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hitherto been reported. While acknowledging the obvious drawbacks of the small sample, Clotfelter notes that the institutions studied are significant for the disproportionate influence they, and comparable elite institutions, exercise in research and in the training of future leaders.
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“Clotfelter breaks new ground in furthering our understanding of the ‘cost disease’ afflicting American higher education over the past two decades. He accomplishes this by skillfully combining national and institutional data, along with detailed figures for a selected group of departments at four private universities.”

—W. Lee Hansen, University of Wisconsin