative differences in terms of scientific maturity.⁶ The 38 state universities have grown significantly after the 1980s. As the richest in the federation, in the 1930s the state of São Paulo created a system of its own institutions that has always been academically and financially autonomous with regard to the federal government. The São Paulo universities, notably the University of São Paulo (USP) and the University of Campinas (UNICAMP), have held a dominant academic position in the field of Brazilian higher education. As they are located in the state of São Paulo, a better structured, more financially supported university system was created in comparison with the institutions maintained by the other states of the federation. The more recent creation of state universities expresses, in a certain way, the expansion of the federal system⁷.

Institutional diversity also appeared within the sub-field of private universities, basically comprised of denominational institutions (Catholic and Protestant), by community-based institutions, and by for-profit institutions. In this subset of establishments there is also a multiplicity of academic vocations, institutional projects, qualification, and of the quality of teaching and research. In general, denominational universities, especially the PUCs (Catholic), professionalized their faculties, started graduate programs, and developed high-quality teaching. Community universities perform significant work in rendering educational services to their communities, maintaining a high degree of interaction with the contexts in which they exist. They have focused

6 There are significant variations in size among federal universities. Data from *Sinopse do Ensino Superior no Brasil 2010* (Synopsis of Higher Education in Brazil, Ministry of Education, Brasília, 2011) indicate, for instance, that the Federal University of Roraima has 5,500 students; the Federal Rural University of Pernambuco has 10,500 students; and the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro has 36,000 students. The data also indicate differences in the degrees held by the faculty members and the presence of graduate programs in federal universities. For more on the differences between public universities, see Martins (2000, pp. 156-159).

7 For more on the creation of the University of São Paulo, which occupies a leading position in the field of higher education institutions in Brazil, see Cardoso (1982).

on teaching activities, working extensively in the domain of university outreach and extension.⁸

The institutional diversity in Brazilian higher education has prompted the creation of educational associations in the public and private sectors. Thus, in the 1990s, the *Associação dos Dirigentes das Instituições Federais* (Association of Directors of Federal Institutions –, ANDIFES *Associação Brasileira das Universidades Comunitárias* (Brazilian Association of Community Universities –, ABRUC *Associação Brasileira dos Mantenedores do Ensino Superior* (Brazilian Association of Higher Education Maintainer – ABNES – connected to the for-profit sector – *Associação dos Centros Universitários* (Association of University Centers) ANACEU, and the *Associação Nacional das Universidades Católicas* (National Association of Catholic Universities – ANUC came into being. These institutions promote seminars and conduct courses and yearly gatherings among their members to deal with issues of interest in their sectors. They also work intensely in social and political relationships with the Ministry of Education and the legislative branch, defending their material and symbolic interests. Through these mechanisms, they produce their institutional identities, mobilize the activity of the field of higher education in Brazil, and intensify disputes among the several segments that comprise the area of higher education in Brazil (Martins, 2003; Sampaio, 2000).

The latest official data indicate that there were 5,449,120 students enrolled in undergraduate studies in Brazil in the year 2010. Between 1974 and 1980 enrollment in the private sector leapt from 596,000 to 885,000 (Table 3). In 2010 the private sector accounted for 3,987,424 students, which represents 73% of the total of number of enrollments in undergraduate courses in that year.⁹

In 1980 the economic crisis in Brazil caused serious increases in inflation rates and high levels of unemployment, which consequently decelerated the expansion of higher education. At the same time, several professional associations and other segments of society began criticizing the quality of private education. The government responded to this discontent by adopting legal measures that temporarily suspended the creation of new courses in existing

8 For more on community-based institutions, see, Neves (1995).

9 According to data from *Sinopse do Ensino Superior no Brasil 2010*, there were 3 million female students attending undergraduate courses, which represents 55% of the total enrollment. The great majority of undergraduate students study at night: 3.4 million, which represents 63% of the total student body. There are differences in the distribution of enrollments in night school among the institutions: federal institutions have 7% of their students in night courses; state establishments also have 7% of their students enrolled in night courses; and municipal institutions have 2%. Private institutions have 84% of their student body attending undergraduate courses at night. Traditionally, for-profit institutions stand out in the supply of night courses.

establishments. Also in this same period, public institutions were established in geographic areas that were of lesser economic interest to the private network. As a result, between 1980 and 1985 there was a small decrease in enrollment in the private sector, going from 885,000 to 811,00, whereas enrollment in the public education system increased from 492,000 to 556,000 (Sousa, 2006).

In the 1980s private education went through times of decreasing enrollments and diminishing stability, as indicated by the data in Table 3. The new private institutions created in the post-1964 period sought to obtain advantages through certain legal measures introduced to regulate higher education. Two of these legal measures accelerated those institutions' pace of growth. The first was brought about by the promulgation of the new Constitution of Brazil in 1988. Article 207 of the Federal Constitution granted didactic/scientific, administrative, and financial and asset management autonomy to universities. Several private institutions created in the post-1964 period perceived in this constitutional precept an opportunity to break free from the bureaucratic control of the Ministry of Education. By becoming universities they would be able to create and remove courses and manage the number of enrollments in their institutions.

As mentioned above, the initial phase of expansion in the secular sector took place through the creation of small non-university establishments. In the late 1970s, the institutional organization process of the private sector was gradually transformed. Initially, some non-university establishments went through a fusion process. Later in the 1980s, the movement to transform isolated establishments into universities accelerated. Between 1985 and 1995, the number of private universities more than tripled, going from 20 to 64 establishments. In 2010 the autonomy granted to universities by the Constitution of 1988 allowed for the clustering of robust educational groups. As autonomy enabled them to grow, these institutions increased and diversified the undergraduate courses offered and increased their competitive advantages in a market that was relatively stagnant (Sampaio, 2000), and the number of institutions grew to 89 (Table 2). These new private universities also sought to obtain more symbolic productivity within the field of higher education by formally distinguishing themselves academically from private non-university institutions. Most of these for-profit private universities that were created in the last few decades are a simulacrum of true universities¹⁰ in that they tend to function

10 Interviews conducted by the author with owners of universities created in the 1990s reveal that they faced serious difficulties in implanting a university structure, because these institutions began, became organized, and expanded as teaching centers. The interviews emphasized that most of them created a series of academic artificialities in order to fulfill the formal requirements established for the functioning of universities. In this connection, see Martins and Velloso (2002).

as a juxtaposition of professional courses. Many of these universities did not provide academic careers for their professors, nor did they institutionalize research (Barreyro, 2008).

The second measure driving the growth of the private institutions created in the post-1964 period was the promulgation of Decree 2,306/1977 by the Brazilian government, which, from then on, regulated the functioning of higher education institutions. According to the Decree, the organizations offering higher education may conform to any of the legally allowed civil and commercial formats and, when chartered as foundations, will be ruled by the Brazilian Civil Code. This decree created two types of higher education providers: nonprofit and for-profit. The former should apply financial surplus exclusively to the goals of the higher education institution. They were forbidden by law to remunerate or grant material advantages or benefits to their institutors, directors, partners, etc. Regarding for-profit providers, Article 7 of the aforementioned decree determined that, “educational institutions strictly classified as private, that are for-profit, were, from then on, submitted to a regime of mercantile legislation, in terms of tax, para-fiscal and labor burden, as if their maintainers and administrators were equivalent to individual merchants” The great majority of private establishments created after 1964 opted for a commercial nature.¹¹

This decree was a watershed in the context of Brazilian higher education. Up to then there was no legislation in the country foreseeing for-profit higher education and, consequently, tax exemption was conceded to all establishments maintained by private individuals or corporations. Private institutions created post-1964 experienced a situation of fiscal ambiguity. From their beginning they intended to conduct for-profit activities, but they did not openly own the entrepreneurial character of their institutions, since they received tax exemptions from the public authority. Decree 2,306/1977 ended the institutional ambiguity in post-1964 private higher education, since from then on, protected by a legal apparatus, they could own the commercial character of their activities *vis-à-vis* the State and society.

This decree allowed private initiative to increase their revenues from higher education. From then on, several of these institutions hired the services of external academic consultants, who did not belong to their faculty or administrative staff, to advise them in a variety of subjects: creation of new undergraduate courses that are capable of attracting new students, development of graduate programs, implementation of distance courses, etc. Gradually, consultants have also begun working in other areas, such as financial

11 Decree 2306, of August 19, 1997. *Diário Oficial da União* (DOU). Brasília.

management, human resources, and information management, supplying diagnosis and drafting propositions in order to increase the entrepreneurial rationale of these institutions.

During Fernando Henrique Cardoso's Presidency (1995-2002), private institutions grew. The neo-liberal economic policies that were implemented resulted in the privatization of several state-owned companies, and also inspired the central guidelines for higher education in Brazil. During this period the government reduced its investments in the maintenance and expansion of federal public universities, cutting back considerably on their financial investments in physical infrastructure, equipment purchases, lab maintenance, library collections, etc. GDP resources that were allocated to federal institutions were reduced from 0.97% in 1985 to 0.64% in 2003. Significant decreases were seen in the salaries of professors and technical-administrative staff at federal universities between 1995 and 2002 as a result of a pay freeze policy. The Ministry of Education encouraged federal institutions to offer more student vacancies using existing human and physical resources despite significant numbers of professors and employees going into retirement. At the same time, public entrance exams for professorships were suspended. The results of these actions placed the work of professors at risk and caused sharp increases in the recourse to substitute professors. (Corbucci, 2000 and 2004; Amaral, 2008; Trindade, 1999).

The policy of the federal government to reduce public resources allocated to federal education institutions were combined with a benevolent attitude toward expanding private education. As a result, the National Education Council, which is a Ministry of Education agency created in 1994, became more flexible in granting requests to authorize, acknowledge, and accredit private institutions. A process to evaluate undergraduate courses was introduced in 1996 as a mechanism to regulate the academic market. Those responsible for educational policies assumed that a competitive logic would encourage students and their families – educational consumers – to choose institutions according to evaluation rankings, which could eventually cause institutions to improve the quality of their products (Dourado, 2002; Caixeta, 2002).

From 1995 to 2002 undergraduate enrollment soared from 1.7 million to 3.5 million, an increase of 209%. The private sector led this expansion by increasing its undergraduate enrollment from 60% to 70%. The number of public universities remained practically the same, while private universities went from 64 to 84 establishments. Of the 77 university centers created during the academic reorganization period of educational institutions, 74 were private. From 1990 to 2002 the demand for higher education, as measured by the number of students registered for the entrance exam, grew by approximately 160%, while the student vacancies increased by 252%. However,

vacancies decreased in federal universities, thereby allowing excess enrollment to be largely absorbed by private institutions. Increased student vacancies reduced the ratio of candidates per vacancy from 3.8 to 2.8 in that period. However, public education continued to be the most sought after, as demonstrated by the increase in ratio of applicants-per-vacancy rising from 5.7 in 1990 to 8.9 in 2004. The number of candidates for private education, during the same period, went from 2.9 to 1.6. (Barreyro, 2008; Corbucci, 2004). In 2010, data (Table 4) indicate that there were 7.5 candidates competing for one vacancy in public institutions and 9 candidates competing for one vacancy in federal institutions. On the other hand, there were 1.2 candidates competing for one vacancy in private institutions.

Throughout the last decade, private education has adopted several strategies to expand in the national territory. It has penetrated regions of the country in which public education had predominated. In this period, enrollments in private institutions grew proportionally more in the North, Northeast, and Center-West regions, than in the Southeast and South regions of the country. As shown in Table 2.1, private education consolidated its presence in terms of the number of institutions in the North (121 institutions), Northeast (369 institutions), and Center-West (277 institutions) regions. It kept its leading position in the South and Southeast regions. At the same time, it penetrated cities in the interior of the Brazilian territory. As shown by the data in Table 2.2, there are 1,365 private establishments in non-capital towns, which represent 65% of the total. Table 5 indicates that in 2010 1.7 million students in private education studied in colleges, that is, in non-university establishments organized to offer a strictly professional education to their students. This contingent represented 43% of the total enrollments. The strategy of boosting the presence of private institutions in small non-capital towns, which was intensified in the 1990s, bore results. In 2012 there were 2 million students from the private sector studying in non-capital towns, which represents 53% of total enrollments (Table 5.1). In 2010 private higher education predominated in all regions of Brazil, in terms of the number of enrollments: North (57%), Northeast (58%), Southeast (81%), South (73%), and Center-West (73%) (Table 5.2). On the other hand, it must be mentioned that in capitals and large urban centers private education has intensified the strategy of implanting their facilities in lower income neighborhoods (Sampaio, 2011).

Since the concession of autonomy, private institutions have used this prerogative to increase and decrease the number of vacancies in conformity with the demand. Organized as commercial enterprises, private establishments create and remove courses in response to market fluctuations. In 2010, of the 28,000 on-site undergraduate courses, the private sector offered

a total of 19,000, which represents 70% of the total. Of these courses, 48% are in non-university establishments (Table 6). The course modalities have also changed in recent decades. The private sector has begun offering courses for the professions for which, traditionally in Brazilian society, higher education was not expected, such as culinary arts, furniture design, hair design, and fashion work. In this way it seeks to attract a very diverse clientele, in terms of age and social background: youth who have concluded secondary education but have not yet had any higher education, upwardly mobile workers, and the unemployed. In parallel, this sector began working strongly in the area of distance education. In 2010, of the 930 undergraduate distance courses, the private sector was responsible for 54%, concentrating in areas such as business, law, and education (Table 6.1). Its participation in graduate courses also increased. Since 1987, the number of masters programs offered by the private sector increased from 79 to 427, and doctoral programs grew from 33 to 187 in the same period. One must consider, however, that most of these masters and doctoral courses are concentrated in denominational universities (Table 7).

Because a large number of private institutions created in the post-1964 period have opted for the commercial format made possible by Decree 2,306/1977, powerful educational groups were formed that act as networks, making use of centralized and professional management. Approximately 40 groups have listed their operations on the stock exchange, among which the following stand out: Kroton Educacional, Anhanguera Educacional, Estácio Participações SA, and Sistema Educacional Brasileiro, SA. These and similar groups have partnerships with international networks¹² of education and control many educational establishments and institutions in several regions of the country. In a setting of extreme competition for the market of higher education, small, family-owned enterprises built in the initial stage have been driven to modernize their entrepreneurial procedures or obtain an attractive financial settlement by selling their establishments to more entrepreneurially structured groups.

The new administration that took office in 2003 took steps to redirect educational policies and sought to strengthen public education, especially in federal universities. Although the Prime Minister of the new administration did not clearly indicate measures for recovering federal institutions, certain actions were implemented in 2004 to reverse the difficult situation these institutions

12 Some groups include the participation of international educational institutions such as Laureate and Advanced. These robust educational groups have internet websites in which they speak of their history, development, and expansion. They also offer their educational services through these sites.

had faced in previous years. Budgets were recovered, new units were implemented, professors and employees were hired using public entrance exams, and salaries were updated. In 2004 the government introduced the University for All program (Prouni) with the purpose of democratizing access to higher education and increasing graduation rates. This program has been the subject of spirited discussion and controversy within academia (Carvalho, 2006).

In that same year the government proposed a University Reform bill that, unlike the one enacted in 1968, was widely debated by the academic community and society. Among other aspects, the bill intends to recover the role of the State as a leader in the higher education system and establish a functional framework for public and private establishments. It also seeks to recuperate the importance of federal institutions by providing regular financing to support activities. Regrettably, the University Reform bill has been stalled in Legislative deliberations, a result of its controversial nature and because it challenges the interests of private for-profit institutions (Martins, 2006; Guissardi, 2006).

In April 2007 the federal government instituted *Reestruturação e Expansão das Universidades Federais (Reuni)* (Program for Restructuring and Expanding Plans of Federal Universities – Reuni). The program's goals are to provide universities with the necessary resources for improving access, enhancing the quality of their courses, improving their physical structure, and reviewing their academic structure. *Reuni* is an attempt to establish the specific framework set forth in the National Education Plan that determined to offer higher education to at least 30% of young people between the ages of 18 and 24 by 2010 (Reuni, 2007)

Brazil's experience over the past 40 years in expanding higher education makes it clear that merely increasing the number of student vacancies in the private sector does not guarantee a democratic higher education system. Higher education in Brazil remains available to only 12% (approximately) of students in the 18 to 24 age bracket, which is in sharp contrast to more advanced countries that have absorbed approximately 60% of young people in that same age group (Barreyro, 2008; McCowan, 2007; Neves, 2005).

Revisiting the university reform bill could be an opportunity for building new academic agreements between all those involved in higher education. A central issue that must be faced is to restore the principle of higher education as a public asset that is an inalienable right granted to all citizens. Private, business-style education entities ruled by the free market have transformed the right of modern citizenship into an individual privilege and have converted its students into consumers of educational products. Private institutions have also generated heavy financial and human costs and burdened many students.

A higher education system that is committed to public interests implies that the State must be democratically involved in regulating and supervising the system. Democratic access to higher education necessarily involves recovering the central role that public universities play in the country. This means that federal institutions must be reinvigorated, granted effective administrative and financial autonomy, and be clearly supported by government in order to recover their capacity to function, expand, and offer high quality academic education that is socially pertinent.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Entrepreneurial profile private institutions appeared in Brazil in the context of the authoritarian regime introduced by the military in 1964. The creation of these institutions was an alternative for the expansion of higher education, in response to the pressure exerted by repressed demand. The new model of business-style private higher education emerged when public universities – especially federal universities – were modernized by the 1968 University Reform and could no longer accommodate the growing demand for access. Expansion of the business-style model was possible due to the weakened capacity of public education to cater to demand. The complex political alliances established by owners of educational enterprises with certain actors in the executive and legislative branches in the past fifty years enabled this growth. The private for-profit sector was encouraged in the 1980s and 1990s by the educational legislation enacted by the Brazilian State. These institutions saw in the legislation an opportunity to restructure and enhance their activities.

In the past fifty years Brazilian higher education has structured itself as a complex and heterogeneous academic field in which the institutions have come to occupy dominant and/or dominated positions, according to the specific criteria that define the prestige and acknowledgement of establishments. It would not be wrong to raise the supposition that in the past decades there has been an academic hierarchization process underway within the field of Brazilian higher education.

Thus, some public universities (federal and state) and certain private universities (usually religious) gradually organized themselves along the lines of a neo-humboldtian academic model. Such institutions created academic structures that enable institutionalized scientific production, developed *stricto sensu* graduate courses, promoted professionalization of the academic career, adopted a fulltime-employment regime for their faculty, preserved academic freedom, joined teaching and research activities, and implemented scientific initiatives in partnership with national development agencies. In 2010 federal

and state public universities accounted for 67% of the fulltime faculty and 66% of the doctoral degrees awarded in the country (Tables 8 and 8.1). Note that professors with doctorates following fulltime teaching careers are concentrated in the private sector, in denominational universities (Catholic and Protestant).

In turn, business-style private institutions structured activities that have a certain academic affinity to the neo-napoleonic model. Essentially, these institutions are concerned with strict professional training and hire professors on an hourly basis who have limited academic titles. An absence of research is the norm in these institutions and they have consolidated *stricto sensu* graduate programs. The way in which the expansion of higher education took place during the period examined makes it clear that a mere increase in vacancies in the private sector did not ensure its democratization. Access to Brazilian higher education is still restricted to approximately 12% of the population in the 18 to 24 age group. This is a contrast when compared to more advanced countries, where approximately 60% of this age group are enrolled in higher education (Barreyro, 2008; McCowan, 2007; Neves, 2005).

In 2004 the Lula administration sent to Congress a university reform bill. Differently from the elaboration of the 1968 Reform, drafting of the university reform bill was subject to an ample nationwide debate with the several actors involved in higher education in the country. The draft bill presented issues that were important to determine the strategic goals of higher education in the country. It clearly stated the role of public education in the country's development process. The bill emphatically manifested a commitment to recovering the physical and human resources infrastructure of federal universities, especially regarding continued financing. The bill also established a framework for higher education institutions aimed at preserving academic quality, etc. To achieve this, the document stressed the need for more control over academic performance in the process required to open private institutions.

Unfortunately the draft bill is stalled in Congress as a result of resistance from sectors that are linked to business-oriented private education institutions. Taking up the draft bill again could be an opportunity to build a new academic pact between the different actors and institutional segments involved in this field (Martins, 2006).

Brazilian higher education faces several challenges. The quality of teaching in several institutions is unsatisfactory. The faculties' working conditions, especially in the for-profit private sector, have not made it possible to achieve a high standard of academic work. An issue presents itself for public discussion: is it possible to support the growth of the supply of higher education in the country with private funding? A central issue that must be dealt with is the restoration of the principle that makes higher education a public asset, an

inalienable right of the citizen. With this in mind, the academic community and those in charge of educational policy should take on the task of rethinking the role and functioning of business-style private education in the context of democratization of educational opportunities. Functioning of business-oriented private education, which is ruled by market mechanisms, turned a right of modern citizenship into an individual privilege, converting its clientele into consumers of educational products and imposing heavy financial and human expenses on a great part its students.

Providing higher education that is committed to the public interest implies that the State democratically becomes a central actor in regulating and supervising the country's entire higher education system. Democratization of access to higher education in Brazil necessarily involves recovering the centrality of public universities in order to reinvigorate federal institutions and give them effective administrative-financial autonomy. They must be clearly supported by the central authority in order to recover their capacity to function and expand. Reversal of the logic that guides the functioning of private education – motivated by the urge to accumulate material gains – is also of major importance.

TABLE 1
Evolution of higher education institutions (HEIs), regarding the type and control of institution- 2010.

Categoria	Funções Docentes (Em Exercício e Afastados)					Total	
	Adminis- trativa	Sem Graduação	Graduação	Especiali- zação	Mestrado		Doutorado
Pública		271	11.903	19.152	41.749	67.667	140.742
Federal		255	7.590	6.237	24.069	45.292	83.443
Estadual		14	3.814	10.068	14.760	21.158	49.814
Municipal		2	499	2.847	2.920	1.217	7.485
Privada		117	8.117	86.884	96.777	34.245	226.140
BRASIL		388	20.020	106.036	138.526	101.912	366.882

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 2
Number of higher education institutions, regarding the academic organizations and administrative categories of the HEIs- 2010.

Administrative Category	Institutions				Brazil totals
	Universities	Uni. Centers	Faculties	IF and CEFET	
Public	101	7	133	37	278
Federal	58	—	4	37	99
State	38	1	69	—	108
Municipal	5	6	60	—	71
Private	89	119	1.892	—	2.100
BRAZIL	190	126	2.025	37	2.378

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 2.1
Number of higher education institutions, regarding academic organization and regional distribution – 2010.

State / Administrative Category	Institutions				Overall Total
	Universities	Uni. Centers	Faculties	IF and CEFET	
North (totals)	15	9	117	5	146
Public	14	1	5	5	25
Federal	9	—	—	5	14
State	5	—	—	—	5
Municipal	—	1	5	—	6
Private	1	8	112	—	121
Northeast (totals)	35	5	382	11	433
Public	29	—	24	11	64
Federal	14	—	—	11	25
State	15	—	2	—	17
Municipal	—	—	22	—	22
Private	6	5	358	—	369
Southeast (totals)	80	84	994	11	1.169
Public	28	3	89	11	131
Federal	19	—	4	11	34
State	7	1	59	—	67
Municipal	2	2	26	—	30
Private	52	81	905	—	1.038
South (totals)	46	17	317	6	386
Public	21	3	11	6	41
Federal	11	—	—	6	17
State	8	—	7	—	15
Municipal	2	3	4	—	9
Private	25	14	306	—	345
Center-West (totals)	14	11	215	4	244
Public	9	—	4	4	17
Federal	5	—	—	4	9
State	3	—	1	—	4
Municipal	1	—	3	—	4
Private	5	11	211	—	227

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 2.2
Number of higher education institutions, regarding the locations (capital and provincial towns) and administrative categories of the HEIs – 2010.

Administrative Category	Institutions									
	Universities		Uni. Centers		Faculties		IFs + CEFETs		Overall total	
	Capital	Prov.	Capital	Prov.	Capital	Prov.	Capital	Prov.	Capital	Prov.
Public	48	53	1	6	16	117	26	11	91	187
Federal	31	27	—	—	3	1	26	11	60	39
State	17	21	1	—	13	56	—	—	31	77
Municipal	—	5	—	6	—	60	—	—	—	71
Private	38	51	49	70	648	1.244	—	—	735	1.365
BRAZIL	86	104	50	76	664	1.361	26	11	826	1.552

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 3
Evolution of student enrollment in higher education, regarding administrative category (Brazil- 1974/2010).

Year	Administrative Category					
	Public				Private	Total
	Federal	State	Local	Total		
1974	205.573	90.618	44.837	341.028	596.565	937.593
1975	248.849	107.111	54.265	410.225	662.323	1.072.548
1976	249.955	99.779	54.829	404.563	692.164	1.096.727
1977	253.602	103.691	52.186	409.479	749.567	1.159.046
1978	288.011	105.750	58.592	452.353	773.204	1.225.557
1979	290.868	107.794	63.641	462.303	849.496	1.311.799
1980	316.715	109.525	66.265	492.232	885.054	1.377.286
1981	313.217	129.659	92.934	535.810	850.982	1.386.792
1982	316.940	134.901	96.547	548.388	859.599	1.407.987

Continua →

Year	Administrative Category					
	Public				Private	Total
	Federal	State	Local	Total		
1983	340.118	147.197	89.347	576.689	862.303	1.438.992
1984	326.199	156.010	89.667	571.879	827.660	1.399.539
1985	326.522	146.816	83.342	556.680	810.929	1.367.609
1986	325.734	153.789	98.109	577.632	840.564	1.418.196
1987	329.423	168.039	87.503	584.965	885.590	1.470.555
1988	317.831	190.736	76.784	585.351	918.209	1.503.560
1989	315.283	193.697	75.434	584.414	934.490	1.518.904
1990	308.867	194.417	75.341	578.625	961.455	1.540.080
1991	320.135	202.315	83.286	605.736	959.320	1.565.056
1992	325.884	210.133	93.645	629.662	906.126	1.535.788
1993	344.387	216.535	92.594	653.516	941.152	1.594.668
1994	363.543	231.936	94.971	690.450	970.584	1.661.034
1995	367.531	239.215	93.794	700.540	1.059.163	1.759.703
1996	388.987	243.101	103.339	735.427	1.133.102	1.868.529
1997	395.833	253.678	109.671	759.182	1.186.433	1.945.615
1998	408.640	274.934	121.155	804.729	1.321.229	2.125.958
1999	442.562	302.380	87.080	832.022	1.537.923	2.369.945
2000	482.750	332.104	72.172	887.026	1.807.219	2.694.245
2001	502.960	357.015	79.250	939.225	2.091.529	3.030.754
2002	531.634	415.569	104.452	1.051.655	2.428.158	3.479.913
2003	567.101	442.706	126.563	1.136.370	2.750.652	3.887.022
2004	574.584	471.661	132.083	1.178.328	2.985.405	4.163.733
2005	579.587	477.349	135.253	1.192.189	3.260.967	4.453.156
2006	589.821	481.756	137.727	1.209.304	3.467.342	4.676.646
2007	615.542	482.814	142.612	1.240.968	3.639.413	4.880.381
2008	643.101	490.235	140.629	1.273.965	3.806.091	5.080.056
2009	752.847	480.145	118.176	1.351.168	3.764.728	5.115.896
2010	833.934	524.698	103.064	1.461.696	3.987.424	5.449.120

Source: (MEC/INEP).

TABLE 4
Number of places offered, enrolled candidates and admissions regarding entrance exams and other selection procedures, according to the states and administrative categories of the HEIs – 2010.

State/ Administrative Category	Entrance Exams and Other Selection Procedures					
	Universities			Uni. Centers		
	Places Offered	Enrolled Candidates	Admissions	Places Offered	Enrolled Candidates	Admissions
Public	362.295	2.934.511	341.453	7.700	11.581	5.152
Federal	218.152	1.936.658	222.126	—	—	—
State	119.017	972.901	111.575	720	485	549
Municipal	25.126	24.952	7.752	6.980	11.096	4.603
Private	895.362	1.261.430	455.411	527.487	594.851	209.252
BRAZIL	1.257.657	4.195.941	796.864	535.187	606.432	214.404
	Faculties			IFs and CEFETs		
	Places Offered	Enrolled Candidates	Admissions	Places Offered	Enrolled Candidates	Admissions
	Public	45.531	114.418	33.402	29.811	304.333
Federal	571	11.468	378	29.811	304.333	28.555
State	18.581	68.059	17.911	29.811	304.333	28.555
Municipal	26.379	34.891	15.113	—	—	—
Private	—	—	—	—	—	—
BRAZIL	1.297.537	1.592.196	550.389	—	—	—
Overall Total						
	Places Offered	Enrolled Candidates	Admissions			
Public	248.534	2.252.459	251.059			
Federal	138.318	1.041.445	130.035			
State	58.485	70.939	27.468			
Municipal	2.674.855	3.334.059	1.181.650			
Private	3.120.192	6.698.902	1.590.212			
BRAZIL	445.337	3.364.843	408.562			

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 5

Enrollments in on-site undergraduate courses, regarding the academic organizations and administrative categories of the HEIs – 2010.

Administrative Category	Institutions				Overall total
	Universities	Uni. Centers	Faculties	IF and CEFET	
Public	1.272.971	14.166	105.987	68.572	1.461.696
Federal	763.891	—	1.471	68.572	833.934
State	471.269	1.199	52.230	—	524.698
Municipal	37.811	12.967	52.286	—	103.064
Private	1.537.003	727.465	1.722.956	—	3.987.424
BRAZIL	2.809.974	741.631	1.828.943	68.572	5.449.120

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 5.1

Enrollments in on-site undergraduate courses, regarding the locations (capital and provincial towns) and administrative categories of the HEIs – 2010.

State/ Administrative Category	Enrollments in On-site Undergraduate Courses									
	Universities		Uni. Centers		Faculties		IFs + CEFETs		Overall total	
	Capital	Prov.	Capital	Prov.	Capital	Prov.	Capital	Prov.	Capital	Prov.
Public	577.405	695.566	1.199	12.967	14.220	91.767	34.555	34.017	627.379	834.317
Federal	437.729	326.162	—	—	899	572	34.555	34.017	473.183	360.751
State	139.676	331.593	1.199	—	13.321	38.909	—	—	154.196	370.502
Municipal	—	37.811	—	12.967	—	52.286	—	—	—	103.064
Private	823.677	713.326	397.314	330.151	742.518	980.438	—	—	735	1.365
BRAZIL	1.401.082	1.408.892	398.513	343.118	756.738	1.072.205	34.555	34.017	2.590.888	2.858.232

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 5.2
Enrollments in on-site undergraduate courses, regarding administrative categories and regions of the HEIs – 2010.

State / Administrative Category	Enrollments in On-site Undergraduate Courses				Overall Total
	Universities	Uni. Centers	Faculties	IF and CEFET	
North (totals)	154.562	59.892	132.544	5.360	352.358
Public	139.246	5.279	2.584	5.360	152.469
Federal	99.897	—	—	5.360	105.257
State	39.349	—	—	—	39.349
Municipal	—	5.279	2.584	—	7.863
Private	15.316	54.613	129.960	—	199.889
Northeast (totals)	501.915	61.708	465.563	22.975	1.052.161
Public	393.566	—	21.549	22.975	438.090
Federal	237.172	—	—	22.975	260.147
State	156.394	—	1.016	—	157.410
Municipal	—	—	20.533	—	20.533
Private	108.349	61.708	444.014	—	614.071
Southeast (totals)	1.377.541	469.793	782.753	26.144	2.656.231
Public	398.910	4.274	64.553	26.144	493.881
Federal	221.647	—	1.471	26.144	249.262
State	162.813	1.199	40.185	—	204.197
Municipal	14.450	3.075	22.897	—	40.422
Private	978.631	465.519	718.200	—	2.162.350
South (totals)	552.588	76.862	256.915	6.765	893.130
Public	218.430	4.613	12.559	6.765	242.367
Federal	128.367	—	—	6.765	135.132
State	72.050	—	10.432	—	82.482
Municipal	18.013	4.613	2.127	—	24.753
Private	334.158	72.249	244.356	—	650.763
Center-West (totals)	223.368	73.376	191.168	7.328	495.240
Public	122.819	—	4.742	7.328	134.889
Federal	76.808	—	—	7.328	84.136
State	40.663	—	597	—	41.260
Municipal	5.348	—	4.145	—	9.493
Private	100.549	73.376	186.426	—	360.351

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 6
 Number of on-site undergraduate courses, regarding the academic organizations and administrative categories of the HEIs – 2010.

State / Administrative Category	Number of On-site Undergraduate Courses				General Total
	Universities	Uni. Centers	Faculties	IF & CEFET	
Public	7.467	94	580	680	8.821
Federal	4.327	—	17	680	5.024
State	2.923	10	247	—	3.180
Municipal	217	84	316	—	617
Private	6.677	3.482	9.597	—	19.756
BRAZIL	14.144	3.576	10.177	680	28.577

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 6.1
Number of undergraduate distance learning courses, regarding the academic organizations and administrative categories of the HEIs, according to the general fields (Brazil, 2010).

General Fields	Number of Undergraduate Distance									
	Universities					University Centers				
	Public			Private	Total	Public			Private	Total
	Federal	State	Munic.			Federal	State	Munic.		
Education	213	88	12	120	433	—	—	—	38	38
Arts, Humanities	1	1	—	5	7	—	—	—	5	5
Social Science, Business, Law	48	14	4	164	230	—	—	—	36	36
Science, Math, Computing	9	1	—	20	30	—	—	—	5	5
Engineering, Production, Construction	2	1	—	10	13	—	—	—	1	1
Agriculture, Veterinary Studies	2	—	—	2	4	—	—	—	3	3
Health, Social Well-being	—	1	—	14	15	—	—	—	2	2
Services	1	—	—	18	19	—	—	—	2	2
Total	276	106	16	353	715	—	—	—	92	92

General Fields	Faculties					IFs and CEFETs				
	Public			Private	Total	Public			Private	Total
	Federal	State	Munic.			Federal	State	Munic.		
	Education	—	—	—	32	32	15	—	—	—
Arts, Humanities	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	—
Social Science, Business, Law	—	—	—	25	25	4	—	—	—	4
Science, Math, Computing	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	4
Engineering, Production, Construction	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—
Agriculture, Veterinary Studies	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Health, Social Well-being	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Services	—	—	—	1	1	3	—	—	—	3
Total	—	—	—	61	61	26	—	—	—	26

General Fields	Overall total				
	Public			Private	Total
	Federal	State	Munic.		
	Education	228	88	12	190
Arts, Humanities	1	1	—	12	14
Social Science, Business, Law	52	14	4	225	295
Science, Math, Computing	13	1	—	25	39
Engineering, Production, Construction	2	1	—	12	15
Agriculture, Veterinary Studies	2	—	—	5	7
Health, Social Well-being	—	1	—	16	17
Services	4	—	—	21	25
Total	302	106	16	506	930

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 7

Number of postgraduate courses regarding administrative category.

Year	Private		State		Federal		Municipal		<i>Total Master</i>	<i>Total PhD</i>
	Masters	PhD	Masters	PhD	Masters	PhD	Masters	PhD		
1987	79	33	279	193	503	159	0	0	861	385
1988	83	37	290	202	562	163	0	0	935	402
1989	89	42	302	215	545	173	0	0	936	430
1990	94	44	310	221	547	184	0	0	951	449
1991	95	45	323	228	563	199	0	0	981	472
1992	90	46	333	234	595	222	0	0	1018	502
1993	97	47	338	246	604	231	0	0	1039	524
1994	110	54	364	267	645	273	0	0	1119	594
1995	112	54	365	274	682	288	0	0	1159	616
1996	102	52	382	283	702	294	0	0	1186	629
1997	115	55	396	287	738	316	0	0	1249	658
1998	121	60	400	293	770	342	0	0	1291	695
1999	148	65	426	309	811	377	3	1	1388	752
2000	174	69	441	323	835	428	3	1	1453	821
2001	198	84	450	357	840	514	4	1	1492	956
2002	242	86	467	359	885	522	6	0	1600	967
2003	270	89	490	359	954	538	7	0	1721	986
2004	288	98	496	368	989	589	9	0	1782	1055
2005	326	102	522	387	1034	607	10	0	1892	1096
2006	376	118	559	402	1122	665	12	0	2069	1185
2007	406	133	577	404	1191	706	13	1	2187	1244
2008	420	147	600	416	1278	755	15	2	2313	1320
2009	433	171	626	434	1360	814	16	2	2435	1421
2010	427	187	657	450	1442	862	18	3	2544	1502
<i>Total</i>	<i>4895</i>	<i>1918</i>	<i>10393</i>	<i>7511</i>	<i>20197</i>	<i>10221</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>35601</i>	<i>19661</i>

Source: CAPES/MEC.

TABLE 8

Overall number of teaching posts (active and non-active) regarding academic organization and level of qualification, according to the administrative categories of the HEIs – 2010.

Administrative Category	Teaching Posts (active and non-active)					Total
	No Degree	Undergraduate Degree	Professional Masters	Research Masters	PhD	
Public	271	11.903	19.152	41.749	67.667	140.742
Federal	255	7.590	6.237	24.069	45.292	83.443
State	14	3.814	10.068	14.760	21.158	49.814
Municipal	2	499	2.847	2.920	1.217	7.485
Private	117	8.117	86.884	96.777	34.245	226.140
Brazil	388	20.020	106.036	138.526	101.912	366.882

Source: (INEP, 2010).

TABLE 8.1

Overall number of active teaching posts, regarding academic organization and labor regime, according to the administrative categories of the HEIs – 2010.

Administrative Category	Active Teaching Post			Total
	Full-time	Part-time	Hourly Wage Earner	
Public	104.957	16.924	8.908	130.789
Federal	70.481	7.416	711	78.608
State	33.062	7.873	4.134	45.069
Municipal	1.414	1.635	4.063	7.112
Private	51.413	60.164	102.969	214.546
Brazil	156.370	77.088	111.877	345.335

Source: (INEP, 2010).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALTBACH, P. (1999), *American Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century: Social, Political and Economics Challenges*, London, The John Hopkins University Press.
- ALTBACH, P. (2005), *Private Higher Education: A Global Revolution*, Boston, Center for International Higher Education.
- ALTBACH, P., UMAKOSHI, T. (2004), *Asian Universities: Historical Universities and Contemporary Challenges*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- AMARAL, N. C. (2008), "Autonomia e financiamento das IFES: Desafios e ações". *Avaliação*, 13 (3), pp. 647-680.
- ANTONIAZZI, A. (1975), "Tendências atuais das universidades católicas no Brasil". *Revista Vozes*, 9 (outubro), pp. 27-35.
- ATCON, R. (1966), *Rumo à Reformulação Estrutural da Universidade Brasileira*, Rio de Janeiro, Ministério da Educação e Cultura.
- ABMES (2002), *Políticas de Educação Superior: Desafios e Proposições*, Brasília, Associação Brasileira de Mantenedores do Ensino Superior.
- BARNETT (2000), *Realizing the University in an Age of Super Complexity*, London, Open University.
- BARREYRO, G. B. (2008), *Mapa do Ensino Superior Privado*, Brasília, Inep, Mec.
- BOURDIEU, P. (1980), *Questions de sociologie*, Paris, Éditions de Minuit.
- BOURDIEU, P. (1982), *Leçon sur la leçon*, Paris, Éditions de Minuit.
- BOURDIEU, P. (1987), *Choses dites*, Paris, Minuit.
- BOURDIEU, P. (1992a), *Les Règles de l'art: genèse et structure de champ littéraire*, Paris, Seuil.
- BOURDIEU, P., WACQUANT, L. (1992b), *Réponses*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil.
- BARBER, Z. (2006), "Globalization, nostalgia, and the university". *Society* (May/June), pp. 44-47.
- BURKE, B., JOHNSTONE, M. (2004), "Access to higher education: the hope for democratic schooling in America". *Higher Education in Europe*, XXIX (1), pp. 19-31.
- CAIXETA, N. (2002), "Educação". In B. Lamounier and R. Figueiredo (eds), *A Era FHC: Um Balanço*, São Paulo, Cultura São Paulo, Editores Associados.
- CALHOUN, C. (2006a), "Is the University in crisis?". *Society* (May-Jun.), pp. 8-17.
- CALHOUN, C. (2006b), "The University and the public good". *Thesis Eleven*, 84, pp. 7-43.
- CALHOUN, C. (2009), "Academic freedom: public knowledge and the structural transformation of the university". *Social Research*, 76 (2), pp. 561-598.
- CARVALHO, C. A. (2006), "O Prouni no governo Lula e o jogo político em torno do acesso ao ensino superior". *Revista Educação e Sociedade*, 27, pp. 976-1000.
- CARDOSO, I. (1982), *A Universidade da Comunhão Paulista: O Projeto de Criação da Universidade de São Paulo (USP)*, São Paulo, Cortez Editor.
- CASALI, A. (1995), *Elite Intelectual e a Restauração da Igreja*, Petrópolis, Editora Vozes.
- CHARLES, C., VERGER, J. (1994), *Histoire des universités*, Paris, PUF.
- CLARK, B. (1983), *The Higher Education System*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- COLEHO, E. C. (1999), *As Profissões Imperiais: Medicina, Engenharia e Advocacia no Rio de Janeiro 1822-1930*, Rio de Janeiro, Editora Record.
- CORBUCCI, P. R. (2000), *As Universidades Federais: Gastos, Desempenho, Eficiência e Produtividade*, Brasília, Ipea.
- CORBUCCI, P. R. (2004), "Financiamento e democratização do acesso à educação superior no Brasil: da desserção do Estado ao projeto de reforma". *Revista Educação e Sociedade*, 25, pp. 977-996.

- CUNHA, L. A. (1975), "A expansão do ensino superior: Causas e consequências". *Revista Debate e Crítica*, 5, pp. 27-58.
- CUNHA, L. A. (1980), *A Universidade Temporã: O Ensino Superior da Colônia à Era Vargas*, Rio de Janeiro, Editora Civilização Brasileira.
- CUNHA, L. A. (2004), "Desenvolvimento desigual e combinado no ensino superior: Estado e mercado". *Revista Educação e Sociedade*, 88, pp. 795-817.
- DELANTY, G. (2001), "The university in the knowledge society". *Organization*, 8 (2), pp. 149-153.
- DELANTY, G. (2002), *Challenging Knowledge: The University in the Knowledge Society*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- DOUGHERTY, K. (2007), "Mass higher education: What is its impetus? What is its impact?". *Teachers College*, 99, pp. 66-72.
- DOURADO, L. F. (2002), "Reforma do Estado e as políticas para a educação superior no Brasil nos anos 90". *Educação & Sociedade*, 23, pp. 234-252.
- DURHAM, E. (2005), "Educação superior, pública e privada". In S. Schwartzman (org.), *Os Desafios da Educação no Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro, Editora Nova Fronteira.
- DURHAM, E., SAMPAIO, H. (1995), *Ensino Privado no Brasil*, São Paulo, USP, Documento de Trabalho do Nupes n.º 3.
- ENDERS, J. (2002), *Higher Education in a Globalising World*, Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- FÁVERO, M. L. (1977), *A Universidade Brasileira em Busca de sua Identidade*, Petrópolis, Editora Vozes.
- FÁVERO, M. L. (1995), *A Une em Tempos de Autoritarismo*, Rio de Janeiro, Editora UFRJ.
- FERNANDES, A. M. (1975), *Universidade Brasileira. Reforma ou Revolução?* São Paulo, Editora Alfa-Ômega.
- FERNANDES, A. M. (1984), *A Questão da USP*, São Paulo, Editora Brasiliense.
- FERNANDES, A. M. (2000), *A Construção da Ciência no Brasil e a SBPC*, Brasília, Editora da Unb.
- FERRARI, A. F. (2001), *José Pelúcio Ferreira e a Pós-graduação no Brasil*, Brasília, Paralelo 15.
- GIBBONS, M. et al. (1994), *The New Production of Knowledge: the Dynamics of Science in Contemporary Societies*, London, Sage.
- GUADILLA, G. C. (2005a), "Complejidades de la globalización e internacionalización de la educación superior: interrogantes para América Latina". *Cuadernos Del Cendes*, 58, pp. 1-22.
- GUADILLA, G. C. (2005b), *Education Superior Latinoamericana en los Albores del Tercer Milenio*, Caracas, Centro de Estudios del Desarrollo.
- GURIN, P. (2002), "Diversity and higher education: theory and impact of educational outcomes", 72 (3), pp. 330-366.
- HORTA, S. B. (1975), "A expansão do Ensino Superior no Brasil". *Revista Vozes*, LXIX (6), pp. 29-48.
- HORTA, S. B. (1996), "A educação no Congresso Constituinte 1966-1967". In J. Curry (org.), *A Educação nas Constituintes (1823-1988)*, São Paulo, Editora Autores Associados.
- JARUSCH, K. (1983), *The Transformation of Higher Education 1869-1930*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- KOGAN, M. (2000), *Transforming Higher Education: A Comparative Study*, London, Jessica Kingdley Publishers.
- LAZUECH, G. (1999), *L'Exception Française. Le modèle des grandes écoles à l'épreuve de la mondialisation*, Rennes, PUF.
- LIPSET, S. M. (1971), *Rebellion in the University*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- LUCAS, C. (1994), *American Higher Education: A History*, New York, St. Martin's Press.

- MARGINSON, S. (2007), "The public/private divide in higher education: a global revision". *Higher Education*, 53, pp. 307-333.
- MARTINS, C. B. (1986), Le nouvel enseignement supérieur privé au Brésil (1964-1983): Rencontre d'une demande sociale et d'une opportunité politique. PhD thesis, Paris, Université Paris v.
- MARTINS, C. B. (1988), *Ensino Pago: Um Retrato Sem Retoques*, São Paulo, Cortez Editora.
- MARTINS, C. B. (1998), "Notas sobre o sistema de ensino superior brasileiro contemporâneo". *Revista da Universidade de São Paulo*, 39, pp. 75-82.
- MARTINS, C. B. (2000), "As universidades públicas no contexto do ensino superior no Brasil". *Tempo Brasileiro, Anuário da Educação*, pp. 156-159.
- MARTINS, C. B. (2002), "Sobre a noção da prática em Bourdieu". *Novos Estudos Cebrap*, 62, pp. 163-181.
- MARTINS, C. B. (2003a), "A pós-graduação no contexto do ensino superior brasileiro". In L. Morhy (org.), *Universidade em Questão*, Brasília, Editora Universidade de Brasília, vol. 1, pp. 175-206.
- MARTINS, C. B. (2006), "Uma reforma necessária". *Revista Educação e Sociedade*, 27, pp. 1001-1020.
- MCCOWAN, T. (2007), "Expansion without equity: an analysis of current policy on access to higher education in Brazil". *Higher Education*, 53, pp. 579-598.
- MEYER, J., FRANK, D. (2007), "University expansion and the knowledge society". *Theory and Society*, 36, pp. 287-311.
- MEYER, J., SCHOFER, E. (2005), "The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century". *American Sociological Review*, 70 (6), pp. 898-920.
- MUSSELIN, C. (2009), "Les Réformes des universités en Europe". *Revue du Mauss*, 33, pp. 69-92.
- NEVES, C. B. (1995), *Ensino Superior no Rio Grande do Sul: A Experiência das Universidades Comunitárias*, São Paulo, USP, Documento de Trabalho Nupes, n.º 6.
- NEVES, C. B. (2002), "Estrutura e funcionamento do ensino". In *Educação Superior no Brasil*, Brasília, Unesco, pp. 43-86.
- NEVES, C. B. (2005), "Educação superior para todos? Acesso, expansão e equidade: novos desafios para a política educacional". *Revista Sociologia*, pp. 124-157.
- RELATÓRIO DA EQUIPE DE ACESSORIA AO PLANEJAMENTO DO ENSINO SUPERIOR (1969), Rio de Janeiro, Ministério da Educação e Cultura.
- RELATÓRIO DO GRUPO DE TRABALHO DA REFORMA UNIVERSITÁRIA (1969). *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*, 111, pp. 119-175.
- RELATÓRIO MEIRA MATOS (1969), *Revista Paz e Terra*, 9, pp. 119-241.
- REUNI. REESTRUTURAÇÃO E EXPANSÃO DAS UNIVERSIDADES FEDERAIS (2007), Brasília, Diretrizes Gerais, Ministério da Educação.
- ROKSA, J. (2008), "Structuring access to higher education: the role of differentiation and privatization". *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 26, pp. 57-75.
- SALEM, T. (1982), "Do Centro Dom Vital à Universidade Católica". In S. Schwartzman (org.), *Universidades e Instituições Católicas no Rio de Janeiro*, Brasília, S. Cnpq.
- SAMPAIO, H. (2011), "Setor privado de ensino superior no Brasil: o que mudou no século XXI?". Caxambu, Trabalho apresentado no GT Educação e Sociedade no 35.º Encontro Anual da Anpocs.
- SAMPAIO, H. (2000), *Ensino Superior no Brasil – O Setor Privado*, São Paulo, Fapesp/Hucitec.
- SANFELICE, J. L. (1986), *Movimento Estudantil: A UNE na Resistência ao Golpe de 64*, São Paulo, Cortez Editora.

- SCOTT, C. (2006), "The mission of the University. Medieval to Postmodern Transformations". *Journal of Higher Education*, 77 (1), pp. 13-49.
- SCOTT, P. (1998), *The Globalization of Higher Education*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- SCHWARTZMAN, S. (1997), *A Redescoberta da Cultura*, São Paulo, Edusp.
- SCHWARTZMAN, S. (1979), *Formação da Comunidade Científica no Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro, FINEP.
- SGUISSARDI, V. (2006), "Reforma universitária no Brasil (1995-2006)". *Revista Educação e Sociedade*, 26, pp. 1021-1056.
- SINOPSE DO ENSINO SUPERIOR NO BRASIL 2010 (2011), Brasília, Ministério da Educação.
- SOBRINHO, J. D., BRITO, M. R. (2008), "La educación superior em Brasil: principales tendencias y desafíos". *Revista Avaliação*, 13 (2), pp. 487-507.
- SOUSA, J. V. (2006), "Restrição do público e estímulo à iniciativa privada: tendência histórica no ensino superior brasileiro". In M. A. Silva, R. A. Silva (orgs.), *A Idéia de Universidade: Rumos e Desafios*, Brasília, Líber Livro, pp. 139-178.
- TOURAINÉ, A. (1968), *Le communisme utopique. Le mouvement de mai 1968*, Paris, Seuil.
- TORRES, C. (2008), *Globalization and Education. Collected Essays on Class, Race, Gender and State*, New York, Teachers College.
- TRAGTEMBERG, M. (1982), *Sobre Educação, Política e Sindicalismo*, São Paulo, Cortez Editores.
- TRIGUEIRO, D. (1967), "O problema dos excedentes e a reforma universitária". *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*, 107, pp. 163-168.
- TRINDADE, H. (1999), *A Universidade em Ruínas. A República dos Professores*, Petrópolis, Editora Vozes.
- VASCONCELOS, M. (2006), *L'enseignement supérieur en France*, Paris, La Découverte.
- VELLOSO, J. (2000), *O PIBIC e a Formação de Cientistas*, Brasília, Núcleo de Estudos Sobre Ensino Superior, Nesub.
- WALLERSTEIN, I. (1971), *The Liberal University under Attack*, New York, A Vintage Book.
- WELLS, R. (2008), "The effect of education on democratization: a review of past literature and suggestions for a globalised context". *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 6 (2), pp. 105-117.

Received 11-05-2011. Accepted for publication 09-03-2012.

MARTINS, C. B. (2013), "Reconfiguring higher education in Brazil: the participation of private institutions". *Análise Social*, 208, XLVIII (3.º), pp. 622-658.