

KIPRIANOS, Pandelis; KAMARIANOS, IOANNIS; STAMELOS, Giorgos; BALIAS, Stathis, (Enero/Julio 2011). Market and the higher european educational policies: when the markets fail-the case of greece. *Edusk – Revista Monográfica de Educación Skepsis*, n. 2 – Formación Profesional. Vol.I. Contextos de la formación profesional. São Paulo: skepsis.org. pp. 61-89.

url: < <http://www.editorialskepsis.org/site/edusk> > [ISSN 2177-9163]

---

## ABSTRACT

Through the explanatory frames of post-Fordism and postmodernism we attempt to inquire the consequences of the dominating reason of the market in the field of European Higher Education Area (EHEA). We particularly looked at the case of the Greek Higher Education.

The international financial crisis and the reformation model of the European economy seem to affect the reforms in the EHEA. Specifically in the Greek case reforms in the area of Higher Education is not only a matter of politics and agreement with the rest European area of Higher Education but also a matter of financial survival.

This study is designed in a way that attempts to phrase a series of assumptions about the EHEA which will be attempted to be founded on the basis of:

- a. highlighting and analyzing the main reason of regulating the area of EHEA, and
- b. the comparative study of implementing the new reforms of Higher Education in countries such as Greece, which due to structural financial weaknesses is a preferential area to perform it.

**KEYWORDS:** Europe, Higher Education, Crisis, Greece

---

## RÉSUMÉ

Moyennant le cadre explicatif du post-fordisme et du post-modernisme nous tentons d'explorer les conséquences de la logique dominante du marché dans l'Espace Européen de l'Education Supérieure (EEES). Nous focalisons particulièrement sur l'Education Supérieure Grecque.

La crise financière internationale et le modèle de gestion de l'économie Européenne semblent affecter les reformes dans l'EEES. Dans le cas grec notamment les réformes dans l'Education Supérieure sont une matière non simplement de politique et de synchronisation avec ce qui se passe dans l'Espace Européen d'Education Supérieure mais aussi une affaire de survie



financière.

Notre étude essaie de répondre à une série de questions sur l'EEES articulée sur deux axes :

- a. éclairer et analyser la logique qui régit l'EEES.
- b. Etudier la mise en œuvre de réformes nouvelles dans l'espace de l'éducation supérieure dans des pays tels que la Grèce enlisés dans des problèmes financiers aigus.

**MOTS CLÉS:** Europe, Education Supérieure, Crise, Grèce.

---



**MARKET AND THE HIGHER EUROPEAN EDUCATIONAL POLICIES:  
WHEN THE MARKETS FAIL - THE CASE OF GREECE.**

**LE MARCHÉ ET LES POLITIQUES D'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR  
EUROPÉENNES: QUAND LES MARCHÉS ÉCHOUENT – LE CAS DE  
GRECCE.**

Pandelis Kiprianos<sup>1</sup>  
Ioannis Kamarianos<sup>2</sup>  
Giorgos Stamelos<sup>3</sup>  
Stathis Balias<sup>4</sup>

**INTRODUCTION: DEPT CRISIS AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM**

The recent images of the French, English and Greek students who reacted, often together with their Professors, against the developments in the area of Higher Education in Europe signify a realistic example of the concerns about the entire European Higher Education Area (EHEA).

The international financial crisis and the reformation model of the European economy seem to affect the also attempted reforms in the European Higher Education Area. The recent past of Southern

---

<sup>1</sup> **Pandelis Kiprianos** is Associate Professor on History of Education at the University of Patras, Greece ([kiprian@upatras.gr](mailto:kiprian@upatras.gr))

<sup>2</sup> **Ioannis Kamarianos** is Assistant Professor on Sociology of Education at the University of Patras, Greece.

<sup>3</sup> **Giorgos Stamelos** is Professor on Educational Policy, with emphasis on Higher Education and European Educational Policy at the University of Patras, Greece.

<sup>4</sup> **Stathis Balias** is Associate Professor on Humans Rights Education at the University of Patras, Greece.

Europe (CASTELS<sup>5</sup>) and particularly the latest developments of the Greek debt crisis is a characteristic example of the changes to come. Specifically in the Greek case reforms in the area of Higher Education is not only a matter of politics and agreement with the rest European area of Higher Education but also a matter of financial survival.

The financial support of European countries such as Greece and Ireland by the Emergency Financing Mechanism (EFM) of the European Union and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) redefines the terms of discussion about the EHEA leading all relevant research attempts to seeking new concepts, and there is no better area to begin with than the markets. Thus, while developments in the European countries are rapid and crucial, the bibliography concerning this phenomenon is rather poor. Europe has not experienced similar situations in its recent history. Therefore, what is left to be done is to draw theoretical examples from similar international situations and start analyzing the data.

To recapitulate, this study is designed in a way that attempts to phrase a series of assumptions about the EHEA which will be attempted to be founded on the basis of:

- a. highlighting and analyzing the main reason of regulating the area of EHEA, and
- b. the comparative study of implementing the new reforms of Higher Education in countries such as Greece, which due to structural financial weaknesses is a preferential area to perform it.

---

<sup>5</sup> CASTELS F. (1995). Welfare State Development in Southern Europe. *West European Politics*, n. 1, vol.1, pp. 291-313.

The Greek educational community is already concerned with the implementation of the new financial policy in education. The financial changes observed daily can be distinguished in two categories, since the consequences of the crisis involve mainly the financial part and the working terms (salary-pension) that these form:

- a. the first category regards the financial status of the academic staff in terms of the reduction of payments pensions and investments, the infrastructure, and the opportunities to study as well as the increase in studies' cost,
- b. the second category examines the redefinition of academic culture and reveals significant changes in educational practice.

While immediate financial changes in the area of Higher Education are obvious since they are attempted in all sections, focusing on the second category and its implementations in the Greek case will clearly highlight the wider dominant role of the markets in the upcoming adjusting redefinition of the EHAE area.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REVIEW: EDUCATION IN THE TIME OF CRISIS**

In the international bibliography the analysis focuses primarily on the financial aspect of the new, social and educational reality that are being shaped under the burden of the financial crisis and the demands of the IMF.

On an international level we could draw data from countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa with similar financial crises. During the 1990 decade most Latin American countries reformed their financial

systems according to the demands of the market economy.

Analysts insist on the importance of the political factor in the reforms made in Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico. They observe that the analysis must not be restrained only within the financial but involve the social and political consequences of the implementation of financial policies, too (ARMIJO & FAUCHER<sup>6</sup>). In the Sub-Saharan Africa, the studies on the financial crisis and the policies of the IMF highlight the consequences of applying these policies to health and education (FISCHER, MELTZER, SACHS & STERN<sup>7</sup>)

As empirical data show the financial choices of the imposed readjustments originated from privatizing and reducing finances (WILSON & WISE<sup>8</sup>). LOGAN & MENGISTEAB observe that these decisions are made to subordinate two fundamental public sectors, health and education. Interestingly enough, researchers conclude that these changes are shifted towards other types of social institutions like family.<sup>9</sup> In the cases examined by BUCHMANN & HANNUM these choices were proved to be damaging for education and economy, as well.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> ARMIJO, L. E. ; FAUCHER, P. (2002). We have a consensus: Explaining Political Support for market reforms in Latin America. *Latin American Politics and Society*, n. 44, vol. 2, pp. 1-40.

<sup>7</sup> FISCHER, S.; MELTZER, A. H.; SACHS, J. D.; STERN, N. (2003). The Future of the IMF and World Bank: panel discussion, papers and proceedings of the one hundred fifteenth annual meeting of the American Economic Association. *The American Economic Review*, Washington, DC, January 3-5, n. 93, vol. 2, pp. 45-50.

<sup>8</sup> WILSON, P.A.; WISE, C. (1986). The Regional Implications of Public Investment in Peru, 1968-1983. *Latin American Research Review*, n. 21, vol. 2, pp. 93-116.

<sup>9</sup> LOGAN, I. B.; MENGISTEAB, K. (1993). IMF-World Bank Adjustment and structural transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Economic Geography*, n. 69, vol. 1, pp. 1-24.

<sup>10</sup> BUCHMANN, C.; HANNUM, E. (2001). Education and stratification in developing countries: a review of theories and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, n. 27, pp. 77-102.

Therefore, according to researchers subordinating vital social sectors such as education causes damage not only on social but also on financial level.

It is here that we see an important drawback in the argument that, since the attempted and upcoming reforms lead to the connection of the area of Higher Education with the logic of the market and the markets themselves, they have a financial benefit. Thomas KLAKE<sup>11</sup> in his study *A Framework for Studying Caribbean Industrial Policy* concludes that the subordination of the educational field instantly damages the financial field as well, having direct consequences on the industrial production and growth. Consequently, what is left is to change the regulating reason that lies underneath the function of the EHEA, since, as SCHAFER notes, these changes have also been formed after cultural modifications in the cultures in which they are implemented.<sup>12</sup> These precise imposed regulating modifications due to the IMF measures are examined by Horace CAMPBELL and Howard STEIN<sup>13</sup>, and are driven by the study of the consequences of the financial measures that the IMF imposed in Tanzania. James LEBOVIC<sup>14</sup> comes to a similar conclusion as he perceives the regulating change of the culture of education as an institution with terms of subordination and descends from democracy to despotism. Similar conclusions, about the consequences of

---

<sup>11</sup> KLAKE, T. (1995). *A Framework for Studying Caribbean Industrial Policy*. *Economic Geography*, n. 71, vol. 3, pp.297-317.

<sup>12</sup> SCHAFER, M. J. (1999). International non-governmental organizations and third world education in 1990: a cross-national study. *Sociology of Education*, n. 72, vol.2, pp. 69-88 .

<sup>13</sup> STEIN, H. (eds). (1992). *Tanzania and the IMF: the dynamics of liberalization*. Oxford: Westview Press.

<sup>14</sup> LEBOVIC, J. (2001). Spending Priorities and Democratic Rule in Latin America. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, n. 45, vol.4, pp. 427-452.

financial structural changes that the IMF imposes on the educational systems of the countries, are recorded by Piers BLAIKIE, Terry CANNON, Ian DAVIS, and Ben WISNER<sup>15</sup> in their study *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters*.

### **POST-FORDISM AND POSTMODERNISM: THE IMPOSITION OF THE LOGIC OF THE MARKET.**

Despite the intense financial demands to reform, we should clarify that the demand to increase connection between job markets and Universities is not recent (SLAUGHTER & LESLIE<sup>16</sup>). What we notice today is nothing more than a development process that was caused by questioning Fordism and the evolution of the post-Fordism model.

In the UK after 1960, bureaucracy was questioned as it was thought to be the organizational logic of education produced by government control. At the same time this signified the questioning of linearity, of institutional continuity and stability of postmodernism (GOYGA & KAMARIANOS<sup>17</sup>). The new era of postmodernism had already begun with *the adoption of the concept of flexibility and existence of more than one 'truths'*. *Knowledge is not only unified but also becomes competitive.* (RENAUT<sup>18</sup>; DELANTY<sup>19</sup>).

---

<sup>15</sup> BLAIKIE, P.; CANNON, T.; DAVIS, I.; WISNER, B. (1994). *At Risk. Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters*. London, Routledge.

<sup>16</sup> SLAUGHTER, S.; LESLIE, L.L. (1999). *Academic Capitalism*. London, Johns Hopkins University Press.

<sup>17</sup> GOUGA, G.; KAMARIANOS, I (2006). Organizational reason and Pedagogic practices. *Social Science Review*, n.47, pp 159-184 (in Greek).

<sup>18</sup> RENAUT, A. (1995). *Les revolutions de l'universite: essai sur la modernisation de la culture*. Paris: Calman-Levy. p. 15



However, dynamic management appears in the decade of 1980 since the demands to connect job market with education are intense, and through politics enterprises appear as a means for University management and operation, making their presence noticeable, and restating the demands for effectiveness and efficiency (Delanty<sup>20</sup>, BALL<sup>21</sup>). Then, economy and budgets obtain a symbolic value, that of being a regulating concern. As a consequence the notion of consumer is introduced in Higher Education. The shift from the producer of the knowledge to its consumer was part of a greater reform that required the withdrawal of the state or even the complete substitution of the control exercised by the state-nation with the Market Economy.<sup>22</sup> This basis is, also, in a wider sense the onset of the structure of a client identity and function.<sup>23</sup>

In the Anglo-Saxon area, in the name of the state's readjustment, Universities and academic studies underwent a second phase of nationalization. Under the pressure to shape a new definition for the relation between cost-efficiency, the cost of educational function passed to the user. One of the most important effects of introducing the logic of the market at Universities was, also, the growth of competition in the area of Higher Education.

The notion of clientele as the preface of the principle of the

---

<sup>19</sup> DELANTY, G., (2002). *Challenging Knowledge*. London: Open University Press. pp. 39-43

<sup>20</sup> Id., DELANTY, 2002.

<sup>21</sup> BALL, S. (2008): *The Education Debate*. London: Policy press. pp. 113-117

<sup>22</sup> MOUZELIS, N. (2005). State, Society, and Market in early and late modernity. In GRAVARIS D.; PAPANAKIS, N.: *Education and educational policy*. Athens: Savvalas editions, pp. 51-60 (in Greek).

<sup>23</sup> TONKISS, F. (1995). *The 'marketisation' of urban government: private finance and urban policy*. London: Goldsmiths College, University of London.



market led to the adoption of the conceptualization of the efficiency of the academic credential as a consumers' commodity increasing the level of reasoning of the involved parties and, at the same time, solidifying the regulation. Thus, the academic is treated as the business intermediary reseller-broker of an increased volume of credentials to which the student will have access. Thus, University students function as detached consumers driven by personal strategies and guided through their numerous choices by market research aiming at being integrating into it.

Therefore, recent reforms under the pressure of the financial crisis have not yet attempted to make fundamental changes in the logic governing the academic community and the University function. Instead, they are another stage of imposing the instrumental reason of regulations that the Market imposes on the area of Higher Education.

In conclusion, we attempted through the viewpoints of post-Fordism and postmodernism to recognise the change and the dominant characteristics that they have introduced to the social and political frame in which the EHEA occurs. What follows is an attempt to highlight everything that we have observed so far in our study on a theoretical level through the constitutive texts, on the basis of which the EHEA functions. Additionally, we will attempt to highlight the tendencies of development on the repercussions in the case of Greece under the pressure of the regulations of the European Mechanism for Financing Stability and the IMF.

## THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA AND THE MARKET

What is meant through the term EHEA is a sphere where ultra national organizations and national governments, groups and interest networks of different range and force even atypical formations and volunteering organizations interact and create a nexus of a multilevel government, which, among others, is concerned with the structure and function of Higher Education.

Undoubtedly the EHEA is not a unified homogeneous area. On the contrary, it is an area for competition between policies in Higher Education overall, and Universities, in particular. A mere indication for this could be that the known Bologna Process involves 47 states, tiny states and entities of a very broadened geographical version of Europe. On the other hand, the Lisbon Process, which concerns Universities too, refers to the 27 member states of the European Union. Surely in logic of either concentric circles or steam engines and train compartments it is usually one agent that produces and transmits policies. As a result, it is not possible in the present study to refer to all constitutive texts and terms that run the creation of the EHEA.

To satisfy the needs of the present study we have chosen the Budapest-Vienna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area as a reference point,<sup>24</sup> which is up to now, the last text signed by Ministers within the action frame of the Bologna Process and the

---

<sup>24</sup> EHEA. (2010). *Budapest-Vienna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area*, 12/03/2010, [http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/2010\\_conference/documents/Budapest-Vienna\\_Declaration.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/2010_conference/documents/Budapest-Vienna_Declaration.pdf) (15/12/2010)

creation of the EHEA. Without question, this text is part of a process that was initiated in 1999, aimed at 2010 and has been expanded until 2020. Moreover, it should be said that in some countries there had been reactions as far as the intended changes of the governments in the name of the Bologna Process are concerned. Whether the regulations suggested by the nation-states promote the predictions of the Process or simply in the name of the Process state mechanisms promote their choices defined by their own national criteria is still under discussion.

Next, we attempt to highlight what we have observed so far in terms of the relation between market and EHEA by examining crucial parts of the Budapest-Vienna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area on 12/3/2010, such as management, the presence of Universities internationally, funding, social growth, academic freedom and accountability, as well as the organization of studies.

### **THE UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT AND THE MARKET**

It would be interesting to observe that in the last text of the Vienna-Budapest in the Bologna Process it is stated that this Process is based on the admission of the existence of a corporate relationship in which public authorities, Higher Education Institutes, students, wider public personalities, employers, quality insurance authorities and European institutions participate jointly (par.4) We believe that a semi state form of management is suggested explicitly.

In other words Universities do not act on themselves but within a frame of a "corporate relationship" and should regard factors inside and outside them. In addition, an acceptance of public responsibility

is stated (par.11), underlying the commitment on public participation while legitimatizing simultaneously the private presence in the area of university education, a characteristic which mainly depicts the image of University education in many countries.

### **THE INTERNATIONAL PRESENCE OF UNIVERSITIES AND THE MARKET**

The EHEA as an area has been affected directly by the procedures of globalization. Global competition as a consequence of the connection and opening of the Markets imposed forms of inter board cooperation of European Universities as well, upgrading thus the distinctions of the European Higher Education (par.5). With the goals of the Bologna Process set, what is aimed is a convergence on an institutional level and subjective actions (par.6). This view has been the onset of actions such as quality insurance, changes in the study curricula, the recognition of study periods and degrees, the mobility of students and teachers among Universities and enterprises, and the social dimension of Higher Education (par. 6).

Financing Universities according to the Budapest -Vienna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area in 12/3/2010 is enacted and controlled by public authorities. It is characteristic that under the pressure of "the difficult financial occurrence" the counties that sign it reassert that Higher Education is a public responsibility, while a clear commitment to ensure that the institutions of Higher Education receive the necessary funds, and this despite the financial crisis, is stated.

This stance is supported by their belief of the importance of

Higher Education as a major driver for social and economic growth and innovation (par.11). Already a year ago in the Communiqué of Leuven<sup>25</sup>, the commitment of the member-states was mentioned for state funding as the basic priority to guarantee an equal access, aiming at promoting equal opportunities to a quality education paying extra attention to the sub-represented groups (par.11) and, furthermore, to a sustainable growth of the institutions of Higher Education (par. 5).

### **ORGANIZATION OF STUDIES: ADJUSTMENT AND FLEXIBILITY**

Studies' organization as an issue had been settled since the first Declaration of Bologna until the Communiqué of London<sup>26</sup> where the programmes of University studies within the EHEA was agreed, and, in fact, in a flexible way, leading to three cycles of studies.

Competences, learning outcomes and workload were the criteria of the reason for efficiency and, consequently, success. This occurred mainly due to the meeting in Prague<sup>27</sup> until the meeting of

---

<sup>25</sup> BOLOGNA PROCESS. (2009): *Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible of Higher Education, Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve, 28-29/04/2009*, [http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/conference/documents/Leuven\\_Louvain-la-Neuve\\_Commiqu%C3%A9\\_April\\_2009.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/conference/documents/Leuven_Louvain-la-Neuve_Commiqu%C3%A9_April_2009.pdf) (15/12/2010)

<sup>26</sup> BOLOGNA PROCESS. (2007): *London Communiqué. Towards the European Higher Education Area: Responding to challenges in a globalised world, 18/5/2007* <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100202100434/dcsf.gov.uk/londonbologna/uploads/document/s/londoncommuniqufinalwithlondonlogo.pdf> (15/12/2010)

<sup>27</sup> BOLOGNA PROCESS. (2003): *Berlin 2003. Realising the European Higher Education Area, 19/9/2003*, [http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/Berlin\\_Communique1.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/Berlin_Communique1.pdf) (15/12/2010)



Bergen.<sup>28</sup> It is, also, particularly important to refer to the last Declaration of two basic principles of the EHEA and its construction: mobility and the acknowledgement of the students' and graduates' qualifications, always according to the needs of the post-Fordism and the postmodernism views in education.

Thus, within the frames of an institutionally detached and fragmentary action of the agent, the importance of the student's freedom is stressed to construct his own educational pathways based on his interests. Therefore, all implicated participants are asked to facilitate the development of a student-centred learning and provide the best possible solutions, sustainable and flexible learning paths.

Flexibility and adjustment are the keys to understanding developments in the EHEA since they are part of its structural element.

Finally, academic freedom was and still remains an important debate base also within the frames of the European Union. In the last years academic freedom has been the concern of other great international organizations and is included in specific bibliography. This interest shows exactly its crucial role and also the current dangers. On a European level and according to the Declaration of Bologna, academic freedom, autonomy and accountability of the institutions of Higher Education are recognized as the principles running the EHEA (par. 8).

What is more, the key role of the academic community in the

---

<sup>28</sup> BOLOGNA PROCESS. (2005): *Bergen Communiqué. The European Higher Education Area. Achieving the Goals*, 19-20/05/2005, [http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/050520\\_Bergen\\_Communique1.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/050520_Bergen_Communique1.pdf) (15/12/2005)



creation of the EHEA is recognized: institutional leadership, teachers, researchers, administrative staff and students. Finally, it is stated that they fully support the participation of the staff and the students in the decision-making structures on a European, national and institutional level (par. 9). Because of this recognition, it is stressed that in order to implement the EHEA it is assumed that a strongly committed staff is needed. Then, the cooperation between teachers and researchers from international networks is required.

Due to the attacks that academic freedom receives in the last years, the 29<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of UNESCO expressed its concerns. 188 countries voted the Constitution according to the working conditions that apply for teachers and researchers of Higher Education with the title «Recommandation concernant la condition du personnel enseignant de l'enseignement supérieur» (Recommendation which concerns the situation of the teaching staff in higher education) regarding that its position has deteriorated in the past years. Characteristically, Article 27 refers to the need of protection against institutional censorship («au besoin de protection de la censure institutionnelle»).

At the same time, in the North American continent (U.S.A and Canada) organizations such as the American Association of University Professors, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Fédération québécoise des professeurs et professeures d'université, have taken steps to face the attacks against academic freedom. In Europe and especially France, networks

such as the *Sauvons la recherche*<sup>29</sup> were and are still being motivated for the same reason. As far as the research control is concerned it is characteristic that research and its findings are now controlled by enormous enterprises as it happens for example in Cambridge with the infiltration of BP, Shell, Unilever, Price Waterhouse, Marks and Spencer, Rolls-Royce, AT and T., Microsoft, Zeneca.

### THE GREEK CASE

The Greek University, as an institution, from the beginning of 19th century, performed four main missions: it constituted the contemporary Greek identity, trained public state employees but also the dominant state elite, and finally, after the Civil War (1946-1949) was involved in the Greek division and functioned as an ideological mechanism of the prevalent political party.<sup>30</sup>

Things, however, changed. Greece participates in the process of creating the EHEA, implying, on the one hand, the possibility of mutually shaping decisions, and on the other hand, its commitment for their implementation. The new situation of the Greek Higher Education has not yet been adequately analyzed due to the rapid changes as well. The proposals under discussion from various points, mainly on behalf of the Ministry of Education that have been recently expressed form a good start to deduct certain conclusions about the effects of the market on the EHEA<sup>31</sup>.

---

<sup>29</sup> SAUVONS LA RECHERCHE : <http://sauvonslarecherche.fr> (15/12/2010)

<sup>30</sup> HEPNET (2011): *Study of the Greek Higher Education*, <http://hepnet.upatras.gr/> [26/1/2011]

<sup>31</sup> MINISTRY OF EDUCATION.(2010), *Consutation Document*, [http://ypeth.opengov.gr/\\_panaretos/?p=3364](http://ypeth.opengov.gr/_panaretos/?p=3364) (15/12/2010)

While reading the texts we first see that they depict the anxiety caused by the debt crisis and is transpired by new liberal considerations. According to these considerations the crisis is the outcome of political mistakes and the state's inefficiency. A suggested solution would be to detach these particular functions from the state's responsibility, and to assign their management to formations that stand for the logic of the market.

### **FROM ADJUSTMENT TO CHANGE**

First and foremost, the Greek University had to deal with the challenge of following international standards, the top leading European ones, and in fact while the standards themselves are undergoing a modification process due to constantly growing competitive international scenery.

Indeed, while in Western Europe and North America the massiveness of the University is being recorded shortly before World War II, in Greece it takes place after 1981. Indicatively, in late 70s less than 20% of the children of the age-appropriate group was enrolled at Tertiary Education. In 2003, the corresponding percentage reached 65%. Of course the massiveness is not equal with the elimination of social inequalities. But these are not expressed in the enrollment process at the institutions, but within it, not only on a department level but on a studies level, as well as (post graduate degrees, doctorates, post doctorates).<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> SIANOU-KIRGIU, E. (2010): *From the University to the labour market: factes of the social inequalities*. Athens: Metaixmio, (in Greek).

At the same time, despite the efforts towards this direction Universities were not associated with national economy. This is attributed to the type of economic growth which is characterized by the overgrown public-state sector and the retail character of the economy. Finally, the criticism against the prospect of connecting Universities with the economy, exercised by a group of political forces of the country, is worth mentioning.<sup>33</sup>

#### **THE MANAGEMENT OF GREEK UNIVERSITIES: FROM STATE CONTROL TO THE MARKET.**

Since the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century decade a series of reforms in the Greek University are constantly being attempted, having as a request its larger connection with the job market. With these thoughts in mind a series of proposals are also inspired for the radical change of the way Greek Universities are being run. We should note here that from the current institutional frame the market is absent, and the weight is placed on the democratic participation of all the institutions of the academic community.

In the new proposals the administrative operation of Universities is disconnected from state control and is connected with the notions of efficiency and effectiveness. The suggested way of their administration is signalled by the notion of “government” namely participation and interconflicts between multiple agents and interests within the academic administration. The new scope not only fails to solve the problem, but obviously is in disharmony with the

---

<sup>33</sup> KIPRIANOS, P. (2009): *A comparative history of greek education*. Athens: Vivliorama Editions (in Greek).



substance of government as a notion. This is characterized by its dynamic character that has as its main trait the permanent conflict of interests. The postmodern element is present together with the logic of the market. The dominant intended operation is flexibility, the permanent inversion aiming at the adjustment to the demands of the system's efficiency.

Similar changes are introduced in financing, as well. According to the current legal frame, the Greek Higher Educational Institutes (H.E.I), are financed by the state in order to fulfill their mission. They maintain the responsibility to manage their funds that derive both from state funding as well as their assets. Radically differentiated by the existing regulations, the relevant reforming suggestions reconceptualize the financial autonomy of the Greek HEI as the finance upon predecided agreements. The academic staff is changed from merely public/ state to institutionalized with individual agreements with its institution and with a minimum guaranteed salary by the state.

The relevant debate is characterized by gaps which, despite the expressed commitment of all parties do not lead to binding formal agreements. More specifically, the suggestions on reform end as an anxious effort to drastically restrict public financing in Higher Education. The operational costs of institutions will be limited after the proposed drastic reduction of institutions, with the reduction of their regular budget (in 2009-2010 reached a 30%) and with the unbearable reduction of the budget for public investments.

With regards to salary costs the goal is to reduce it as much as possible. This is intended to be done in five ways: a) the drastic

reduction of the salary of currently working academics (the state will guarantee a minimum salary), b) the freeze on hiring, c) the mass retirements within the next few years without the corresponding replacements, d) the mergence of Institutions and Departments, and finally, e) the creation of a large dispensable mass of new generation lecturers, variously supplied with doctorate and post doc candidates, with a small to minimum salary cost and without the possibility of being promoted, which will staff the undergraduate study programs.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that we avoid referring to alternative sources of financing and especially to tuition. The first is legalized by referring to University autonomy. The second is probably a result of tactics.

### **THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF GREEK UNIVERSITIES**

The social dimension does not seem to constitute a concern of the imminent reforms of EHEA. It is characteristic that as a social dimension of Higher Education a particularly shrunked version of it is reported, having as a first step the forms of cooperation between the public and private sector for food and accommodation and the immediate closer connection of financing studies with the market , with the creation of a system of student loans and scholarships.

We must point out here that in the European area the social dimension is an important multilevel parameter to which the countries that signed the Vienna-Bucarest Declaration refer. The social dimension includes four parameters: multiple access, studies, study support, contribution to society. The Consultation text of the Greek Ministry of Education refers only to the first parameter, and, in

fact, in a way particularly traditional and inter-Greek (new access system for the traditional candidates of the University, and, in fact, not in correspondence with what is anticipated by the EHEA).

### **MARKET, UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY STAFF AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM.**

According to the constitutive texts about the EHEA, academic freedom is perhaps one of the most important and mostly debated chapters of the Greek Law No.1268. Therefore, it is characteristically foreseen:<sup>34</sup> (...) *Academic freedom in teaching and research as well as free spreading of ideas is consolidated in H.E.I. The imposition of only certain scientific views and ideas, and the conduct of classified research is not allowed (...).*

As far as the staff and its role it is clearly stated that: *Members of H.E.I. are the Teacher and Research Staff, the Specialized Administrative-Technical Staff, the Special Educating Staff, the Administrative Staff and undergraduate and post graduate students.* Collaboration and international prospect through staff collaborations is set as an institutional act, as an act of every University.

It is interesting to observe that the texts of the upcoming reform of the EHEA are not concerned with the issue of academic freedom. Thus, the question on '*how to ensure their academic freedom?*' is not posed. The issue of academic freedom seems not be of a great interest to the extent that the main target seems to be the drastic restriction of payment costs of the University staff. It is

---

<sup>34</sup> Section B. of paragraph 3 is presented as it was replaced by section a. par. 1 article 79 N. 1566/1985.

consequently obvious that in the name of financial reductions, academic freedom comes second.

### **MARKET, UNIVERSITY, STUDENTS AND ORGANIZATION OF STUDIES**

According to the existing regulating framework of the EHEA the basic structure of organization of the university studies is the University Department. This is historically connected with the treatment of one science, despite the pressure for a interdisciplinary study (an objective one due to the complexity of current problems and at the same time both financial and political because of the aim to reduce the University's cost of function). The student enters a Department, the program of which he attends and from which he is appointed graduate at the end of his studies. This often guarantees him two major goals: firstly, his professional constitution on the base of a scientific constitution (treatment of a science) and secondly, collectiveness in his formal qualifications that give him access to determined and, usually, solid professions.

With the proposed changes the Department is replaced by the Faculty, which means a radical inversion of the organisation of academic study and philosophy of the academic institution. It is not certain, however, that change is made towards the construction of the EHEA. It resembles more the reintroduction of traditional inter-Greek perceptions that have their roots in the 60s. Surely, to be precise it appears that elements of the EHEA are used (e.g. flexibility of studies) which are intermingled with the Greek -centralized ideas of the 60s.

The Department is weakened but not abolished. Separate Postgraduate Faculties are created. Doctoral studies are organized. The lifelong learning programs in the institutions of Higher Education are generalized. The opportunity is given to develop distance learning programs of education but also programs of effective connection with the job market and the growth of entrepreneurship. The National Frame of Qualifications of Higher Education is fully applied. The quality insurance process is expanded to a process of certifying programs and institutions, too.

Furthermore, students are not a discernible section of the relevant texts of the suggested reform. As far as their studies is concerned the key axis of the new developments is the subjective choice and flexibility. Therefore, study curricula are suggested with an *academic organization which facilitates freedom of mobility among various study curricula, fields of expertise and institutions of the country, with academic criteria and the possibility of attending agreed and corresponding periods of study in institutions abroad.*

### **INSTEAD OF A CONCLUSION: FINAL REMARKS**

Through the explanatory frames of post-Fordism and postmodernism we attempted to inquire the consequences during a time of crisis, of the dominating reason of the market in the field of EHEA. We particularly looked at the case of the Greek Higher Education which forms an interesting case, since the changes are driven by the pressure of the debt crisis and the submission of the country to the European Financial Support Mechanism and the IMF.

From the aforementioned comparative study analysis we concluded in a series of questions as far as the relation between the European University and the market is concerned. On the one hand, an explicit objective is the cooperation among the involved parties. On the other hand, it is assumed that Universities should overcome competition. But is it possible for these two opposing objectives to thrive simultaneously? Similar is the question posed on two objectives of the Bologna process, competition and attractiveness. Can these two objectives be equally applied in all 47 state members of the Bologna Process?

Similar questions are posed on other aspects of the University, as well. If the Ministers that signed the Communiqué of Leuven recognize academic freedom, autonomy and accountability, how do they ensure these? As quoted, if the institutions of Higher Education play an important role in promoting peaceful democratic societies and enforce social cohesion and political participation, then how is unbiased, broadened and multiple access to these ensured? Through the facilitation or/and the assurance of completing one's studies? Through the development of citizenship? Perhaps through the collaboration and not competition? In which ways is the participation of staff and students in the decision making mechanism on a European, national and institutional level supported, especially when the staff seems to lose its status and the students are dealt more as if they were clients?

Why is it that in the texts concerning the EHEA the word "staff" prevails -generally- and words such as "teachers" and "researchers" are avoided? Furthermore, can the staff that has "flexible" work

relations be "utterly dedicated"? Why is it that an administration comprised by a staff with powerful working status is considered an obstacle? Why is it that an administration outside the institution could be considered more "utterly dedicated" to EHEA than another originating from the university community? Why is it that a "staff" with a weakened and flexible working status is believed to have a greater interest in creating international networks?

In any case, the constitution of EHEA changes university standards of the European states. Its aim is not only a national society, but primarily the European area. Consequently, the Greek University, as well as those of other European countries, should be instantly or primarily regarded as European.

Could it be, then, that the whole procedure is indeed, unilateral, in favor of the financially stronger member-states? The absence of a balancing mechanism of the market is becoming more and more tangible, since the entire procedure is evolving within the frame of a kind of political and social Darwinism. The concern is serious and was expressed in the Communiqué of Leuven in 2009.

---

## REFERENCES

### BOOKS

- ARMIJO, L. E. ; FAUCHER, P. (2002). We have a consensus: Explaining Political Support for market reforms in Latin America. *Latin American Politics and Society*, n. 44, vol. 2, pp. 1-40.
- BALL, S. (2008). *The Education Debate*. London: Policy press.
- BERIDZE, D. (2000). *La liberté académique à l'Unesco. Internationale de l'éducation*. Dossier « Libertés académiques », septembre, pp. 12-13.
- BLAIKIE, P.; CANNON, T.; DAVIS, I.; WISNER, B. (1994). *At Risk. Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters*. London, Routledge.
- CAMPBELL H.; STEIN, H. (eds). (1992). *Tanzania and the IMF: the dynamics of liberalization*. Oxford: Westview Press.
- DELANTY, G., (2002). *Challenging Knowledge*. London: Open University Press.
- KLAK, T. (1995). A Framework for Studying Caribbean Industrial Policy. *Economic Geography*, n. 71, vol. 3, pp.297-317.
- KIPRIANOS, P. (2009). *A comparative history of greek education*. Athens: Vivliorama Editions (in Greek).
- RENAUT, A. (1995). *Les revolutions de l'université: essai sur la modernisation de la culture*. Paris : Calman-Levy.
- SIANO-KIRGIOU, E. (2010). *From the University to the labour market: facets of the social inequalities*. Athens: Metaixmio (in Greek).
- STAMELOS, G. (2009). *Educational policy*. Athens: Dionikos (in Greek).
- TONKISS, F. (1995). *The 'marketisation' of urban government: private finance and urban policy*. London: Goldsmiths College, University of London.
- SLAUGHTER, S.; LESLIE, L.L. (1999). *Academic Capitalism*. London, Johns Hopkins University Press.

\* \* \*

### SCIENTIF JOURNALS

- BUCHMANN, C.; HANNUM, E. (2001). Education and stratification in developing countries: a review of theories and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, n. 27, pp. 77-102.
- CASTELS F. (1995). Welfare State Development in Southern Europe. *West European Politics*, n. 1, vol.1, pp. 291-313.
- GOUGA, G.; KAMARIANOS, I (2006). Organizational reason and Pedagogic practices. *Social Science Review*, n.47, pp 159-184 (in Greek).

FISCHER, S.; MELTZER, A. H.; SACHS, J. D.; STERN, N. (2003). The Future of the IMF and World Bank: panel discussion, papers and proceedings of the one hundred fifteenth annual meeting of the American Economic Association. *The American Economic Review*, Washington, DC, January 3-5, n. 93, vol. 2, pp. 45-50.

LEBOVIC, J. (2001). Spending Priorities and Democratic Rule in Latin America. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, n. 45, vol.4, pp. 427-452.

LOGAN, I. B.; MENGISTEAB, K. (1993). IMF-World Bank Adjustment and structural transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Economic Geography*, n. 69, vol. 1, pp. 1-24.

MOUZELIS, N. (2005). State, Society, and Market in early and late modernity. In GRAVARIS D.; PAPADAKIS, N.: *Education and educational policy*. Athens: Savvalas editions, pp. 51-60 (in Greek).

PANAYIOTOPOULOS, N. (2001). La conversion de l'état grec à l'économisme dominant. *Regards Sociologiques*, vol. 21, pp. 41- 49.

SCHAFER, M. J. (1999). International non-governmental organizations and third world education in 1990: a cross- national study. *Sociology of Education*, n. 72, vol.2, pp. 69-88 .

WILSON, P.A.; WISE, C. (1986). The Regional Implications of Public Investment in Peru, 1968-1983. *Latin American Research Review*, n. 21, vol. 2, pp. 93-116.

\*\*\*

## ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS

HEPNET (2011). *Study of the Greek Higher Education*, <http://hepnet.upatras.gr/> [26/01/2011]

\*\*\*

## REPORTS

BOLOGNA PROCESS. (2009). *Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible of Higher Education*, Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve, 28-29/04/2009, [http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/conference/documents/Leuven\\_Louvain-la-Neuve\\_Communicu%C3%A9\\_April\\_2009.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/conference/documents/Leuven_Louvain-la-Neuve_Communicu%C3%A9_April_2009.pdf) (15/12/2010)

BOLOGNA PROCESS. (2007). *London Communiqué. Towards the European Higher Education Area: Responding to challenges in a globalised world*, 18/5/2007 <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100202100434/dcsf.gov.uk/londonbologna/uploads/documents/londoncommuniqufinalwithlondonlogo.pdf> (15/12/2010)

BOLOGNA PROCESS. (2005). *Bergen Communiqué. The European Higher Education Area. Achieving the Goals*, 19-20/05/2005,

[http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/Bergen\\_Communique1.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/Bergen_Communique1.pdf) (15/12/2005) MDC/050520

BOLOGNA PROCESS. (2003). *Berlin 2003. Realising the European Higher Education Area*, 19/9/2003,

[http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/Berlin\\_Communique1.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/Berlin_Communique1.pdf) (15/12/2010)

EHEA. (2010). *Budapest-Vienna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area*, 12/03/2010,

[http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/2010\\_conference/documents/Budapest-Vienna\\_Declaration.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/2010_conference/documents/Budapest-Vienna_Declaration.pdf) (15/12/2010)

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION.(2010). *Consultation Document*, <http://ypepth.opengov.gr/panaretos/?p=3364> (15/12/2010)

SAUVONS LA RECHERCHE.: <http://sauvonslarecherche.fr> (15/12/2010)

---