University, Economy and Democracy: transformations and challenges

The case of Greece

LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing

Stathis Balias, Ioannis Kamarianos, Pandelis Kiprianos and Georgios Stamelos

Stathis Balias is an Associate Professor at the University of Patras (Greece). His teaching and research interests focus on Theory of Democracy, Citizenship, Human Rights and Human Rights Education. He has published in Greek, English and French.

Ioannis Kamarianos is an Assistant Professor at the University of Patras. His academic interests include social inequality in issues related to educational process and Sociology of Higher Education. He has published journal articles, book chapters, reviews in Greek and English, and books.

Pandelis Kiprianos is a Professor at the Univeristy of Patras. He has published articles and books on the History of Education in Greece and on the Sociology of Education in ethnic minorities. His current research interests are focused on the Sociology of Policies in Higher Education.

Georgios Stamelos is a Professor at the University of Patras. His fields of interest are Higher Education Policy and European Education Policy. He has published in Greek, French, English and Spanish.

"The terrorists have gone through our school systems"
The EU Commission President Juncker points out that Europe's terrorists were not imported from the outside. They are grown here.

"Die Terroristen sind durch unsere Schulsysteme gegangen".
Kommissionspräsident Juncker verweist darauf, dass Europas Terroristen nicht von außen importiert wurden. Sie seien hier aufgewachsen.

"Les terroristes sont passés par nos systèmes scolaires".
Le Président de la Commission de l' UE Juncker souligne que les terroristes européens n' ont pas été importés de l'extérieur. Ils sont cultivés ici.

(DIE WELT, 24/03/2016).

Contents

Introduction 6

Chapter 1 13

Transformations and their effects on the profile of the University 13

1.1 Introduction 13
1.2 The University and its resources: the turn towards the market 14
1.3 Massification of the University 17
1.4 The University as complex social institution 18
1.5 Academic administration: from the management to a new managerialism Model 20
1.6 Participation of the university community in the universities' Administrative bodies 23
1.7 Re-thinking governance 28

Chapter 2 34

The European Higher Education Area, the Bologna Process and Greek Higher Education 34

2.1 Introduction 34
2.2 The architecture of the EHEA 35
2.3 The philosophy behind the EHEA 36
2.4 Tools of the EHEA 38
2.4.1 European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) 38
2.4.2 European Qualification Framework (EQF) 38
2.4.3 Quality assurance 40
2.5 Political challenges of the EHEA 41
2.5.1 The social dimension of university studies 41
2.5.2 Between cooperation and competition 42
2.5.3 The case of the universities and university governance 44
2.5.4 The problem of moral and democratic values and active citizenship 45
2.6 The EHEA and the Greek system of higher education 47
2.6.1 Why the Greek universities are hostile to the Bologna process 47
2.6.2 Greece in the context of the Bologna Process 48
2.7 Conclusions 51

Chapter 3 53

Democracy versus the market: the paradoxes of the Greek University 53

3.1 Introduction 53
3.2 The Greek university field and its democratization 54
3.3 A disputable opening in the market 60
3.4 The limits of the new model of governance in a context of crisis 65

Chapter 4 71

The Council of Europe action for a sustainable democracy: the role of University 71

4.1 Introduction 71
4.2 The Council of Europe and the creation of a democratic culture through Education: the contribution of the University 72
4.3 The Council of Europe and the social space 76
4.4 Towards a sustainable democracy: the contribution of the University 78
4.5 Council of Europe policy and its limits: the example of Greece 82
4.6 Conclusions 85

Chapter 5 87
A critique of economic reason: critical pedagogy and educational Leadership as agents in the democratization of the university 87
5.1 Introduction 87
5.2 The University and knowledge: democracy and critical thinking 88
5.3 The University caught between the logic of the market and the needs of democracy 92
5.4 Critical pedagogy, teachers and democratization of the University 95
5.5 Educational leadership and the University: theory and reality 98
5.6 Conclusions 103
References 106
E-references 115

Introduction

The 21st century is characterised by great changes in the economy and in society. These changes are taking place in a world that is evolving at great speed within the framework of globalization and the economy of knowledge, influencing the way in which we perceive and understand various institutions such as the university. Indeed, it seems that for the university, its relationships with the economy, society, the state and knowledge are changing (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004; David *et al*., 2011). As a result, the university has been placed at the centre of specialised research insofar as it has been assigned an important role in a world that is open, mutable and competitive. On the one hand, the university is opening up, firstly to new population groups that until now didn't have access to it and secondly, it is being transformed into an institution of life-long learning, receiving a public which is differentiated in terms of age and needs. This development is linked to an old demand concerning the democratization of higher education. This is a significant step forward. On the other hand the massification of the university is justified through the demands of knowledge –based economy and as a result is linked all the more closely and all the more one dimensionally with the dominant Discourse of market economy and the dominant policies that implement it, which are based on the neo-liberal economic dogma. Massification, on the one hand, and the suzerainty of the economy on the other, is putting pressure on the university to reorganise and reform. Inadequate public funding, as an outcome of the predominant policies with their restriction of the Welfare state and public resources, massification, the mutation of the institution into an agency for life-long learning as well as the economic crisis which is plaguing certain countries, like Greece, has a significant influence on this. Consequently, the universities are turning to alternative sources of funding in order to secure their survival. This is a shift that directs them to the demand to respond to the needs of a knowledge-based economy.

The aforementioned which have to do with the university and its external environment have decisive consequences within the university. Indeed, a central issue has proved to be university governance. The main demand is its efficiency. This demand cements its legitimacy in face of criticism that university governance was democratic and hence inefficient. Thus, a paradoxical dilemma is created, democracy or efficiency? In this dilemma it seems that the scales are tipped in favour of efficiency and so the discussion on leadership as a driver for change[1], is condensed

[1] http://www.oecd.org/edu/imhe/IMHEinfos_Jult12_EN%20-%20web.pdf (retrieved 26/2/2016)

into a model where student participation is restricted to minimal, if not completely extinguished and the participation of the teachers is drastically restricted. In contrast, professional managers from the market and stakeholders as experts and expressers of the needs of the economy enter governance. This is a radical change in university governance which it is believed will bring the university better into line with the needs of the economy and by extension, will ensure its survival.

At the same time, in Europe we have the process for the creation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). This is a process that many players lay claim to, each for his own interests and hence it is highlighted as a field of conflict, competition, contradictions as well as a field of negotiations and compromises. What is certain is that a complex system of governance is created where the supranational, national and intra-national context co-exist and try to influence the organization and operation of the university. As a result, the university is called on to reform in a cloudy landscape where depending on who it is conversing with; it needs to think either supra-nationally, nationally or intra-nationally.

Despite this, dominant rationales and policies exist in the EHEA and are consistent with the global policies which are dominated by the logic of the market economy. Of course, in the case of the EHEA it seems that there are still significant, although certainly minority, powers which push towards a more balanced approach, emphasizing the social dimension of studies and consider even the university to be a public responsibility.

The EHEA is also useful as an *analyst* of the contradictions that shape it, contradictions which reveal the limitations of the one-dimensional view of the relationship between university and market. In fact, this relationship, in order to exist, requires a robust economy with large, globalised businesses or alternatives areas with comparable advantages like the (English) language. Such countries exist on the European continent (Germany, the United Kingdom, etc.). In contrast, in countries like Greece the previous model can't function insofar as it had neither a large economy nor big businesses and today the economic crisis the country is experiencing makes the discussion on the relationship (massified) university – market economy meaningless.

The issue of the mismatch between the dominant globalised and/or European political Discourse and the reality in Greece hides an even more significant issue. The Greek universities, in their attempt to come into line with the dominant market Discourse, neglect other missions assigned to the university such as the diffusion of values and ideas related to human rights, active citizenship and democracy. So, their graduates, entering a stunted labour market and a society which is disorganised due to

high unemployment do not have counterweights to deal with the situation they are called on to negotiate. The result is that they reshape the problem of lack of prospects into a problem of lack of trust in the institutions of democracy, since they fail to protect them. Thus, since they are one-dimensionally educated and do not have suitable counterarguments, they are pushed to express their discontent through extreme political and social choices. The crisis of trust in democracy which expresses a lack of prospects mainly for the new generation seems to be a generalised European problem. In Greece it is expressed through the rise of neo-Nazi formations. In other countries it is expressed through the amplification of terrorist organizations. In each case, we have the recent statement by Jean Claude Junker, president of the European Commission, who, in a common interview in the European newspapers *Die Welt, La Repubblica, El Pais, Le soir, Le Figaro, La Tribune de Genève* and *Der Tagesanzeiger* on 24/3/2016, mentioned that "the terrorists passed through our education systems…they passed through our schools and took active part in our social life".

The Greek case is significant because it depicts the contradictions in the priorities of the dominant policy. Greek higher education grew gradually from the beginning of the Greek state, and with objectives which always served the needs of the state. In the latest historical period, (1974-2009), the main social demand was for the "democratization" of higher education, in the sense of the massification of entry to it. This social expectation was realised by Greek universities and so for about 30 years there was some harmony between social expectations and educational policy. From the 1990s and on, and with the development of European policies and later the EHEA, Greek higher education needed to come into line with more general European choices and priorities. The crisis revealed the contradictions of the implemented policies.

However, from here a new discussion begins, which has to do with the consequences of the one-dimensional link of the university with the market. This link seems to have serious implications for the preparation of the graduates of tomorrow to respond to the needs of the operation of the institutions and ultimately the need to defend democracy.

And yet the Council of Europe has prepared us for this with a series of actions. Of course, the Council of Europe can act as "European conscience", but, on the other hand, it doesn't have those mechanisms or authority which would help it implement its work. Despite this, the Council of Europe provides us with all the theoretical material to enable us to understand that the one-sided focus on the needs of the market, the paradoxical dilemma "efficiency or democracy" and the marginalization

of moral values and competences for the democratic function of society lead us to that which President Junker admitted.

The main aim of this book is firstly to highlight the deadlocks of the one-sided focus on the market and secondly, to argue the need to re-define the university as a pillar of support for democracy. And as a consequence, to emphasize the need for equilibrium between the vision and mission of the university.

Based on the problematic detailed above, this book will attempt to approach the main problems today's university is facing, chiefly in the European space, giving at the same time a picture more particularly of the problems of the Greek university and Greek higher education.

In the first chapter we analyse the changes the institution of the university has undergone, at the level of funding, massification and chiefly governance, placing emphasis on its evolution from the model of shared governance to a managerialism model. This evolution was accompanied by changes in its administration which resulted in a reduction in participation in governance by non-professorial staff and students and a corresponding increase in the participation of representatives from outside the university, especially from the business world, something which had negative consequences as much for its democratic operation as for its efficient governance. Finally we examine student participation in the governing bodies of the university as much as an issue concerning the institution's democratic operation as an issue of their education and shaping into active citizens.

In the second chapter we focus on the attempt to create the European Higher Education Area through the Bologna Process, and on the objectives it set, the problems, the contradictions and its one-sidedness, mainly in whatever has to do with the emphasis on economic priorities, like the professionalization of graduates and the corresponding downgrading of the development of democratic values. At the same time we attempt to analyse its influence on Greek Higher Education and on the way in which it here adapted the objectives of the endeavour to its own particularities. More specifically, we analyse the problems, the contradictions and the difficulties of the Greek university in adapting to the goals of the Bologna Process for the creation of the EHEA, examining the particularities and characteristics of Greek Higher Education. We point chiefly to the Greek university's difficulty in adapting to a model which is radically different as much at the level of its relationship with the labour market, as at the level of its democratization, which, due to political rhetoric and the social expectations that this cultivated, primarily means mass access to higher education and only secondly its internal operation.

The third chapter focuses exclusively on the Greek university, its formation in recent decades and its democratization, which focuses firstly on its massification and, secondly, on the adoption of a more democratic model of governance. We also analyse the gap between the university and the labour market, which due to its small extent in relation to the number of students, leads to high graduate unemployment. Within this context, the Greek university's turn towards the economy seems pointless, while at the same time the issue of its funding emerges, which intensifies with the economic crisis. So, the problematic relationship of the Greek university with the economy is demonstrated as well as with the new model of governance, which, particularly at a time of economic crisis, proves to be dysfunctional and inefficient.

In the fourth chapter we examine the role of the university from the point of view of Council of Europe actions, with the aim of showing, in comparison with European Union policies, the need for the growth of a democratic culture through education, and, especially, through the university. Starting from the ascertainment that the university in Europe, chiefly within the context of the Bologna Process, doesn't satisfactorily carry out its role for the support of democracy and its values, we show the significance of the actions and philosophy of the Council of Europe for a sustainable democracy, which is perceived of as an educational act. What should be noted however is that the concept of a sustainable democracy contains, in a deeply interdependent way, a valuative as much as a social dimension. Finally, we examine the example of the Greek university, noting significant weaknesses concerning the cultivation of a democratic culture, as it is understood by the Council of Europe.

In the last chapter we assert the need for a university which will serve not only the economy, but which will at the same time support democracy and its values. As an institution for the production and use of knowledge, we believe that the university can contribute decisively to the support of democracy in society, on the condition that it is democratised through the development of a democratic ethos and a critical spirit. To highlight the importance of the democratization of the university, we make a critical approach to its relationship with the market, drawing attention firstly to its importance for democracy, and secondly, its one-sided nature, in the sense that the predominance of the logic of the market in the university leads to the relegation of the cultivation of democracy and its values. We then claim that the democratization of the university requires the accompanying growth of a critical pedagogy and a democratic educational leadership. We highlight at the same time the enormous obstacles in the way of such a change, such as the bureaucratic structures, the predomination of an economic logic, the power relations that develop through the use

of knowledge, as well as the culture and morals of the universities, which reflect the sociological reality of the country they belong to.

Chapter 1

Transformations and their effects on the profile of the University

1.1 Introduction

Throughout the 20th century, more especially after World War Two, and even more in recent decades, the University underwent significant changes which had an effect as much on the way it was perceived as a social institution, as on the way in which it was governed, and on its function. In this chapter we will focus on these changes with the aim of seeing how they are imprinted on its function, and particularly on its governance and its development.

The development of the University in recent decades was the result of a series of changes, the most significant of which focus on funding and the institution's relationship with the market, on its massification and the effects this has on its social role, and finally, on its shift to a complex institution with the ensuing consequences for its organization, function and profile.

On this level in particular we will analyse the development of university governance and its shift to a managerialism model, under the influence of the wider changes in the institution's socio-economic environment, which led to changes in its governance, with a reduction in the participation of the non-professorial staff and the students, and the increase in representatives from outside the university, and especially from the business world.

Finally, we will examine the dominant model of governance today, related to the participation of factors internal and external to the university, the trends detected in the way it is governed and, above all, student participation in the university's governing bodies, as much as a matter relating to the democratic function of the institution as a matter concerning their education and shaping into active citizens.

1.2 The University and its resources: the turn towards the market

A crucial moment in the development of the university was the founding of the University of Berlin in 1810, which marked a new era for tertiary education and knowledge. A founding stone in the perception of its founder, Wilhelm von Humboldt is the turn towards research in a climate of academic freedom. Since then, and until today, the university has become, and remains, the fundamental social institution for the production of research and knowledge. This role of the university also defined its relationship with its environment, and, by extension, its development.

The transition from the humboldtian model of the university to the university of today is marked by huge changes as much in the social role of the institution as in the social perception of knowledge. These matters have been a topic for discussion as well as conflict especially since the end of the 19th century and remain so today. Essential to the understanding of these matters is the relationship of the university with its surroundings, both national and international, and particularly its relationship with the economy, as well as its financial dependence on the state.

From their first appearance until the beginning of the 19th century, the universities were financially independent (Gerbod, 2004:84). Apart from the extent of their wealth and their own resources, the administration of these assets proves to be a crucial factor, since they are self-governing. Since then and until the 1970s, the universities rested on two principles: state funding and their autonomy, which is linked to their financial independence. Self-government, on the one hand, and on the other, their funding mainly from state budgets, gives grounds for continual tension between the maintenance of autonomy and the independence of the university from the state-financier on a variety of issues, from the appointment of staff to ideological orientations and the use of knowledge.

The issue of the relationship between the state and the public sector on the one hand, and the university on the other, has become all the more composite in recent decades with the increasingly marked connection of the university with the economy and the market. Since then one of the most fundamental questions that is constantly posed is their relationship with the market and by implication the social role of the University and the content of the knowledge produced.

At the beginning of the 20th century in his book *The Higher Learning In America: A Memorandum On the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*, which was published in 1918, the American sociologist Thorstein Veblen poses the question of the relationships between the University and the market. Veblen claims that the

University depends more and more on businesses and businessmen and that more and more people in the United States believe that as an institution for the production of knowledge it ought to function as a business and be governed as such (Veblen, 1918:65).

The discussion on the relationship of the university with businesses settled down in the post war period due to the generous financial support of the state. This holds true as much for western European as for North American universities. The universities in the USA, the public ones first and foremost, are generously funded by the federal and local authorities up to an amount that could surpass 90% of their income. As Burton Clark notes: “The decade of 1958-1968, a period of relatively stable prices, saw a *sevenfold* increase in federal funds for basic university research, from $178 million to $1,251 million” (Clark, 1995: 130).

The issue reappears in the 1970s when more and more states, starting with the USA and Great Britain, partly due to the crisis but also for ideological reasons, reduce funding. As can be seen in table 1, in many countries, western and not, funding from public institutions has been reduced over recent decades, and private funding has increased. This is a significant moment in the history of the University which is starting to change the balance between autonomy/funding, the way it functions and, mainly, its objectives.

Table 1. Expenditure on Higher Education as percentage of GDP by source (2011)

Country	USA	Germany	United Kingdom	France	Sweden	Japan	Chile
Public	0,9	1,3	0,9	1,3	1,6	0,5	0,8
Private	1,8	0,2	0,3	0,2	0,2	1,0	1,7

Source: OECD 2014: 232.

Derek Bok, former rector of the University of Harvard claims that in order for the American universities to remain competitive in research them must come closer to businesses: “This change in priorities led the government to consider new ways of linking university research to the needs of business. In 1980, Congress passed the Bay-Dole Act, which made it much easier for the universities to own and license patents on discoveries made through research paid for with public funds. Federal and state legislation offered subsidies for a variety of university-cooperative ventures to help translate the fruits of academic science into new products and processes. Tax breaks encouraged industry to invest more in university-based science” (Bok, 2003: 11-12).

This development had far-reaching consequences. In the following years other countries too, like France in 1990, adopted similar policies. At the same time, in the middle of the 1980s public subsidization of the universities was reduced and private subsidization increased. The question arises of whether the university is an institution that simply imports elements from the businesses or whether it is actually transformed into a business. A number of analysists reach related positions, although often starting from different viewpoints.

Among them is Bill Readings who puts this trend down to the weakening of the nation-state after the end of the Cold War and the resulting globalization of the economy.

"Here I argue that the discourse of excellence gains purchase precisely from the fact that the link between the University and the nation-state no longer holds in an era of globalization. The University thus shifts from being an ideological apparatus of the nation-state to being a relatively independent bureaucratic system. The economics of globalization mean that the University is no longer called upon to uphold national prestige by producing and legitimating national culture. The University is thus analogous to a number of other institutions – such as national airline carriers – that face massive reductions in foreseeable funding from increasingly weakened states, which are no longer the privileged sites of investment of popular will" (Readings, 1996: 14).

However, Bok believes that despite the huge changes they have undergone and their increased opening up to the market and the business world, the universities are not being transformed into businesses, thanks to the ethos of the members of the community. "Although the dangers are real, not all ties with industry are suspect, nor should universities refuse every opportunity to earn a financial return from their work (…). Fortunately researchers have been surprisingly resistant to the worst temptation of commercialism" (Bok, 2003: 200, 204).

Without doubt, even if we accepts Bok's position, we can't help but note the significant change in the relationships between the university and the outside environment, chiefly the economic one, which sets new challenges for the institution and the members of the academic community and which, as we shall see below, has serious implications for its function and governance.

1.3 Massification of the University

In his study of Oxford and Cambridge students, Laurence Stone notes that from 1670 until the middle of the 19th century, the number of students fell and since then has been increasing (Stone, 1975). The trend that Stone highlighted seems to hold true in a number of countries, especially in central and northern Europe, such as Sweden, the Germanic states and Holland. It doesn't seem to be valid in southern Europe, where the number of students in countries like Spain and France increased slowly but surely until the end of the 18th century, and in other countries where it sees fluctuations, like in Italy (Di Simone, 1996:302-311, Charle-Verger, 2007:40-47).

Generally speaking, from the end of the 19th century, the number of students increases due to the founding of new institutions, the increase in the number of women and the widening of the institution with the creation of departments which treat new cognitive areas, or the upgrading of existing departments.

Based on the number of students, we can discern a first period, from the early years of the 19th century until 1860-1870, which can be characterised as a period that saw the stabilization of the institution of the University in Europe and its growth in other countries. A second period, from 1860 until about 1930 is marked by the universal and spectacular increase in the number of students.

This trend continues today, after a brief period of stagnation following the economic crisis in 1973. In the USA, according to data from the *National Centre for Education Statistics,* from 4.145.065 in 1961 and 8.948.644 in 1971, the number of students reached 17.487.475 in 2005. In Great Britain, from 106.000 in 1950, the number of students reached 2.386.200 in 2013(http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/File:Number_of_tertiary_education_students_2013_%28 thousands%29_ET15.png). Correspondingly in France, from 155.475 in 1950, they reached 288.415 in 1960 and 843.735 in 1971 (Boudon, 1973: 103), while those enrolled in tertiary education in 2013 reached 2.338.100(http://ec.europa.eu/ eurostat/statisticsexplained/index.php/File:Number _of_tertiary_education_students, _2013_%28thousands%29_ET15.png).

Table 2. Absolute University Enrollment in Britain, Germany, Russia, and the USA (1860-1930)[2]

Country: Year	Britain		Germany		Russia		United States	
	stud.	univ.	stud.	univ.	stud.	univ.	stud.	univ./col.
1860-61	3,383	5	12,188	20	5,000	9	22,464	
1870-71	5,560		13,206		6,538		31,900	560
1880-81	10,560		21,209		8,045		49,300	
1890-91	16,013		28,621		13,169		72,250	
1900-01	17,839		33,739		16,357		100,000	
1910-11	26,414		53,364		37,901		144,800	
1920-21	34,591		86,367		109,200		251,750	
1930-31	37,255	16	97,692	23	43,600	21	489,500	1.400
growth:	11 times		8 times		9-22 times		22 times	

Source: K. J. Jarausch, 1983: 13, table I.

1.4 The University as complex social institution

In his doctoral thesis and later in his first classic study, Emile Durkheim, influenced by economists and especially by Adam Smith, develops the view that one of the fundamental characteristics of contemporary societies is the increasing social differentiation and social division of labour. Based on this argument he claims that one of the basic features of modern societies is their growing complexity. In

[2] Note: British figures include both Old Universities and new Provincial Universities. German figures are for the Empire (less Strasbourg after World War One) and include old universities. Russian figures include Warsaw and Dorpat until World War One. Because there is no precise American equivalent to the European university sector, an approximate estimate of U.S. dynamics was based on one half of the enrollment in colleges and universities together with the entire enrollment in the professional schools, since there were clearly of university-like status and function. The U.S. figures were computed from informal estimates of the college/university professional school, and normal school/teacher’s college enrollment, provided by C. B. Burke. Since they were for males in 1860 and for both males and females thereafter, they somewhat overstate expansion.

addition, the social division of labour is a prerequisite for balance in the "higher societies" (1978: 392).

This view is central in various sociological movements, especially functionalism and structural functionalism. Its application to the University is depicted with clarity by Burton Clark.

"In short, diversity, not uniformity, is the master trend. The need to concentrate and hence differentially distribute financial resources and personnel and equipment and students grows ever stronger as higher education systems grow in population size and in coverage of cognitive territories. The institutional division of labour can no more be stopped, let alone reversed, than the division of labour in society. Hence the thought that all institutions of higher education can be equal becomes a species of utopianism. If differentiation is not effected among institutions, it will take place within them, producing ever more polyglot universities that call for heroic internal management to simply maintain peaceful relations among disparate factions and somehow insert a capacity for spontaneous change" (Clark, 1995: 246).

The trend Burton Clark describes is undeniably real. A lot of new universities were established, their structure changed, the cognitive and research subject areas that they treated multiplied. New departments were established with new cognitive subject areas, the number of students increased dramatically, so too did the staff, both academic and administrative. All this transformed the University into a continually more composite body, the chief characteristic of which being the specialization of knowledge and the university departments that treat it, something which has important consequences for its organization and function. The university is constantly changing face and, through the division of labour and associated specialization of the cognitive subject areas, is transformed into what Clark Kerr, Rector of the University of California had already called in 1964 a "Multiversity".

"The multiversity is an inconsistent institution. It is not one community but several – the community of the undergraduate and the community of the graduate; the community of the humanist, the community of the social scientist, and the community of the scientist; the communities of the professional schools; the community of all the non-academic personnel; the community of the administrators. Its edges are fuzzy-it reaches out to alumni, legislators, farmers, businessmen, who are all related to one or more of these internal communities. As an institution, it looks far into the past and far into the future, and is often at odds with the present. It serves society almost slavishly-a society it also criticizes, sometimes unmercifully. Devoted to equality of opportunity, it is itself a class society. A community, like the medieval communities of masters and students, should have common interests; in the

multiversity, they are quite varied, even conflicting. A community should have a soul, a single animating principle; the multiversity has several-some of them quite well, although there is much debate on which souls really deserve salvation" (Kerr, 1964:18-9).

Whether we call it University or Multiversity, the university has evolved today and has been transformed into a complex as well as fundamental institution for contemporary societies, which is called upon to act out a signifying role on many levels. To promote knowledge, to contribute to social and economic development, to certify professionals and scientists, to shape democratic citizens and to contribute to social and democratic development. At the same time, the universities are linked all the more with the market and develop multi-level relationships with it. This is imprinted on its formation, function and, in recent years, its governance.

The basic question is how, and through which processes does all this influence its internal organization and function, and especially its governance. In order to answer this question, we will now attempt to analyse firstly the changes it has undergone at the level of governance. We will then examine the internal function of the institution investigating the issue of the participation of the members of the academic community notably the non-professorial staff and the students. Finally, we reconsider the current model of governance in the light of the recent transformations the universities have undergone.

1.5 Academic administration: from the management to a new managerialism Model

The universities were traditionally self-governing and to a large extent their governance bore the characteristic of shared governance. This trend strengthened especially in the 1960s and 1970s, in the USA as much as in the European universities, while after the 1980s it accelerated. As far as the development of the European universities and their relationship with authority is concerned, W. Ruegg and J. Sadlak distinguish four phases "1. 1945-1955: Recovery in a divided Europe, 2. 1956-1967: Emerging national and international university policies, 3. 1968-1982: Expansion, democratization, bureaucratization, 4. 1983-1995: Towards a harmonized European model (Ruegg and Sadlak, 2011: 74).

In the same period we have developments in the governance of the institution. Firstly, at the level of language and terminology. "The term 'management', notes G. Lockwood, "was not part of the cultural vocabulary of the university in 1945 except

to describe a process or method of organization alien to a public institution as opposed to a business firm. The university was governed and administered but not managed. (…) 'Management' began to feature in the literature and conference papers in the 1960s. Its acceptability and usage within the university came in the 1970s, firstly as a reaction to the student-led wave of concentration upon the politics of governance as the focus of internal organization in the late 1960s, secondly under the impact upon universities of the oil-inflation-inspired world economic crises of the mid-1970s" (Lockwood, 2011: 124).

Finally, the term 'management' began to be widely used after 1985 together with the acceptance and use of the term managerialism (Lockwood, 2011:125).

Something similar could also be said for the people in the University. In the past we spoke more about the academic community, its members, its constituents. Today we talk about stakeholders or consumers (Bolland, 2005: 209).

How are the aforementioned changes imprinted on University governance? In his well-known comparative study in 1983, Burton Clark distinguished four types of university as far as the organization of governance is concerned: the continental mode (a combination of Faculty guild and State bureaucracy) the British mode (a combination of Faculty guilds with a modest amount of influence from institutional trustees and administrators), the American mode ("like the British has combined beloved faculty forms with institutional leadership and administration but in comparison with the British faculty rule has been weaker and the influence of trustees and administrators stronger") and the Japanese mode (a mixture of the American and continental mode) (Clark, 1983: 125-130).

Since the publication of Clark's typology, much has changed. Tertiary education became further massified, public funding shrank and the significance of the market increased as much as a source of income as a mechanism for demand, technical knowledge, goods and services. It is not at all by chance that in many countries, chiefly those outside continental Europe, private funding of tertiary education approaches or surpasses public.

The reduction in public funding led the universities into financial straits and pushed them to search for funds from other sources. This is even true for the north American public universities where the contribution of the States was greatly reduced. "According to McPherson et al." writes James Duderstadt, "from 1990 to 2009 states have reduced their funding per enrolled student by an average of 35%, totalling more than $15 billion each year nationally" (Duderstadt, 2014: 8). To address the problem and its consequences concerning notably the future of the American research universities the National Academy of Science and Engineering

and the Institute of Medicine have after a request made by Congress in 2010 formed a committee of renowned researchers. The committee arrived in 2012 at 10 recommendations. The second refers to funding. "The states should strive to restore appropriations for higher education to levels that allow public research universities to operate at world-class levels, while providing them with greater autonomy to enable them to compete strategically and respond with ability to new opportunities" (Duderstadt, 2014: 8).

More significant are the changes in continental European countries and in general in those with the characteristics of the type that Clark called continental. In many of these countries, particularly in the south, and amongst them Greece, tertiary education was heavily dependent on the State and had a comparatively small link with the market. Consequently, opening up to the market is more painful since traditions and beliefs are put to the test and relationships within the university change with repercussions as much in the field of power as in the administration of the policy being practised (Kiprianos et al., 2011).

Did these changes lead to a new type of university governance? Experts from seven countries, from six European countries and the USA, who met in 1998 in Switzerland, answered in the affirmative. It is a new type of governance which they call new managerialism. What is it about? The meeting's co-ordinator, Dietmar Braun distinguishes, based on three criteria (belief system, substantive rationality and procedural rationality), three types of governance, up until the 1980s. They are the collegium model, of the British universities, the market model of the American, and the oligarchic – bureaucratic model which characterizes European countries like France, Germany, Switzerland and Holland.

Brown claims that in the 1990s things changed with the transition to governance of the new managerialism type which crystallizes into two particular types: one more efficiency oriented model and a second client/market oriented. The first chiefly characterizes countries that previously had the oligarchic – bureaucratic model. The second, the USA, Great Britain and also Holland. The shift to the first type takes place mainly with the quest for efficiency in a period of austerity. The countries that are integrated into the second type start from radical utilitarian beliefs which are part of a wider neo-liberal strategy.

How do the latter two types differ? The second is characterized by greater procedural freedom in decision making and has less real autonomy from the markets. In short, the countries of the first type come closer to the countries of the second, but there are still differences in the relationship with the state and the market and at the level of values. For Braun, this explains why the changes are relatively limited and

less painful in the USA and much more painful in other countries, particularly Great Britain, which passed from one type, the collegial, to another, oriented to the client and the market (Braun, 1999: 239-261).

What is the current situation, internationally, within the universities, as far as their governance is concerned? “At the moment”, sums up Brown, “universities in all countries are trying to establish a balance between two extremes: the university as the curiosity-driven institution in the cultural belief system and the university as the service-enterprise according to the more utilitarian belief system. Given the universal tendency to establish the new managerialism as the predominant governance model it should be clear that there will be no way back to pre-existing structures. The predominance of the cultural model has gone for good. What universities have to learn at the moment is how to avoid either permanent immobilism becoming mere market-driven organizations with calculate frameworks. There is no easy way out. Piecemeal engineering and gradual adaptation to national conditions instead of radical and large-scale reforms might be a good option to find a balance which suits best the interest of all actors involved” (Braun, 1999: 261).

1.6 Participation of the university community in the universities’ Administrative bodies

The transition to a new managerialism model has consequences at the level of the administrative bodies, but, chiefly, in their duties and in the balances and relationships between them. In addition, it also results in the reduction in the participation of members of the academic community, especially of the non-professorial staff and the students and an increase in the representatives from outside the university, particularly from the business world.

More specifically, the European universities, like the North American ones, are governed, generally speaking, by four distinct bodies which naturally differ on a number of points: on the number and composition of their members, their duties and their relationships with one another. As Lockwood put it, “Despite periods of considerable turbulence or debate, the internal governance of the university in Europe since 1945 has been based upon a quadrilateral of power or authority (…). (Lockwood, 2011: 140).

For a start the new model of governance is based on the Institutions’ Councils, which include members from inside and outside the university. Their total number of members, the proportion of those internal and those external to the university, the

way they are appointed, and to a lesser extent, their duties, are differentiated from country to country. Traditionally, in Great Britain they include more external members, in continental Europe, more internal.

In second place there is the Senate, which, presumptively, is comprised of elected representatives of all the members of the university community. It is chiefly concerned with academic issues and so rarely with research.

Thirdly, at the head of the institution, the Rector (President or Vice-chancellor) whose duties and the means of his appointment differ from country to country.

He represents the institution while the Council of Chancellors, the fourth body, is institutionally recognized in more or less all European countries and represents the universities against every other institution, as much at a national as at an international level.

Changes in university governance are concentrated in three areas: in the change in the duties of the four bodies and hence in the importance of each body, the university's relationship with the outside environment, political and economic power more particularly and the participation of the members of the academic community.

As far as the first point is concerned, until the 1980s, the basic administrative body was the Senate, a kind of parliament of the academic community. It had the first word on academic issues as well as financial matters and research. In contrast, in recent decades, with the strengthening of the new managerial model the significance of the Senate has been restricted in favour of the Council, which includes more and more people from outside the university, and in a number of cases, appointed by the government, as occurs in Dutch universities.

These changes pose a crucial question. Who are the external members who participate in the Councils and bear significant weight in decision making and what is the importance of political power? Firstly, representatives of the business world participate, something which strengthens the position of those who talk about the increasing role of the market in the orientation of the university. On the other hand, we know that in most countries, especially European ones, university governance is mainly influenced by political power. This brings us to the following paradox: while universities import all the more elements from businesses and end up functioning as such, it is the governments which more often than not make decisions on this. In other words, while the universities are self-governing and defend their autonomy, many of the measures that concern them are enforced on them by the centralized power. That is why Peter Scott referring to the UK Universities from 1963 to 2007 speaks of their "nationalization" (Scott, 2007: 66).

Another consequence is the reduction in the importance of bodies within the academic community. This appears to be particularly evident in the EU. “Education politics in European universities,” states Stavros Moutsios, “as deliberation and decision-making on behalf of academic community and as governance of their institution, is thus being eliminated by transnational policy-making and corporate management (…). Within the university, management-based governance is dissolving the academic community by turning scholars into ‘human resources’ with no say in the affairs of their institution, and students into temporary customers” (Moutsios, 2013: 35).

This trend is in line with changes in the power relations within the academic community, particularly the strengthening of the body of professors. This trend is much more composite than it might appear at first glance. The increased power of the professors in relation to other groups doesn’t mean an increase in their general power as was the case before World War Two. On the contrary, in both research and teaching, this is limited to the demand for applied research in specific fields, or with the imposition of rules in teaching and the achievement of learning outcomes. It would be more correct to claim that the whole process turns out in favour of certain groups of professors who treat cognitive subject areas in greater demand in the labour market and at the expense of others, especially in the social and humanistic studies, which are of less importance in the job market. However even this ascertainment is general. Many of the rules, especially those pertaining to teaching, are legislated for by the education authorities in each country, governmental first and foremost, a fact which alters the relationships of the political power with the universities and reduces, as we saw before, the importance of the teachers.

On the other hand the participation of non-professorial staff in governance is reduced and is restricted to their professional matters. Things are more complicated when it comes to the students. Their participation in governance is reduced and restricted to educational/pedagogical issues.

In order for us to understand this trend, it would be useful for us to define student participation and the levels on which it develops. Manja Klemencic (2012: 642-650), in reference to students, distinguishes four levels of relations: the bipolar state/students, university/students, professors/students, and the students amongst themselves. The criteria for this categorization are those involved in the university and the individuals who practise governance. The problem with this particular categorization lies in the fact that the four categories overlap, and mainly that others are involved too, such as the administrative staff or the university sponsors.

In our opinion, it is more correct to approach their participation based on the nature of the relationship between those involved. From this viewpoint we distinguish three basic aspects: the making of decisions that concern the function of the university as an institution, the making of decisions that concern the daily life of the members of the university community, and, to some extent, their life outside of it. And, finally, the pedagogical relationship, the production and transmission of knowledge.

We could investigate the three aforementioned aspects from another point of view. It is obvious that the third aspect more or less covers the pedagogical, in other words the teacher-learner relationship, as well as the relationships internal to each of these two groups. The second has to do with the relationships among the students themselves, their relationship with the governance of the university and to a lesser extent, with the political power. The first is linked more to the structure of the administrative bodies and the central decision making. In other words it concerns as much the university's relationship with the political leadership (the state and/or the local authorities, depending on the country), as the operation of the administrative bodies, their duties and the relationships between them.

Of course, from this point of view, as with all others relating to participation, we need to bear in mind the space where the participants' relationships are formed. Are they formed within the Department, the School or centrally in the University? This parameter is significant since it depends on the content of the decisions and the distance of the members of the community from the decision making centres. Obviously, the closer the decision making centres are to them, the closer the decisions are to their daily life. Consequently it is clear that this will be imprinted on the function of the university as well as on the positions and practices of its members.

Examining the three aspects that we distinguished, we discover significant differentiations over time. Generally speaking, we observe two parallel developments. Firstly, the three aspects are differentiated as if they were on three distinct levels. Secondly, in the European space, student participation in the first aspect is reduced and in the other two, especially the third it is strengthened, particularly at the level of declarations.

If we consider the three aspects over time, we are led to the conclusion that in recent years a transformation in the form of student participation that we knew up until the 1980s has taken place. Student participation, in the process of the transition to a managerial model of governance, is drastically reduced in favour of the other two aspects, especially the third, which concerns the pedagogical relationship teacher/taught. This trend is not uniform but it exists. Indicatively, in the study 'five

leading universities'[3], Bjorn Stensaker has concluded: "Considering all models together, it is the entrepreneurial one that stands out as the dominant model in the strategic plans. (…) Links to the collegial model can also be found in the strategic plans. However, these links are mostly found in sections addressing quality and excellence and the need to strengthen core activities – education and research. Considering the strong emphasis of the universities to emphasize leadership in instigating change, it is quite interesting that the most references to the collegial model can be found in the sections where the importance of leadership is discussed (Stensaker, 2012: 10-11).

The withdrawal of student participation and the distancing of the students from their unions come at the same time as the reduction in public funding in the universities and the aforementioned changes in their governance. In 2002, in research on student participation by the Norwegian Ministry of Education which was conducted for the Council of Europe in view of the programmed meeting in Oslo of the Education ministers of the then 45 countries that took part in the Bologna Declaration, only two European countries didn't foresee student participation in university governance.

Analysing the results of the research, Sjur Bergan estimated that in 2003 the percentage of student participation in the administrative bodies of most of the European countries fluctuated between 10 and 20%. In the rest it was below 10%. Apart from participation, the duties of the students are significant. According to the research, students in the majority of the European countries had the right to speak and vote on all issues. In 8 countries however, student representatives had the right to speak and vote only on certain issues, mainly concerning studies, staff appointments, governance and funding (Bergan, 2003: 4-5).

Since then student participation seems to have been further reduced in the central governing bodies of the universities. The institutional weakening of the student unions was also set in motion, either with the abolition of compulsory participation, wherever that existed (in Sweden in 2010), or with the introduction of general clauses concerning student participation on the Councils (Portugal), or even with the strengthening of funding of the two student Unions in Denmark (Vos, 2011: 315-6, Klemencic, 2012: 34).

Similar developments took place in other European countries. In Spain for instance, the Ministry of Education published a text related to the Student Charter, in which the significance of their participation in university matters was noted.

[3] The University of Helsinki, the University of Uppsala, the University of Lund, the University of Copenhagen, and the University of Oslo.

However, the text was not ratified, and the universities that could have integrated it into their internal regulation, didn't do so, so student participation remained up in the air (Planas et al., 2011: 3-4). In Greece, law 4009/2011 drastically reduced student participation at all levels, but especially in the administrative bodies, making it merely decorative and juxtaposing participation with efficiency (Kladis, 2012).

The weakening of student participation contrasts with the points of view expressed by some actors, notably the Union of European Students (ESIP). For instance, in research conducted in 2002 for the Council of Europe, the majority of the three sectors questioned (representatives of the government, the students and the universities) state that student participation in their universities is sufficiently representative but at the same time mention that it requires further strengthening (Persson, 2003: 10).

1.7 Re-thinking governance

From the aforementioned, it can be concluded that after the 1980s a double shift took place on the level of university governance. From shared governance and management, we moved to a new model, more managerial. A basic characteristic of this trend was the weakening of the participation of members of the university community, especially of the non-professorial staff and the strengthening of the presence of interest groups from outside the university. Secondly, the development cited touches on all sectors of university life, but not uniformly. Within the university community the role of the professor is relatively strengthened, at the expense of other groups, while at the same time weight is given to student participation in the pedagogical process, and simultaneously their presence in governance is weakened.

How is this double development to be explained? Multiple and not always converging answers have been given to the question. We saw that Veblen, adopting a position related to the Marxist, puts it down to the big businesses' quest for profit. In contrast, Readings links it to the historical course of the nation-state. However, common to both these views is the belief that for a number of reasons the universities are to be found closer to the market and its challenges and function or tend to function as businesses. This is where the institution of the new managerial model of governance, which depends on two principles, begins.

The first principle is to be found in the lifting of the distinction public/private, public/private goods and their conversion into products. This is how the

argumentation for the withdrawal of the state from tertiary education, the turn to private funding and the participation/appointment of representatives of the businesses world in Councils of the Institutions emerged. The second principle lies in the handling of the university as if it were (with the exception of the learning process) a business with the appointment in some cases of the rector who acts as manager (Vinokur, 2005: 9).

At the opposite end of the spectrum to the aforementioned view are to be found two others, which have different starting points and arrive at distinct proposals. The first was depicted by Bok. According to the view we presented, universities turned to business to balance the reduction in public funding which was brought about by the petrol crisis in 1972 and the inability of the public sector to meet the increased needs. This means that the change was more coincidental and hence reversible. This change, Bok claims, doesn't radically alter the face of the university, at least the American universities, since, despite their marked link to the labour market, they remain faithful to their founding principles thanks to the moral character of the academics.

The third perception starts out from the changes that took place in the universities in recent decades which, according to their supporters, make their governance much more demanding and composite. They claim that the university as a body became very composite and that its exchanges with the external environment became more intense, decision making more difficult and that it needs to take place more quickly. The more marked interdependence with the external environment, the complexity of decisions and the need to make them more rapidly, comprise the three elements on which the new understanding of university governance is based (Birnbaum, 2003: 4-5, de Boer, 2007: 35, Lapworth, 2004:307).

The last view is not of course entirely new. Its origins can be found in Weber's theories of bureaucracy. Joseph Schumpeter first developed it in his theory on Democracy (Schumpeter, 1983). According to him, societies continually become more complex, as do decisions. Hence Democracy is transformed more into a process, while for politicians to take the correct decisions they need to have the appropriate technical knowledge or delegate the decisions to technocrats.

This view permeates the new managerial model of governance. The members of the university community are unable to govern effectively because they are not professionals. In addition the decision making processes in the universities, as long as the universities are collegial, are slow and time consuming. In other words, according to this view, Democracy is contrary to efficiency. Finally, while universities are turning all the more to the market and depend on it financially, it is

useful for people who know the market to actively participate in decisions that concern it. These three arguments arrive at a given picture in terms of the manner of university governance and the individuals that will take it on: small bodies so that decisions can be taken quickly, made up of people who understand the market and know how to take the appropriate decisions quickly.

This view can be checked from three different standpoints. As far as the first is concerned, rapid decision making and knowledge of the exercise of governance are evaluated positively, but they are not sufficient since they require two additional elements: knowledge of the problems and acceptance of their decisions by those directly affected, that is to say, the members of the university community. However, how can the external members of the Council understand the problems of the university and its members? Consequently how can they take the correct decisions? On the other hand, a prerequisite for the successful implementation of a decision is its acceptance by those affected by it. Consequently it is not at all to be taken for granted that the members who do not come from within the institution itself meet this requirement.

Obviously the supporters of the new model of governance don't ignore this problem. For this reason, in most countries, university governance is exercised by individuals from inside and outside the University. Does this mean that those within the University ignore how governance is exercised and are satisfied in filling in the picture and giving information to the outsiders, the professionals? Or that both sides, depending on the problem, contribute to the decision making? If the first holds true it means that those within the university don't know about governance and consequently carry less weight in decision making. If the second holds true then both are knowledgeable and make decisions together. Hence the problem in this case doesn't lie in knowing how to exercise governance by the members of the university community, to be precise, the professors, but in the subject matter of the decisions, or in other words, in the relationship of the university with the external environment.

This last ascertainment, while not explicitly expressed, runs through the discourse of academics and politicians. With this argument, the presence of administrators and mainly students is restricted. How can administrative staff have a say in non-administrative affairs, given their area of knowledge? How can students have a say in decision making, given their age, their short-lived presence within the institution and ignorance of its problems?

Undoubtedly, the transformation of the University into a more complex institution has consequences for the participation of all the groups within the university community, particularly the students. From field research on student participation

however, a more composite picture emerges. Their participation is restricted, but existent and their participation can, under certain preconditions, be strengthened.

According to the aforementioned research by the Council of Europe, in most countries student participation ranges between 16 and 30%, in some countries less and in two above 30% (Persson, 2003:9). In Spain participation in student elections in many universities like those at the University of Barcelona doesn't surpass 20% and in others, like those in Madrid, 70% do not participate in any election at all (Planas et al., 2011: 5). Something similar happens in Greece where student participation, despite the marked partisan nature of student groups, approaches 30% of enrolled students. Participation of Dutch students in the elections for the governing bodies is at around the same percentage.

Does this mean that students do not wish to participate in the university governing bodies? Research reveals differences from country to country. Students at the University of Cyprus appear to be dissatisfied with their participation in the governing bodies and would like it to be widened (Menon, 2005: 175). In Holland, on the other hand, the students (as well as the professors) were not interested, nor appear to be interested in greater participation with the argument that it is very time-consuming: "More than half (53%) of the governed – particularly students – are not interested (at all) in governance issues at the faculty level. Only 12% says that they are interested in governance and policy issues at their faculty. (…) The fact that the work and achievements of the councils is often unknown (33%) in addition explains the low interest in a seat on a representative council" (Huisman, 2006: 233-4).

So what is reduced participation due to? In Holland the students put it down to the fact that it requires time. In Cyprus and Spain they mention the time but also the scant information. The second argument explains, in part too, the unequal participation: it is lower in the central governing bodies and higher at the level of Department and School. It seems however that information from the university and its associated parties contributes effectively to an increase in participation. Research from Spain reveals this. "Recent studies carried out at Spanish universities indicate that, with the right measures, participation increases significantly. Evidence of this is to be found in the work of the University of Cantabria Student Council (Urraca, 2005), which consistently implemented measures on different fronts with the aim of achieving real and effective student participation (reviewing regulations, electoral calendars and processes, recognizing dedication to these representative and participative bodies, and providing specific training in this respect). This also coincides with the conclusions of the more recent study conducted by Caceres, Lorenzo, and Sola (2009) at the University of Granada" (Planas et al., 2001: 9).

In conclusion, the complexity of the university as an institution places limits on participation since it demands an investment of time, energy and knowledge. As far as the students are concerned this can in part be solved with their provision of information by those within the university. In short, students participate more and more actively when they are informed. From this assertion can we conclude that students should be excluded from the governing bodies because their participation is limited and their contribution to the decisions small?

If this reasoning prevailed on a political level then by right it would lead to a technocratic-elitist view according to which the right to elect and be elected wouldn't be universal but would be awarded based on citizens' knowledge and skills. Beyond this however we can answer the question through the prism of two others: How effective is the new managerial model of governance? What is the pedagogical role of the university and what is this role's relationship with student participation?

One could argue that this model is relatively new and we cannot safely assess its effectiveness in such a short period of time. However, research suggests that it is not very effective. "However", state Larsen, Maassen and Stensaker, "empirical studies on the effects of the changes in university governance reveal rather ambiguous results of reform initiatives. In many countries, it is difficult to conclude that universities are more effective and efficient. New decision making structures do not always lead to the desired behavioural changes and the outcomes of the new governance arrangements seem to have a number of unintended consequences (Larsen et al., 2009:3).

This is to some extent to be expected since decisions do not always and everywhere have the required consensus from the actors involved, the academic community does not act towards their implementation, the decisions are doubted. The most characteristic criticism from this point of view lies in the fact that governance, under the pressure of time and the need for actual effectiveness, acts with a view to the achievement of immediate results and not long term strategy. In short, the future is sacrificed to passing goals which may prove fatal for the institution.

In addition, the university is also a pedagogical institution. Of its stated central objectives, the cultivation of critical thought and the formation of active citizens is among the oldest. Consequently, participation in governance has a double character. Firstly, taking on a part of the responsibility for the function of the institution and, secondly, an educational means for the shaping of active citizens. Indicative of this are the EU texts that talk about student-centred learning and student participation in the learning process.

However can we demarcate student-centred learning on two distinct levels, on the one hand participation in the learning process and on the other so-called exclusion from governance and the decision making bodies? The distinction seems to us to be contradictory and technically impossible. It is logically inconsistent for the university to promote active learning and to deny participation in decision making which concerns the students. Is it not a contradiction in terms for students to learn to be active in learning but passive in governance?

Obviously, involvement in governance is more complex than active presence in the learning and generally speaking the pedagogical process. The former requires decision making, and often rapidly. In the second, in contrast, the objective and the time spans are different. Priority is for the student to actively learn and be initiated in research. Even like this however, the full separation of the presence and life of the student at the university onto two levels is not implied. One level on which he has a say, and a second where others decide for him.

In any case the changes that have taken place in recent years constitute a huge challenge for the universities on all levels. One of the challenges is its governance. The previous shared model of governance, could respond to the new challenges: to the massification of the students, the search for new sources of funding, to the new management needs, especially from academics, exceptional in their field, but not well acquainted with governance, economy and the external environment.

The model of governance predominant nowadays, the new managerial doesn’t seem to respond satisfactorily to the new challenges. In the name of efficiency it cuts the universities off from their democratic past and the traditional collegial self-governance, puts aside its members, and gives weight to management by individuals who may know about governance but aren’t necessarily familiar with the university. All this results in tension and conflict, which do not help democratic, sound and hence effective governance.

What is needed consequently is a model of governance that respects the democratic traditions of the University and at the same time responds to contemporary challenges. These are challenges that could be grouped into two large categories: the changes which occurred within the university, and the international developments, especially the weakening of the nation states, at least on an economic level, with the conditions of globalization.

Chapter 2

The European Higher Education Area, the Bologna Process and Greek Higher Education

2.1 Introduction

The European Higher Education Area had a conflictual start. The dispute around the date when its creation began is indicative: 1998 or 1999?

In 1998, the ministers of education of the four big states of the European Union (EU), France, the United Kingdom, Germany and Italy came together in Sorbonne on the initiative of the then education minister of France, Claude Jean Allègre. He himself later (25/2/1999) confessed in a speech at the College de France: "in any case, if we hadn't done it ourselves, on a European level, Brussels would have done it".[4]

It is interesting for one to note that this phrase has been repeated a number of times in the history of European Education Policy (EEP). It's a key phrase which demonstrates that the pressure of Community bureaucracy on some issues which are integrated within the grey zone of responsibility (community or state) ultimately mobilise the states themselves since they don't want to leave the issue in question to the initiative of the Commission. Hence, when they believe that they can't obstruct the Commission's involvement in an issue, they prefer to take it on themselves.

Consequently, the meeting in Sorbonne was a reaction of the big States to the Commission's initiatives on issues concerning higher education. However, another reaction came from the other EU states, which considered that the meeting of the '4' was an attempt to create a European directorate within the field of higher education. Hence, they pressurised for, organised and succeeded in holding a meeting in Bologna a year later (1999). There 29 European states met and set the foundations of the EHEA. There are two points of interest here: firstly, the member-states of the EU didn't permit the Commission's participation as a representative of the EU[5].

[4] www.education.gouv.fr/realisations/education/superieur/epscp.htm (retrieved on 20-02-2001).

[5] The EU is accepted later when European students are added to the participants (ESIB, later ESU, http://www.esu-online.org), the Union of European Universities (CRE, then EUA, http://www.eua.be), etc. Of course, since it was in the EU's interest, and it had the means to do so, it intervened continually and pushed for the realization of the EHEA. A characteristic example is the funding for the Tuning programme which was one of the first attempts to define a commonly accepted European framework of scientific fields (http://www.unideusto/tuningeu/).

Secondly, in order to make it clear that it was not an EU policy, European non-member states of the EU were also included. So from this conflict of interests, the EHEA was born.

2.2 The architecture of the EHEA

Initially, interest focussed on the architecture of the space. Its ultimate formation talks about three levels of study where the first has at least 3 years of study (bachelor), the second 1 or 2 (master) and the third 3 years (PhD). Passage from one level to the next presupposes possession of a study title from the previous cycle. Of course, over time this criterion became more flexible since many states adopted prior learning and a system of accumulation of qualifications expressed as ECTS (http://ec.europa.eu/education/ects/ects_el.htm) and ECVET (http://www.ecvet-team.eu/en), within the framework of the logic of lifelong learning.

It should be noted that the final arrangement was not accomplished without tension and disagreements. For example, in the Prague Communiqué the phrase ‘at least’ needed to be added to the initial inflexible prerequisite of 3 years of study for the first cycle. Hence, in the end the phrase ‘at least 3-year studies’ for the first cycle of studies was shaped. In this way many countries, among them Greece, overcame certain difficulties in coming into line with the EHEA, while maintaining the basic characteristics of their academic traditions. The choice of the duration of the first cycle of studies has to do, on the one hand with the acceptance in a society of the ‘how much time does one need to emerge as a good professional in a line of work’, and on the other, with international relations, to the extent that the American bachelor takes 4 years and consequently 3-year degrees are not recognised in the USA, unless there is some relevant mutual agreement, as is the case with the United Kingdom.

In any case, as much with the integration of the EUA as the EURASHE (the technological branch of higher education, the former polytechnics), as well as the students (ESU) as equal members of the Bologna Process, the relevant decisions are not judged only by government bureaucrats, but by those to whom the decisions apply. Student participation in particular was, on a symbolic and actual level, extremely significant, since they were considered equal members and not as clients or passing users.

Today, the architecture of the EHEA is considered, rightly or wrongly, a question that has been solved or has at least matured somewhat, since more or less all the Bologna process states have adopted the logic of the three levels. In reality, there are

still problems. It seems however that two groups of states have been created, a first group in which the degree for the first cycle is awarded after three years and the master's after two, and another where the first degree is awarded after 4 years and the master's in 1. Of course here too there are quite a few exceptions and variations.

What is interesting is that by now the idea that an EHEA exists has become accepted and that this contains some common characteristics, even when this isn't absolutely precise. In this way however a European climate of pressure is created on the governments to advance to the necessary reforms, so that the national systems can resemble the characteristics of the architecture of the EHEA. On the other hand, it is also true that the governments exploit the specific climate to promote unpopular social changes, which they blame on European pressures. Hence, a dynamic relationship between the communal, flexible and adaptable EHEA and the governments, as well as the EU and other participants gradually developed validating a new type of European governance of higher education in Europe.

2.3 The philosophy behind the EHEA

After the first surprise, which was imprinted on the occupation with the external characteristics of the EHEA (architectural structure) attention turned to the thinking behind it. Initially there was a great surprise and upset (which one cannot be sure is yet over), since the development of the idea of student-centred learning and learning outcomes was believed not only to create problems in the traditional architecture of higher level studies, but also overturned the basic idea of its formation around the treatment of a scientific field (ESU, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c).

The learning outcomes, a complex of knowledge, competencies and skills, remind one more of the usefulness and instrumentality of studies, rather than the traditional conception of the knowledge of a science. So, for example, it is no longer sufficient for one to say that he is studying to become a teacher; he must be in a position to state expressly what he is capable of doing as a teacher. However this approach upsets the structure of a scientific field, its particular sectors and their development into a study programme.

This change should perhaps be related also to the promotion of interdisciplinarity, which is presented as a paradigm change in university studies, in order to underline the radicalness of its content and the changes it brings about in the traditional organization of studies. Interdisciplinarity is understood as an effective answer to the demands of the complexity of today's problems and dead-ends, first and foremost

ecological and then social, economic and political (Gibbons, 1994; Aggelopoulos, 2013). In any case, the combination of interdisciplinarity and learning outcomes de-legitimises and overturns the traditional one-discipline studies organised on long-standing constant and unchanging university Departments/Faculties. The Departments/Faculties, in this way of thinking, were considered anachronistic and inflexible which is why there is a trend towards replacing them with a more flexible structure, the 'study programme'. One can see that this is a major challenge and there are many reactions, since the study programme is naturally something more adaptable, but on the other hand, convincing answers have yet to be provided concerning the consequences of the rearranging of the traditional scientific fields.

Here, perhaps it is worth noting the filtering and adaptations or interpretations, which the common decisions on a European level come in for when they are introduced into the national context. For example, France, applying the learning outcomes approach to its national model, called it the 'professionalization' of studies, placing emphasis on the need for graduates to be able to know how to do particular things and find employment (Stamelos and Vasilopoulos 2013).

At the same time, with the development of the study programmes based on learning outcomes, interest is focussed on the student himself, and his needs. Here, the ideal type profile of the student is fundamental. A fundamental issue proves to be the massification of studies and the integration into them of new populations with differentiated characteristics - socially, in terms of age, educationally, as well as in terms of their motives and ambitions. Nowadays the major problem seems to be that the combination of massification and the extreme inhomogeneity of the student population lead to mass abandonment or great prolongation of the period of study. So, the traditional problem of access to higher level studies is transformed and becomes the problem of abandonment of studies. In parallel, the social inequalities which were seen to exist in access, have by now shifted to the level of higher education and are related to the study programme and/or the institution (Stamelos and Paivandi, 2015).

Taking this as given, a tendency takes shape which transfers interest to the student. This is also the legislative factor in the justification of the need for student centred learning, in other words learning focussed on the student, on his interests and needs. However the focus on the students is tied up with the marginalising of the Department/Faculty and a programme of study based on one science, and on the strengthening of the understanding of flexible learning paths based on the individual interests of the learner. As a result, what is proposed on the one hand is adaptation of teaching and evaluation methods to the needs of the student, while at the same time

support institutions such as tutoring, psychological and advisory support and so on are created.

Here perhaps it would be worth noting a strong challenge, which concerns 'post studies'. The mono-disciplinary studies most often lead to specific work environments with co-ordinated and structured means of access to professional activities with established professional rights. In contrast, the trend towards personalized learning paths in interdisciplinary formations objectively weakens the collectiveness as much of the degree (as the outcome of collective learning) as of the collective employment rights after graduation (Stamelos, 2009).

2.4 Tools of the EHEA

With time and with the gradual development of the EHEA, a series of tools are integrated or adopted for the servicing of its needs. We will now present three of them.

2.4.1 European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS)

The ECTS has been associated with European mobility and the Erasmus programme, as a mechanism for the accumulation and transfer of teaching units, an essential element for the development of mobility, the fundamental priority of European policies. Then, the ECTS acquired an absolutely co-ordinated and clear content the aim of which was its complete implementation, not only at EU level, but throughout the European continent (http://ec.europa.eu/education/ects/ects_en.htm).

The ECTS however commits, to the extent that it can't function outside student centred learning and the logic of learning outcomes. Even its qualitative calculation takes place based on the student workload and not based on the teacher centred conception of teaching staff working hours. In addition no accepted means of transferring from the teacher centred view of a study programme to student centred learning, exists. Consequently, in its current form, the ECTS cannot be understood, or accepted, beyond student centred learning.

2.4.2 European Qualification Framework (EQF)

A commonly accepted mechanism for the handling of degrees based on qualifications was missing from the overall European construct. This mechanism would make degrees easier to read in European higher education and in parallel in the

European job market. Starting with the Dublin Descriptors (http://ecahe.eu/w/index.php/Dublin_Descriptors) and parallel national and European focussed works, a European qualifications framework was formed, with eight levels, in which higher education occupies levels 6 (bachelor), 7 (master) and 8 (PhD).

Each level is described in terms of knowledge, competences and skills (http://ec.europa.eu/ploteus/content/descriptors-page). It is interesting that the EQF is not forced on the member states of the EU. On the contrary, the member-states are called on to create their own national qualifications framework and then bring it into line with the European framework. Indeed it isn't even essential that the national levels consist of eight levels, like the European.

Of course, in reality all the member-states are under indirect pressure to adapt to the eight levels in the sense that otherwise the difficulties they face in coming into line with the EQF increase. Meanwhile on the other hand, the member-states are not passive receptacles. For example, Ireland adopted more levels, Denmark preferred to accord with the EQF only in levels 6, 7 and 8 of higher education, while Germany was interested first and foremost in non-formal education. Despite this, Portugal, which placed the level of its high school graduates at '3' faced significant problems since the other states had placed it at level '4'. For example, level '3' doesn't grant access to higher education in the other European states. So, if Portugal insisted on the initial idea of placing the high school leaving certificate at level '3' it would eventually face problems of access for its high school graduates to other European institutions of higher education as well as problems in its own universities concerning quality assurance since they would be admitting students from level '3', while in the rest of Europe this would not be acceptable. For this reason the Portuguese government sought modification of the Portuguese qualification framework. What is interesting here is that while the EU played a major role in the EQF, its implementation took place in such a way that that the member-states could appear to protect their national system of higher education. So here too one has an example of how the development of a European policy takes place in such a way that the boundaries between national and European responsibility and initiative are indistinguishable. In this way the European spills into the national and is considered as one and the same.

On the other hand, if a state doesn't take care to develop and validate a national qualifications framework then it is in danger of becoming isolated since from 2016 and on all degrees must clearly express the level they are integrated into within the context of facilitating educational and employment mobility.

Ultimately, what is the major challenge? From a traditional point of view, with powerful and dominant national states, there is the danger of the loss from most states of their best educated and an uncontrollable brain drains towards a few strong and robust European countries. In a potential European integration a new middle class of highly specialized workers would be created, who could roam freely across the European continent considering the European space a common home. The future will show.

2.4.3 Quality assurance

Quality assurance in higher education starts as a horizontal issue in the famous Memorandum of 1991 (European Commission, 1991) only to evolve very rapidly into a pillar of the European structure since it is directly linked to the development of trust which is seen as a prerequisite for the promotion of mobility and mutual recognition of degrees and by extension of graduates as a specialized work force.

It is not by chance that an independent body, the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) (http://www.enqa.eu) was created and which took on an important role. The methodology for the creation of this body is the same, officially Community. More specifically, while a European model was created, the well-known standards and guidelines (ESG) (http://www.enqa.eu/index.php/home/esg/), at the same time national quality assurance Agencies were created which were charged with the job of evaluating higher education in their states. Each state developed its own objectives and tools for their implementation (for example, Evaluation for improvement, evaluation for accreditation, institutional evaluation, evaluation of studies programmes, etc.). They were then called on however to be integrated into the ENQA after the external evaluation of their national Agency. The evaluation judged whether the methodology followed was in line with the European methodology of the ESG. Integration into the ENQA is of central importance for the international recognition of national evaluations, and hence the evaluated institutions. In the opposing case, there is the danger of being excluded from international projects and European funding. For example Greece, which was late in setting up the mechanism in question, received just such a threat from the EU. On the other hand, this threat was never carried out even in some extreme cases of non-evaluation, which still remain incomplete. The threat was used more as a means of applying pressure for the formation and carrying out of the evaluations. Finally, national agencies that didn’t follow the ESG were put under pressure. Sweden is an instance of such a case.

Quality assurance, as much as evaluation as the mechanism for its implementation, present a powerful challenge to higher education in the sense that a sole definition of quality was never provided, and from the international bibliography we know that there are many and varied definitions (Harvey and Green, 1993). The acceptance of one definition will clearly have political implications.

2.5 Political challenges of the EHEA

The EHEA is not a harmonious and unimpeded collaboration of states on higher education issues. It is basically, and above all, a field of competition as much political as state, and at the same time supranational. It is also a field for the exercise as much of negotiation skills as the willingness to compromise. Next we will provide some indicative examples.

2.5.1 The social dimension of university studies

The Bologna process starts out at a time when the majority of Europe's powerful states are governed by neo-liberal parties. It is more or less the same time when the Lisbon Process is formed and approved within the framework of the EU. As a result, their reasoning and their objectives are in line with the political priorities of those parties.

Later on however, and until the middle of the first decade of the 21st century, the social democrat parties gain strength, electing quite powerful governments. Thus in the Lisbon Process they manage, by 2005 to pass a series of modifications which distort its outward appearance and result in its failure (2010). And in the Bologna Process on the one hand other powers enter such as the EU, the student union, the union of European universities, etc, and on the other for the first time the concept of the social dimension of higher education appears and develops (in the Berlin Communiqué). This dimension, although it never managed to become dominant, played and continues to play a role as a counterweight and wave breaker in the attempts to lift the social responsibility of the state, as expresser of a social collectiveness, for higher education (Weber and Bergan, 2005).

Essentially, the social dimension is the point of conflict of two policies. On the one hand, that which wants higher education to be an exclusively private responsibility and interest, and on the other, a policy, which sees even higher education as a social good and consequently as an object of social responsibility policy (Kladis, 2006; Ponten, 2007).

It is interesting that it is the EU, which seems to have found a privileged field for the development of policies in opposition to the positions of a number of states (European Commission, 2011) that particularly insists on social duty.

The social dimension contains in brief four dimensions: access, studies, student support and graduation support. On this basis:

A. Multiple and various means of access to higher education must be ensured so that populations differentiated as much in terms of age as at the level of needs, can be integrated.

B. The types and manner of studies so that the different populations can follow a programme of study (traditional, distance, part time study, etc.).

C. The mechanisms for study support which either have a direct relationship with studies (tutoring, new teaching methods, etc.) or with social provisions (halls of residence, student restaurants, infrastructure for young children whose parents are students, etc.).

D. Mediation mechanisms between graduates and society, and in particular the labour market.

Indeed the EU seems to use the social dimension to emphasize mobility and the internationalization of studies (European Commission, 2013). The essence seems to lie in the attempt to support the EU's emblematic mechanism, in other words, the Erasmus programme (European Commission 2014). This programme, which has become the flagship of the European identity of the new generation, receives documented criticism since Community sponsorship is not sufficient for mobility for all, a fact which makes it socially partial. Linking mobility with the social dimension, the EU pushes for the development of support policies for the social dimension, hoping for the restriction of the significance of the social origin of the students in the development of their mobility.

2.5.2 Between cooperation and competition

The Bologna Process develops a legislative discourse, which is based, on the one hand on cooperation between the participating states and on the other on the attractiveness of the formed EHEA for the outside world. With this rationale, common tools are shaped which facilitate the increase in cooperation. Common thinking behind study programmes and EHEA mechanisms (ECTS, etc.), quality assurance as a means of increasing mutual trust, mobility as a mechanism of internationalization, and, more recently, common study programmes and so on, are examples.

Despite this, the initial, idyllic picture of admirable and honest cooperation does not hold true in reality since the logic of competition is a component part of the creation of the EHEA and concerns the member-states as much as the Institutions (Huisman and Van der Wende, 2004, 2005).

A. The member-states

A1. Competition between EHEA states for the attraction of students and researchers from other EHEA states.

A2. Competition of EHEA member-states for the attraction of students and researchers from other states outside the EHEA.

Within this framework, the traditional national policies for the attraction of foreign students not only are not limited but also acquire a new momentum in the context of the fight for global or regional influence as much on an economic and political level as on a cultural one.

B. The Institutions

With the withdrawal or drastic restriction of the state in the funding of the institutions of higher education, the various institutions are under pressure, with their very survival at stake, to seek out new resources which are to be found either in the attraction of students from other states or the attraction of researchers and competitive research (Estermann and Clayes-Kulik, 2013; Estermann, Benetot and Clayes-Kulik, 2013). In any case, the powerful institutions seem to become more powerful, creating what has been termed, with some metamorphosing lexical process, 'centres of excellence'.

What probably should be underlined here is that one of the basic peculiarities of the universities was their international relationships and exchanges through the collaborations of researchers. Of course a political dimension always existed in the sense that the power of the time, depending on the historical period (church, emperor, monarch, nation-state) influenced the politics of the attraction of foreign students (Stamelos, 1990). Despite this, collaboration amongst colleagues had powerful roots and a tradition within the university. With the creation of the EHEA and the competition it promoted at a time of insecurity for the institutions, the institutions are forced into a fight for survival, first and foremost economic survival, in a context, which programmatically argues for the promotion of cooperation. This point seems to highlight a significant contradiction within the framework of the Bologna process.

Despite that, we shouldn't neglect the EU, which within the framework of the Bologna process acts as an independent player and indeed a powerful one. The EU competes indirectly with the powerful member-states in that it aspires to the creation of a common European economic, political and cultural space. For example, with the

creation of sectors of European priority and with its fundamental tool for policy promotion (http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/index_en.htm), the European funding programmes, the EU endeavours to create a parallel reality beyond traditional competition. Anyway, based on the sectors of interest, it seems to focus on sectors of economic interest, neglecting entirely anything to do with human or social studies. This is clear from the list of 'European sectors of interest' which are: aeronautics industries, automotive industry, biotechnology, chemicals, construction, cosmetics, defence economy, digital economy, electrical and electronic engineering industries, fashion and creative industries, food industry, gambling, healthcare industries, maritime industries, pressure equipment and gas appliances, raw materials, metals, minerals and forest-based industries, medical devices, space, tourism and toys (Stamelos and Vasilopoulos, 2013).

2.5.3 The case of the universities and university governance

University teachers are experiencing the collapse of their work and economic status. If this is due to the development of the EHEA or would have happened in any case, is questionable. Developments on the other side of the Atlantic don't leave room for many doubts. The same is true for the corresponding policies that were implemented in the United Kingdom in the second half of the 1980s[6]. In any case, the university teachers are not happy within the framework of the EHEA, at least the majority of them aren't. Indeed it seems that a deep chasm is being created between the older ones with established rights and younger researchers with very limited or non-existent rights.

The university as it operated for a number of years had, as a structural component, the professor who dominated in structures and processes within the university.

The changes, which are taking place are extremely negative on different levels of the university institution.

First of all, on an administrative level. Within the context of the EHEA it appears that the idea is being promoted either of a double model of university governance with a Committee and a senatorial team or the model of a single body. In any case, it

[6] The result of these reforms by the Thatcher government, in the second half of the 1980s is described exceptionally well by David Lodge, linguist, university professor and globally recognized novelist. In his book *Nice Work* he describes the logic behind the policy implemented. The government couldn't understand how it was possible for an organization to function efficiently and at the lowest possible cost when all had equal rights and equal access to the decision making centres. From one viewpoint, at whose centre lay the enterprise and its function, the university, like the business, should have a management comprised of very few members who would decide for the mass of the 'workers' in the business: Who stays, who goes, what will be done and at the least cost. Greek edition: David Lodge. (1998). Nice Work, Polis Publications, Athens, page 393.

becomes clear that professionals external to the institution and sometimes managers from the private sector are entering university governance. This development is substantiated on the one hand by the need for a closer relationship between university studies and society and especially the labour market and on the other by the need to seek sources of funding and the reduction of costs due to reduced public funding and the increase in the institution's sectors of interest. However, in this way the professor not only loses his former position of power within the institution but also sees the overturning of his employment status in that work positions are continually shrinking and replacements made with non-permanent staff within the context of poor pay and employment insecurity (Kohler, Huber and Bergan 2006; CHEPS, 2008a, 2008b).

In addition, within the rationale of cutbacks and 'useful' studies a series of specializations in the human and social sciences are being seen as pointless, without employment prospects and consequently low or zero priority.

From here a generalized philosophical and structural criticism starts, as much in the EHEA as in the policies followed which claims that the sterile focussing on the professional instrumentality of studies denies students the development of a range of knowledge, competences and skills which concern moral values, human rights and active citizenship (Kladis, 2011). These shortcomings then appear with what we have got used to calling the crisis of Democracy and social cohesion, and it feeds the extreme ideologies, which are re-emerging in different forms on the European continent nowadays.

However the problem is not only the restriction of the role of the university teacher in university governance, and the change in his employment status. It is also the overturning of what had been taken for granted at the level of the implementation of a study programme. The university teacher is no longer at the centre. Now the student and his needs are at the epicentre. In fact, these needs are intensely heterogeneous, something, which essentially creates extremely difficult working conditions for the teacher, who has also seen his status and influence be drastically reduced.

Thus, the university professor transforms into staff member and from a structural element of the institution is transformed into an expendable secondary element, 'a worker', easily replaced due to the plethora of unemployed young doctors and postdocs.

It is indeed the collapse of a professional space.

2.5.4 The problem of moral and democratic values and active citizenship

Higher education policies on a European level, turned with vigour to the problem of economic development and work integration, seem to silence a series of problems,

which are developing nowadays and are not easily or directly integrated into a narrowly economic viewpoint.

European societies are being rocked by problems caused by the social exclusion of significant population groups as a result of the upsetting of the bonds of the social network and the reduction of the welfare state in the post war period. As a reaction, the exclusions lead to extremist ideologies and acts of violence, such as racism in a variety of shades and tendencies, from the traditional Nazism and fascism to the more recent senselessness of extreme Islamic groups (Stamelos, Vasilopoulos and Kavasakalis, 2015).

A Europe which for years turned the whole of its education systems one dimensionally in the direction of professionalization is today starting to realize that apart from the unemployment of the young, an equally large problem is also the lack of moral and democratic values which would lead to the participatory functioning of society.

The truth is that certain European institutions, like the Council of Europe, have been aware for some time of the dangers. But the CoE doesn't have the means to exert any practical influence on the shaping of national or European policy.

It is also true that the EU too has for years been considering the problem of social cohesion and the need to develop not only useful but also social and (inter)cultural competences and skills, as well as the need for the development of citizenship (European Commission, 2012). It is however also true that these policies were to be found, and will always be found in the shadow of economic policies. In any case, the differences on the issue between the European states are huge. Despite that, the fact that these policies are not dominant doesn't mean they don't exist. They do exist and it appears that great importance is attached to the role of the university as a body for the development of active citizenship and intercultural dialogue (Stamelos and Vassilopoulos, 2014).

On the other hand the conflict becomes clear when, on the one hand, higher education policies push towards professionalization of studies and a connection with the labour market and on the other every form of study programme concerning the development of values, ideas and moral commitments is considered unsustainable and is edged towards extinction.

At the base of this crucial contradiction it is of decisive significance (although not especially widely-known) that within the framework of the fundamental rights of the EU there is a series of rights for development such as human dignity, freedom, equality, solidarity, or justice (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EL/TXT/?uri=URISERV:133501).

What does all this show us? That the EHEA is a dynamic space where opposing forces develop, clash, negotiate and compromise, changing it in a way that is sometimes unforeseen and unexpected.

2.6 The EHEA and the Greek system of higher education

2.6.1 Why the Greek universities are hostile to the Bologna process

In recent decades the Greek university considered it an honour that a significant number of its graduates were accepted by the most well-known universities in the world and some of them became famous worldwide. Consequently, it could be proud of the fact that it is in a position to follow the international production of knowledge and to diffuse it directly and satisfactorily to its students. Due to the size of the state as well as the development and structure of its economy the issue of research is not presented as a crucial issue although when it was, it was well-received (Stamelos and Karanatsis, 2002).

After the end of the Second World War and the civil war, the university became almost unavoidably involved in the political abnormalities of the time (1949-1974) and consequently in the deep social divide that had been caused.

For this reason, with the restoration of democracy in 1974, the fundamental social demand was for the university's 'democratization'. Democratization of the university was two sided. Mainly it concerned mass access, and secondly its internal functioning. As a result, from 1984 until 2004 the policies that were implemented focussed on the demand for democratization. This was achieved, on the one hand, with the huge increase in the size of the network of higher education institutions, and with an institutional framework that targeted the internal democracy of the institution (N.1268/1982), and on the other, with the enrichment of the existing network. The impressive widening and enrichment of the network never took place based on the real needs of the labour market. Interest was focussed first and foremost on the demand for 'democratization'. This ultimately had both positive and negative sides. On the one hand, it managed to increase the number of students entering from 20-25% at the end of the 70s, to 70-80% today. On the other hand, it produced a vast number of graduates who could not easily be absorbed by the labour market; something which led to disappointment and to the reproduction of the clientalist system since the social, in other words, political, network played an important role in the search for a job (Stamelos, 2015).

As a result, the policies implemented, on the one hand, corresponded with the social expectations, a fact which contributed to political stability and, on the other hand, led to a dead-end since the overdeveloped network of higher education was supported exclusively by state funding and European support programmes.

Another serious problem was of a political nature and can be used as an example of how globalised or at least European policies have an effect on national ones. Guideline 89/48 created a large political problem in Greece due to the development of educational provision in the form of a kind of franchising. In the case of Greece, during the 90s, a series of unclassified educational structures known then as *free study laboratories* came into contact with mostly English institutions and proposed common study programmes. Based on the European institutional framework, Greece should have recognized their degrees since they bore in their title *institution of higher education* of a country, which was a member of the EU. However article 16 of the Greek Constitution forbids private higher education. Since then a series of court cases at the European court (CEC) have convicted Greece, in contrast to the Greek courts which, based on the Greek constitution, decide differently. This seems to be the reason why Greece, even today, has not implemented the Lisbon Agreement concerning recognition of degrees.

Bearing this in mind, Greece, on the one hand can do no more than follow the other EU countries in the implementation of the Bologna Process, but on the other, the country is hesitant if not indirectly hostile towards this process and its prospects.

2.6.2 Greece in the context of the Bologna Process

If one had to describe in one phrase Greece's role in the Bologna Process it would be with the following: it votes (by necessity) on the decisions but makes a show of delaying their implementation.

The first shock for Greek higher education was the architecture of Bologna. The major problem was the 3-year studies in the first cycle of studies. The reactions were violent, which is why Greece played a leading role in the introduction of the final text with the well-known phrase 'at least', which made the initial provisions more flexible. Thus, Greece solved its fundamental problem since it insisted that the bachelor should have a four and not three year duration.

However the greatest tension came from the provisions on the necessity of establishing a quality assurance system for institutes of higher education. The reaction was such that one could speak of an uprising (Kavasakalis and Stamelos, 2014).

The truth is that since the 80s there had been legislative provisions that spoke of the need for the existence of a system of evaluation (different each time, depending on the statute) but this had never been applied in practice (Stamelos, Vasilopoulos and Kavasakalis, 2015).

Paradoxically, Greek universities are among the first to participate in the European pilot programme 'European Pilot Programme for Evaluating Quality in Higher Education'. More specifically, in the two year period 1994-1996, two Greek institutions participated. In addition, the Greek universities start to participate in the CRE/EUA programme 'Institutional Evaluations' which had begun in 1994. This participation emerged as much out of the desire of the Ministry of Education to conduct the international institutional evaluations of the Institutional Evaluation Program (IEP) as out of the wish of the universities themselves to participate voluntarily in an international process. From then until 2005 eight Greek institutions of higher education had participated in the programme[7]. At the same time in the two years 1998-2000, national evaluations in higher education took place based on the Action *'Appraisal of Institutions of Tertiary Education'* which had been funded by the *1st Operational programme for Education and Initial Vocational Training* (O.P. 'Education' 1). The central objective, according to the description of the Action, was the appraisal as much of the educational work accomplished in the IHE and the TEI (Technological Educational Institutes), as of the services they provided. In total, 85 proposals were approved and as a result, in the two years period 1998-1999, 14 out of the country's then 18 IHE and 11 out of the 14 TEI participated either with institutional or departmental proposals (Kladis, 2000).

If one tries to understand the contradiction, which exists here, he would consider firstly the traditional lack of trust between the Ministry and the Institutions. This is a lack of trust, which is fed by inflammatory discourse as much on the part of a significant portion of the political world, as on the part of the mass media, which spoke of a huge crisis and decline of the Greek institutions of higher education in the attempt to legalise the need for their evaluation. This criticism doesn't seem to be easy to substantiate based on the existing data (HepNet, 2013, 2014). However, the result is impressive.

Ten years later, the Hellenic Quality Assurance and Accreditation Agency enjoys high acceptance as much from the state as from the institutes, evaluations take place without meaningful reactions, while neither the politicians and neither the media nor the doomsayers who rejected it appear to have been justified, and as a result they are clearly in a politically awkward position.

---

[7] It should be noted that the cost of the evaluations was covered in its entirety by the Ministry.

On the other hand, its opponents' analysis did reveal an interesting shift. Essentially it was the EU and its policies that were struck by lightning (Kavasakalis, 2011). In a university that was the privileged field of leftist thinking, the need to establish a quality assurance system was interpreted as an external intervention and invasion, and was confronted in terms of national-patriotic resistance, see rebellion. Added to this was the ideological criticism that the European policies couldn't be anything other than of a neo-liberal nature and consequently were seen as an attempt to commercialise learning and privatise the public good of education.

And now we come to the major (political) challenge, which concerns Greek higher education within the framework of the EHEA.

The massification of Greek higher education and the widening of its network were legitimised through the social demand for 'democratization'. If the basic logic of the EHEA is founded on a narrow and one-dimensional professionalization of studies and their direct link with the needs of the labour market, then Greek higher education suffers from a fundamental contradiction, in the sense that Greece is a country with a limited production base and an ailing labour market. Consequently, a policy aimed at the linking of an existing higher education with a non-existent (or weak) labour market creates a huge contradiction and intense disharmony between politics and society.

The latter strengthens social disappointment and reaction as much over the high unemployment rate (25% in total, over 50% for the young) as over other problems which appear such as the various waves of immigration, creating an explosive climate and a deep crisis of trust between the political class and society and between institutions (like the university) and social needs (if higher studies are seen one dimensionally as professional).

Finally, but by far the least important point, has to do with the significance of the development of supranational, here European, policies, and the reversals they bring about in the means of analysis a researcher can make. If, then, the analysis base is the nation-state, then the above approach is substantiated. If the base for analysis is not the national, but the European context, then our approach is not substantiated. In fact, in this case, the fact, for example that thousands of young Greek graduate engineers and doctors immigrate to European countries (like Germany or the United Kingdom) cannot be considered a problem since the European space is understood as unified. Indeed, it could even be considered as good practice since able young scientists (Labrianidis, 2012, 2013a, 2013b), (able since they are widely accepted), at lower production cost, in relation to the corresponding cost in other European

countries, are educated and comprise an added value in a 'European' society and economy.

Perhaps the 'small' problem lies in the fact that these young graduates managed to be sufficiently educated by the Greek state with money from the Greek taxpayer, while they contribute to the prosperity and development of other countries. Here too, as can be understood, the ambiguity between collaboration and competition which is ultimately beneficial for the more powerful countries appears, and as a result there is a widening of the differences and a strengthening of social reactions which bring back with force collective stereotypes and hostilities which are traditional in the European space and which were in decline after the second world war.

2.7 Conclusions

The EHEA, whether it came about as a reaction of the larger member states of the EU to the Commission's initiatives, or as a reaction of the other states to the attempt to impose a directorate on the part of the four big EU countries, is here. Indeed, it doesn't only concern issues to do with the structure of studies but perhaps above all a different understanding of knowledge, its production and its value. Consequently, it is a radical incision. Despite this, the EHEA is not a field of admirable, cloudless and linear collaboration. It hides tough national competition, conflicts, inconsistencies and contradictions. At other times it is used by the national governments as a mechanism for the enforcement of reforms, which are deemed undesirable by the national framework of operation. Consequently it is a composite construct.

Countries like Greece, which, on the one hand, is not a policy producing country but on the other see them in the nucleus of Europe, try to follow its provisions through national filters as well as resistance. Focussing on Greece, the development of the EHEA is understood as a paradigm shift, since it is radical. Indeed, the Greek system of higher education developed over the last 35 years based on the model of the 'democratization of access', in the sense of its massification through the widening of the network. This was linked with real social expectations founded in the historicity of the experience of the social context. Consequently the policy of 'democratization' is on the one hand linked to social necessity and on the other was comprehended by the social context. Ultimately there was a harmony between society and policy. This model didn't face any problems as long as the country on the one hand found resources to maintain it, and on the other could proceed to

making job appointments in the narrower and wider public sector. Despite this it was a model that didn't have the economy and the needs of the labour market at its centre.

The integration of Greek higher education into the EHEA caused a shock because it is a different model of development. The basic idea behind the EHEA is of the strong and direct link between higher education and the labour market and its needs. This is a model, which perhaps responds to the needs of large and robust economies, like Germany's, but it is doubtful whether it reflects the reality of the Greek labour market, which is supported by very small and medium sized enterprises and a large public sector. In any case, with the model promoted by the EHEA, the massification of Greek higher education does not appear to be legitimized. In addition, with the country's increasing economic difficulties, the Greek model is beginning to face significant difficulties, as much concerning its function as concerning the professional absorption of its graduates. However, the most crucial is perhaps that the particular policy is starting to no longer be understood by society. Consequently, a gap is beginning to be created between policy choices and social expectations.

Finally, the truth is that as far as the EHEA is concerned, we are talking about a dynamic construct in development, which will follow wider developments. If Europe is driven to the consolidation of national egotisms and closed borders the future will not be rosy. If Europe follows the path it has chosen in the aftermath of the last war, then there are two prospects: either the suzerainty of the powerful states and the reduction of the others to their hinterland, or the prospect of the federalization of the European space. Higher education will by definition follow the wider developments. The picture today doesn't leave much room for optimism. At the same time, the relevant policies seem not to be understood by their national contexts, an element, which leads to a split in the relationship society-policy, something which is especially dangerous for the democratic functioning of a country, as the Greek example shows.

Chapter 3

Democracy versus the market: the paradoxes of the Greek University

3.1 Introduction

After decades of stagnation Greek higher education began to develop in the 1980s, and the central goal of its development was democratization. Democratization means two things: opening up to the largest possible number of students, and the transition from an oligarchic model of governance to a new, democratic model, that of shared governance.

The changes in governance internationally and the attempt to link higher education with the market resulted in disintegration. This disintegration reached its peak with the current debt crisis which had two important consequences: public funding decreased without being supplemented from other sources, and the state ceased to function as the main graduate employer. Hence, today we face a new phenomenon. The Greek HEI train scientists who have two prospects: they either embark on an undetermined period of unemployment or under-employment, or are forced to seek employment abroad. At the same time, the gap between the HEI and a structurally limited labour market is widening. Consequently, higher studies (and the associated economic cost, as much at the level of preparation for access as at the level of the cost of funding), which, for a period of 30 years, ensured social and economic upward mobility, can no longer play that role. Thus, social discontent and disappointment increase, and this has a tendency to turn into anger against society and its institutions, a phenomenon which is expressed at times as anger against the general functioning of society and its democratic institutions.

In this chapter we will analyse the formation and function of the university field in Greece, and its basic goal, democratization, in the period 1974-2009, which started with the restoration of democracy in 1974 and finishes with the onset of the current economic crisis. Then we will focus on the double change, in governance and in the attempt to change the relationships between the university field and the economic environment. Finally, we investigate the consequences of the changes in the context of the current debt crisis.

3.2 The Greek university field and its democratization

The term university appeared in the Greek language in around 1800. The first university in Greece, today's University of Athens, was founded in 1837, following discussions concerning the possibility of the founding and operation of a higher education institute in a sparsely populated and poor kingdom (such was the Greek state when it was first established). It was the first university in the Balkans and one of the first in the orthodox Christian world after the University of Lomonosov in Moscow, which was founded in 1775.

From the outset, the University of Athens had four main missions: it constituted the modern Greek identity, it trained civil servants but also the dominant state elite, and finally, after the civil war (1946-1949) it was involved in the division of Greece, and functioned as an ideological mechanism of the dominant political group. Following the model of the western universities, it was made up of four schools: Theology, Legal Sciences, Medicine and Philosophy. Study was a public expense and was safeguarded by the Constitution.

The University of Athens was the only "higher" institute in the Greek realm and the Greek speaking world until the foundation of the University of Thessaloniki in 1924. After 1910, thoughts were formulated for the foundation of other universities. This idea was implemented with the upgrading of the existing educational institutions and the establishment of new, the main aim of which was the technical-professional training of the young and their incorporation into the labour market.

First of all, the existing institutions were upgraded. The rebuilding of Athens and the construction of royal palaces in 1836 had revealed a huge lack of technicians. To fill this gap, the *Royal School of Arts* was established in 1837, it was renamed the *School of Industrial Arts* in 1862, and in 1872 the *National Metsovio Polytechnic (National Technical University of Athens, NTUA)* and was recognised as equal with the University.

In the spirit of this change of direction, after 1880, towards technical-professional education, in 1929 two new institutions were founded, the *Supreme School of Economics and Business Studies* (today's Athens University of Economics and Business) and the *Athens College of Agriculture (*today's Agricultural University of Athens). The same logic was behind the founding of two new institutions by private individuals and professional bodies strongly influenced by the French model. In 1930 the *Panteio School*, whose point of reference was the School of Political Sciences in Paris, and the *Liberal School of Industrial Studies* (today's University of Piraeus), from the *Association of Greek Industrialists and Manufacturers*, on the

model of the Higher French Commercial Schools, were established, aimed at the provision of special training for industry employees.

After the Second World War, in contrast to the massification of the universities in most western countries, the changes in Greek higher education were limited. They concern the addition of new departments in existing HEI and the lengthening of studies at some institutions, which from “institutes of higher education” become “universities”.

The developments accelerated after 1964 when the liberal Centre Union party came to power in the country, under George Papandreou who adopted the idea of *human capital.* The decision was taken to create a technological university in Patras which began operation in 1966. In 1968, a year after the Generals seized power and established military rule, the Greek civil service signed an agreement with the World Bank which took on the organization of the University of Patras. Finally, in 1973, the decision was taken to establish two more universities, in Crete and Thrace.

After the fall of the Dictatorship in 1974, the central-right New Democracy party (ND) continued the policy of slow changes in higher education. Hence, in the seven years they governed the country (1974-1981), very few things happened in higher education. Among them was the decision, in 1977 to establish a polytechnic in Chania, which accepted its first students in 1984.

This period is similar and so is the development in the number of students. In the table we provide its development from 1860 until 2015. The table was formulated based on two criteria: the recurrence and the years in which noteworthy fluctuations in the numbers took place.

Table 1. Students in Greece 1860-2015[8]

Year	1860	1870	1880	1889	1930	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2015
Students	696	1,244	2,096	3,335	8,466	25,658	72,269	85,718	116,938	147,728	177,676	213,098

Sources: a) Skarpalezos 1964, appendix, from 1860 to 1889. b) Greek education statistics to 1990. Greek Statistical Agency from 2000 to today: www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SJO01.

In order to understand the numbers we should bear three factors in mind:

The numbers refer only to the universities and not to Higher Education overall. Two conclusions can be made. First of all, from 1860 until today, the number of students has been rising continually. Secondly, the increase is continuous but not

[8] Until 1980 they are all the enrolled students. After 1990 it is only those in “regular semesters”.

especially marked, with the exception of three periods. The first period lasts close to thirty years, from 1860 to the beginning of the 1890s. Something similar, on a smaller scale occurs from the beginning of the 1960s until 1981.

We can consider these two findings comparatively through the prism of the increase in the number of students in Europe and North America. As far as the first discovery is concerned, it is obvious that in Greece too, as in other western countries, student numbers rise. The increase is to be found in three time periods: in the 1860s and 1870s, in the 1930s and in the 1960s.

Staying with the second finding, we could suppose that in Greece too one can observe a trend similar to the one F. Ringer highlighted in Germany, France and England (Ringer, 1979). This is not exactly the case. The rate of increase is not the same, something which leads to "convergences" from the development in the number of HEI and students in European countries.

Summing up the rise in the number of students enrolled at Greek universities from the beginning until 1981 we distinguish three periods: the first, from 1860 until 1890, is characterised by the large, for the time, increase in students, which resulted in Greece being among the western countries with the highest percentages of students in Europe. The second, until 1940, is marked by a decreased development of Higher Education, which resulted in the number of students being close to European averages. In the third period, until 1981, the post-war trend continues, access to Greek higher education becomes difficult and the number of students is at comparatively low levels.

The reasons for this discontinuous increase are linked to the formation of the Greek nation-state and the social value of the degree. Here we can discern a usual trend, like that analysed by L. Stone for the British Universities since the 16th century (1975). The needs of the newly created state in terms of staff are translated into a great demand for educational titles.

From the end of the 1880s the view that the number of students should be reduced since Greece had the most, in proportion to her population, in Europe, prevailed. Beyond adaptation to the givens of the 'big' countries, for achieving this objective, two other arguments were used, which are condensed into the expressions used widely until 1940, "unemployed job-hunters" and "spiritual proletariat". The second term was introduced from Germany[9] and fed by the graduates' difficulties in finding

[9] The term is introduced in 1851 by the German conservative journalist Wilhelm Riehl. It has echoes of the unemployment welfare of previous decades but also the political concern that the uprisings in many European countries in the 1840s and especially in 1848 were linked to the Universities, the professors and the students (Anderson, 2004:127).

employment. To concern regarding graduate unemployment is added the dominant political powers' fear of student political radicalism.

Despite the changes internationally, chiefly after 1930, movement in Greek Higher Education is limited. At the end of the 1950s Greece is among the countries with the lowest, in proportion with its population, student number, and even more so for students in tertiary technological education. In this period, and especially from the beginning of the 1960s, a process for the increase in admissions is begun, which accelerates after 1964. From 25,658 in 1960, the number of students reached 43,411 in 1963, 58,000 in 1965, 72,269 in 1970 and 87,476 in 1981, while the number of students in the higher technological institutes remains particularly low.

Despite the four-fold increase in student numbers in the 1960s and 1970s, Greece continued to have a comparatively low percentage of students since the increase in other western countries is more rapid. In addition, the increase doesn't meet the "demand" which grew stronger at this time. Hence more and more young people turned to foreign universities, in the USA, West Germany and France initially, and from the mid-1960s, Italy.

Things changed radically with the integration of the country into the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1981 and the taking over of the governing of the country a few months later by the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK). Integration has accelerated the opening up and internationalization through the setting of common European policies and research projects. At about the same time, the Greek university rapidly increases its student population. Indicatively, in the second half of the 70's approximately 20% of young people were registered in Tertiary Education (Sianou, 2010).

European policies questioned the triangular relationship of State-University-Knowledge and the challenge shifts from the State to the University. Thus gradually the State's action shifted to a University model where the discovery of knowledge was a secondary aim. Its main purpose, during the last 30 years, has been democratization. With this term, two things are mainly implied. They are the change in the model of governance and the admission of greater numbers of students.

As far as governance is concerned, the dominant "aristocratic" model, which copied the German model before the Second World War, and was based on a collegium of powerful full professors who had close relations with the political power, was abandoned. Based on law 1286/1982 this was replaced with a model which had all the features of shared governance. This means two things. Firstly, it means less dependence on the State with the establishment of a strategic, "intermediary" body, the National Education Council (NEC, ESYP in Greek) – which

functioned as a link with society and the social partners, but which hardly functioned. Secondly, governance on all levels, from studies to central decisions is exercised collectively by students, non-professorial staff and teaching staff.

Equally radical was the opening up of H.E. This took place in three ways. University education became unified, many TEI (Technological Educational Institutions, resembling the British Polytechnics, but without any connection to the universities) were founded, and from the 1990's and on, organized postgraduate studies were established on a large scale.

Until 1981 there were four categories of H.E. Institutions, the Universities and the Polytechnics, the so-called Higher Schools and the C.H.T.P.E (Centres for Higher Technological and Profession Education, former TEI). In one decade, from 1982 until 1991, the Higher Schools were transformed either into independent universities or university departments. In addition, from 1984 until 2000 five new universities were established, and a lot of new departments in the pre-existing ones. Finally, the C.H.T.P.E. was upgraded, renamed TEI and their three year study programmes, became four-year.

Crucial for the widening of H.E. was the adoption in 2002 by the Government Cabinet of its Regional Planning and Urban Development plan, according to which "in every region there should be a bipolar made up of at least one multidisciplinary university and at least one multidisciplinary TEI", aimed at "balanced regional development". Based on this reasoning, two new universities, new TEI and a lot of new Academic Units (Departments or Faculties) were founded. To these, two new universities were added. Hence, in 2009 H.E. was made up of 40 institutions, 24 universities and 16 TEI.

The great expansion of higher education after 1981 was reflected in a similar increase in student numbers, more precisely, the four-fold increase. In a thirty year period, the number of students in universities and TEI increases four-fold and from 20,000 reaches 80,000. In other words, while at the beginning of the 1980's 20% of candidates aged 18 enrolled, today the number reaches 80% of candidates, evenly distributed in universities and TEI. The expansion is continuous throughout this period with small exceptions, and accelerates particularly after 1996. Hence, Greece, which until the early 1990's was among the European countries with the lowest proportion of students is today among those with the highest.

"Over the past 15 years" the OECD mentions in its report, "Greece has experienced a dramatic increase in enrolment rates in tertiary education. The number of students completing upper secondary education has increased as well as the numbers of students taking the university entrance examinations. The demand for

tertiary education has risen as reflected in the numbers of students taking the university entrance examinations, but the actual numbers entering the system in any year is determined by the ministry of education. The ministry determines the number of students actually given places and the departments to which they are admitted (within numerous clauses set by the ministry). Therefore, the number of new entrants to the system each year is determined by ministerial decision, not directly by student demand. The enrolment rates increased significantly from 1999 through 2005 and have stabilised and decreased slightly since then (…). In 2007, the last year for which data were reported to UNESCO, Greece had one of the highest tertiary education enrolments per 100 000 persons in Europe – and, in fact, the world (…) As other countries had modest increases (and some decreases) in the period from 1999 to 2007, Greece experienced a 52.5% increase" (OECD, 2011: 62-63).

Two other factors need to be considered together with this data. They are the rapid development of postgraduate studies and the fact that during this period many Greeks study at universities in other countries, mainly in Europe and North America.

With law 1268/1982 the first PASOK government tried, for the first time to organise postgraduate studies on a mass scale. Without success, however. Postgraduate studies were essentially organised in the mid-1990s, but since then the number of students has been continually increasing. In the academic year 2005/06 the total number of students at university was 402, 393, of which 33,234 were postgraduates, 28,493 were doctoral candidates and 340,766 undergraduates. In 2014/15 the corresponding numbers are 464,387, 37,298 postgraduates, 23,156 doctoral candidates, and 403,933 undergraduates. Consequently, students in the third cycle in these two time periods respectively represent 15.3% and 15% of the total number of students, a percentage close to the percentages in other European countries, especially those where undergraduate studies last at least four years.

Finally, as far as Greek students at universities abroad are concerned, these were a few dozen at the end of the 19th century and reached 1,000 in the 1920's. After the Second World War, their number increased dramatically. From 8,717 in 1960, they reached 14,147 in 1970, 31,509 in 1980 and 32,184 in 1990 (Kiprianos, 1995:606). In the 1990's their number, as the table shows, increased and then fell steadily until 2011, and then turned around.

Table 2: Greek students abroad (1999-2013)

1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
66,951	63,676	61,730	55,162	50,531	47,352	41,687	34,452	31,965	28,590	28,864	29,226	29,382	34,140	32,029

Source. http://data.uis.unesco.org/Index.aspx?queryid=172.

The numbers of Greek students at universities abroad gain meaning if we compare them with the number of Greek students in Greece and with the total number of students who study outside their countries. Students abroad were 33% of students in Greece in 1960; their percentage falls in the 1970's and peaks in 1980 at 35%. In 2001 it approaches 20% and in 2013 falls to 8.3%.

The picture for the total number of students internationally is similar. Until 2002 Greece was, proportionally according to its population, the country with the greatest number of students abroad. Indicatively, the number of students abroad globally was calculated in 2002 to be 1.9 million, of who 1.78 million were in OECD countries. 4.4% of students in OECD countries were Korean, 3.3% Japanese, 3% German, 2.7% French, 2.6% Greek and 2.5% Turkish (OECD, 2004, p. 298). Since then the situation has changed dramatically. Since 2002 far fewer Greeks have been leaving to study abroad at a time when student mobility on a global level has seen an explosive increase and in 2014 surpassed 4.5 million students.

Despite this it should be emphasized that the policy of widening access that Greece followed, which was a European policy from the 1990's and on, is exclusively linked to the democratic demand for higher studies by large sections of Greek society. It was never linked to a Greek model of production and by extension the needs of a national labour market. Even with the national strategic planning at the beginning of 2000, which otherwise was a success, regional development was based on the needs created for the housing, feeding and living conditions of students studying in different parts of the country. Despite this, it should be noted that the policy in question was in tune with social demands and ambitions and as such enjoyed strong social legitimization.

3.3 A disputable opening in the market

What were the consequences for Greek H.E. of democratization after 1982, at the level of governance and outcomes? First of all we note that until the beginning of 2000 they are judged positively inside and outside the country. Indicatively, the Eurydice study *Two decades of reform in higher education in Europe: 1980 onwards,* published in 2000, "On the whole, under the reforms introduced to date, Greece has managed to apply the principle that the university decides and the State supervises. Under the new legislative framework that has been introduced, the role of the Ministry is restricted to monitoring the legality of the procedures of the AEIs with respect to the recruitment of teaching staff, while planning with regard to the recruitment of administrative staff has been entrusted to the institutions themselves.

The Ministry, therefore, no longer approves the study programs of the departments of the AEIs. The State now only handles general structural matters and leaves the university and social bodies free to resolve more specific problems" (Eurydice, 2000: 270-1).

Soon, the positive picture changes. Criticism focuses on three points. The number of students and institutions of higher education are considered very high and the State is unable to fund them. However reduction in the numbers of institutions and students isn't proposed, nor is the question of a decrease in public funding which was already low compared with other western countries, directly raised. To confront the problem the two dominant parties of the time, PASOK and ND, propose the founding of non- profit private universities. In this way they believe that the State will be able to disengage in part from the funding of higher education and a portion of young people will turn to these institutions, relieving the state institutions. At the same time, and for ideological reasons, the public higher education institutions are not given the opportunity to seek alternative sources of funding, such as fees.

The establishment of non-state non-profit making universities constituted a matter for intense public conflict. Their foundation required a change in the Greek constitution of 1975 according to which higher education is public and provided exclusively by the state. After these reactions, mainly from the unions and parties of the Left, the whole endeavour didn't yield results.

Since then, all attempts on the part of the governments have focused on changes in the institutions of higher education in two areas: governance and their link with the labour market.

The change in governance takes place gradually from 2007 and peaks in 2011. It is accompanied by intense criticism of the existing situation within the H.E., which is criticised on two main grounds: its complete inefficiency and lack of transparency on all levels. In 2007 law 3549 'Reform of the institutional framework for the structure and function of Institutions of Higher Education' were voted on. In the introductory report on the law we see a new appraisal of the structure and function of the HEI. "A basic concern and widespread belief is that Greek Higher Education is going through a deep and lasting crisis. The system of Higher Education is characterised by centralization, introversion and lack of transparency. Within the folds of the H.E.I phenomena such as a want of democracy in the choice and promotion of their administrative staff, abuse of the concept of asylum and various dysfunctions are observed". (…) "Law 1268/1982 contains numerous imperfections and a number of clauses which remain impossible to implement in practice. Its arrangements have been an object of criticism from the academic community itself, and as a result today

the alteration of fundamental clauses and its conformity to international and European data in the space of Higher Education, is considered absolutely essential".

Provisions are made for a series of measures for the treatment of the wrongs. For the independence of the universities, the establishment of four-year academic developmental programmes by the universities in collaboration with the central administration is proposed, a measure thought up by professor Claude Allègre in 1988, advisor on university matters to the socialist Education Minister Lionel Jospin and which since then has been implemented in France. In addition, the drawing up of internal regulations in all the institutions (only half of the universities had them), the establishment of an Institution Secretariat to assist the rectories authorities as well as the possibility for the universities to advance to the reconstitution of Schools or Departments, were adopted. As far as the internal functioning is concerned, beyond a series of clauses aimed at transparency, the power of the Department on certain issues, such as election of its members, is reduced, with the inclusion in the electorate of 1/3 of specialists from outside the Department, and the issue of university asylum is demarcated more strictly.

Four years later, in 2011, the OECD report 'Education Policy Advice for Greece' was published. The report is to be found at the opposite end of the scale to the aforementioned report of 2000, which raises questions. How can one report be positive to say the least, and the second, 11 years later intensely critical? Certainly the writers of the two reports are not the same people, however, as experts, they follow certain criteria. In any case passing reference is made in the report to the Giannakou law (OECD, 2011: 63-4), and intense criticism is levelled at the existing operation of Greek higher education and a series of measures are recommended.

The following are considered to be the main problems which act as an obstacle to the efficiency of the university:

The main issues are in four inter-related areas:

- The lack of capacity for effective institutional governance and management;
- Inefficient allocation of human and financial resources;
- Limited capacity to steer the system to achieve essential efficiencies and improved performance and to sustain the momentum of reform over changes in governments; and
- Limited non-public funding and cost-sharing to complement governmental subsidy. (OECD, 2011: 76).

The OECD makes recommendations, some of which concern obvious weaknesses in Greek higher education such as the fragmentation of a number of institutions, the existence of small-sized Departments which struggle to meet educational and

research needs and the overlap of cognitive subject areas by the universities and TEI. The report focuses mainly on two aspects: governance and the allocation of resources.

"From the perspectives of this OECD review, the key provisions that must be in place for Greece to move forward include:

Strengthening of the governance and management capacity of institutions to permit substantially increased devolution of authority and responsibility from the ministry of education;

Establishing a new independent steering entity, the Higher Education Authority, to provide overall co-ordination of the system and to lead the step-by-step implementation of the reforms; and,

Undertaking fundamental reform of financial management and the mechanisms for resource allocation and oversight".

For governance, OECD suggests the institution of a Council, which will have jurisdiction in all areas except the academic, which will be taken on by the rector, who is appointed however by the former. "Governing boards (Councils) must be of sufficient size to accommodate the necessary range of interests and allow for the creation of specialist committees, such as a subcommittee on finance (…). External members should constitute a majority of the governing board. Ideally they should be drawn from industry and the professions, not from the ranks of retired academics. The latter will simply perpetuate the current organisational culture. HEIs need to involve external public interests and, with the prospect of financial autonomy, these need to include financial expertise. The academic community should welcome the creation of governing boards. The terms of membership of external members should be sequenced to ensure continuity over time. Boards with frequent turnover of membership have difficulty in maintaining the needed group cohesiveness for effective governance and the core knowledge essential for addressing complex policy issues. (…). The chair of the governing board should be drawn from the external members but should be elected from the whole board" (OECD, 2011: 82).

As for the financing, the report states that Greece is the one country of the 19 of the then EU and OECD, with the highest percentage of state funding (94%) and the smallest private funding (6%), a fact which can be put down to a large extent to the fact that the Greek Constitution prohibits fees. Within this framework, the establishment of fees is recommended, as well as a greater link with, and consequently more funding from, the business world. "The low level of private spending is partly the result of the absence of student fees as mandated by the Greek Constitution, which explicitly states that tertiary education is to be provided free of

charge and exclusively by the public sector. It also results from weak links between tertiary education institutions and the private sector of the economy, particularly as regards joint research projects" (OECD, 2011: 78).

Shortly after the OECD report in 2011 law 4009 "Structure, function, quality assurance of studies and internationalization of higher education institutions" was voted on in the Greek parliament, with a vast majority. The law adopts many of the elements of the OECD report but with some differentiations. It doesn't introduce fees since this is contrary to the Greek Constitution, the majority on the Council is held by the internal members, not the external, the Rector is not appointed by the Council but elected from a list of three candidates that the Council has chosen and approved.

How could these changes be characterised? First of all, they reflect those we drew attention to in other western countries. In Greece too a transition is attempted, although deferred, to a new managerialism type of governance. The declared objective is efficiency in the face of the debt crisis (Kiprianos et al., 2011). With two differences, however.

If we look at Greek higher education over time, we would say that it comprises a characteristic case of the oligarchic-bureaucratic model. It functions under stifling state control, and within it, a small group of professors dominate. This model weakens after 1982 with law 1268. Central control remains, weakened, but power within the university is dispersed thanks to the abolition of the chair, the increase in the number of teachers and the collegial manner of operation and decision making.

After 2007 attempts are made to rebuild the relationships between the state and H.E. The basic tools for this are the four-year agreements between the two sides based on particular objectives. It is an idea with a symbolic character which doesn't please those who favour the complete withdrawal of the state from education and envision a university absolutely in line with the market.

The idea of the four-year agreements is reproduced in law 4009/2011, but is not implemented. On the contrary, at a time of debt crisis, two other matters are of interest. One is the turn to a new mixed model with elements from both of D. Braun's types that we reported in the first chapter. It aims at efficiency (efficiency oriented model) within the framework of the reduction of state funding and, at the same time, seeks clients (client/market oriented), students first and foremost.

Apart from the principles, we note that the new model of governance of the Greek H.E., as introduced by law 4009/2011, differs as much from OECD's recommendations as from certain principles of the Bologna Process. Private

interests, such as other public authorities (e.g. the municipalities), or employers' associations are not represented, as employers are few.

On the other hand, some steps are being taken in the direction of the withdrawal of the state. Arrangements are being introduced that give H.E. institutions the chance to make contracts for the hiring of transport for the transportation of students, cleaning contracts and contracts for the security and maintenance of their facilities as well all other matters that relate to the particular needs of each institution (article 5). These arrangements show the move towards the privatization of certain of the universities' functions, and the implementation of a market mentality.

The same reasoning is behind the policy regarding the salaries for all categories of staff. Since they are paid directly by the state, the objective is the reduction in the cost of salaries. This can be achieved: a) with the drastic reduction in the salaries of active university staff (the state will guarantee a "minimum wage"), b) with the freezing of appointments, c) through staff retirement without corresponding replacements, d) with the merging of Institutions and Departments, finally, e) with the creation of a great mass of doctoral candidates and post-docs, at a small to minimum cost in terms of salary, who will staff the undergraduate study programmes.

For the legitimization of these choices, the ruling parties need the support of the powerful professors. For this reason they tried to provide 'incentives' and duties in order to increase their weight within their institutions. Hence we are being driven towards a model which reminds us of the situation prior to 1982: the state, through a part of the professors controls the operation of the university. This, however, is contrary to the argument of the ruling parties that the university should be self-governing. In contrast, it leads to a perception that makes a distinction between efficiency and democracy. According to this reasoning, democracy is from the outset inefficient and for this reason is limited so that the universities can respond to the challenges of the times (Kladis, 2011).

3.4 The limits of the new model of governance in a context of crisis

The policies as far as the organization, governance and funding of Greek H.E. are concerned originate in three discourses. One which, as J. Habermas analysed it, is seated in the dominance of the space of the Market and the over determination of all the other spheres of human existence (Olssen M. and Peters, 2005: 313-345, Habermas, 2013: 4-13). This discourse permeates the formation of the EHEA to a great extent. The second discourse is circumstantial and is linked to the transformations in the University, its massification and the difficulties in its public

funding. The third discourse refers to the current debt crisis in Greece and the huge problems this creates on all levels.

These policies were put to the test during the years of the crisis, and it seems they failed. They didn't achieve their stated aims, in contrast, and without being exclusively responsible for that, had three extremely significant consequences which weigh down as much the operation of the H.E. as the behaviours of the members of the university community, staff and graduates.

1. The first consequence concerns the funding of the HEIs and the staff. The stated position regarding the withdrawal of the state, reduction in public funding and its replacement with private sources (students and private bodies) took on new dimensions during the crisis. Public funding was drastically reduced without being replaced by private funding and enormous dysfunctions were created. This is vividly depicted in three indicators: the decrease in funding itself, the decrease in the number of staff and the decrease in their salaries.

a) Undoubtedly public funding wasn't reduced only in Greece. According to the Commission's report "Within the EHEA, all countries except Luxembourg, France, Denmark and Germany decreased public expenditure for tertiary education at a constant price at least once in the years between 2008 and 2012. (…) In a second group, yearly decrease(s) in public expenditure on tertiary education were relatively small, and never exceeded 5%. (…) In a third group, countries experienced much more significant decreases (yearly decreases higher than 5.5%) either during a single year (the United Kingdom, Portugal, Latvia, the Czech Republic, Austria, Estonia, Ireland and Poland), over two years (Bulgaria, Cyprus and Lithuania) or even over three years (Romania). In all these countries except Lithuania, the level of public expenditure devoted to higher education at a constant price was lower in 2011 compared to 2008. The most severe decline can be observed in Romania (-36.2%). (European Commission, 2015:40-41).

Greece's case is similar to Romania's. Public expenditure on education in Greece was always low, compared with the average for EU countries, below 3.5% of the GDP compared with the average for EU countries. From 2005 to 2009, however, before in other words the onset of today's debt crisis, it increased by 22.2%, slightly more than the increase in GDP in the same period, which increased by 19.2%. Things then change dramatically. From 2009 until 2013 public expenditure on education, in constant prices, decreased by 29.9%, in other words, by 1/3 (KANEP/GSEE, 2016: 126-128).

Even more dramatic was the decrease in the public funding of H.E. In the period 2005-2009 it increased by 19.2%, exactly the same as the increase in the GDP. From then until 2013 it dropped by 31.7%. In the two following years the decrease is greater and touches the larger universities in particular. According to estimates the overall decrease for them in 2009-2015 touches 60% and in some of the largest, like the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, it reaches 75% (Feidas, 2014: 35).

b) This is all depicted in the size of the staff. According to EUROSTAT data, the teaching staff in all categories were, in 2013 17,877. In 2014 this number fell to 15,221 (http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/ nui/submitViewTableAction.do). This decrease continued in 2015. According to data processed by the Hellenic Statistical Agency, from 25,857 in 2010 the teaching staff fell in 2013 to 19,583. In the same time period the teaching staff in the 28 countries of the EU increased from 1,374,660 to 1,420,153 (KANEP/GSEE, 2016: 214).

c) Finally, as far as the teaching staff's salaries are concerned, the international economic crisis after 2008 led to their decrease in a number of countries. According to OECD, "on average across OECD countries with available data, teachers' salaries decreased, for the first time since 2000, by about 5% at all levels of education between 2009 and 2013. In England, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Portugal, Scotland and Spain, teachers' salaries were significantly affected by the crisis. As for Greece, "various reductions in teachers' benefits and allowances have affected teachers' salaries since 2000. As a result, gross salaries fell by more than 25% in real terms between 2010 and 2013. In addition, Greek teachers also saw their net salaries shrink as a tax for solidarity was created. This tax increased the level of taxation on teachers' already reduced gross salary; and the insurance coverage paid by teachers is still calculated based on their earlier, higher salaries. (OECD, 2015: 434).

2. The crisis affects graduates, since both it and the restrictive policies that followed led to the shrinking of the state and the loss of employment opportunities. Hence, in the space of a few years unemployment took on huge proportions especially among the young including graduates. The dramatic development is shown in table 3.

Table 3. Unemployed graduates by level of study (1st trimester (quarter) 2008 and 1st trimester (thousands)

Level of Education	Population		Work force		Employed		Unemployed		Not economically active	
Year	2008	2015	2008	2015	2008	2015	2008	2015	2008	2015
Total	9,433,2	9,215,1	4,985.7	4,777,0	4,567,2	3,504,4	418,6	1,272,5	4,447,5	4,482,2
PhD. – MA	109,0	166,1	100,4	144,5	94,9	125,9	5,5	18,0	8,6	21,6
University Graduate	1,055,7	1,199,2	829,7	871,1	783,7	698,3	46,0	172,8	226,0	328,1
TEI Graduate	1,036,6	1,178,8	849,6	936,0	759,5	680,9	90,1	255,0	187,0	242,8
Secondary	2,789,8	2,919,7	1,657,0	1,667,5	1,503,2	1,178,2	153,8	489,3	1,132,9	1,252,2
Primary	3,8709	3,378,2	1,499,6	1,124,4	1,381,1	604,1	118,5	320,3	2,371,3	2,253,7
Little or no schooling	571,1	417,2	59,4	33,5	44,9	17,0	4,5	18,4	566,7	383,8

Source: http://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SJO01/

From 418, 6 thousand in the first three months of 2008, unemployment reached 1, 278, 5 in 2015, in other words it tripled. From 8, 4% of the work force, it reached 26, 6%. The increase is explosive among holders of Master's degrees and PhDs and even more so among young graduates. In short, the crisis touched all the categories of the active population, including graduates. From 7, 1% in 2005 the percentage of unemployment for the latter climbed to 19, 1% in 2014. (http://www.oecd.org/edu/education-at-a-glance-19991487.htm: 112)

The explanation can be found in two places: the withdrawal of the state and the weakening of the public sector, firstly, and secondly, the weak link between higher education and the economy. The policies for overcoming the crisis which have been followed since 2009 until today began with the acceptance that one of the fundamental reasons for the crisis was the inflated public sector. For this reason appointments were 'frozen' and more than 100 thousand public employees were either fired, or retired. Thus, the public sector which traditionally constituted the basic graduate employer ceased to make appointments (Sianou-Kirgiou, 2010). The private sector in turn didn't compensate for the withdrawal of the public sector. On the contrary, it was further weakened during the crisis and didn't manage to absorb even the relatively small number of graduates it had absorbed in the past.

3. The private sector's inability to absorb graduates and in general young people with qualifications bears witness to the difficulty in the relationship between education and the economy in Greece. It is also difficult however to put it down to the quality of training of the graduates and the quality of the Greek HEIs. On the contrary, during the crisis more and more young graduates sought work abroad.

This phenomenon, as L. Labrianidis and his colleagues have shown, has taken on new dimensions in recent years. In relevant research from 15th May 2009 to 15th February 2010 Labrianidis estimates that this group amounts to 126,616. The number, he notes, touches 10% of university graduates in Greece, when the corresponding percentages in economically advanced countries fluctuates between 0, 4 and 2, 5% and in the less economically developed is at 7%. "Greek professionals had lived and worked in 74 different countries all together. However, 91% of the participants were concentrated in 10 countries only, including mainly the UK (31, 7%), the USA (28, 7%), Germany (6, 5%) and Switzerland (5, 4%). A small percentage (4%) worked in less developed countries" (Labrianidis, 2013:11).

From his sample, Labrianidis concludes that a large part studies abroad, and in fact in one of the top 100 universities. "The graduates working abroad have studied for many years (73.6% have an MSc and 50.9% a PhD) and with 40% of the degrees acquired abroad coming from one of the 'top 100 universities' in the world! (…) A significant part of Greek professionals abroad work in Universities and in research related activities (around 46%), 15% in multinational companies, 10% in international organizations and 5% in finance/banking. A minority combines work abroad and in Greece (e.g. a dentist who works abroad but visits Greece for some days during the month to perform surgeries)".

The current that Labrianidis describes gains strength until at least the end of 2014. In the Greek Press reference is made to 200,000 scientists, mostly young, who have established themselves in economically affluent countries after 2010. In fact according to public opinion research in 2014, half of young people were thinking of doing the same (http:///www.imerisia.gr/article.asp?catid=26510&subid=2&pubid=113706179).

Beyond the numbers, from the aforementioned we can arrive at three findings concerning the relationship between education and labour market in Greece. If, as it appears, young Greek graduates and scientists find employment and indeed on good terms abroad, then studies in Greece are not bad. If this is true then the adaptation of education to the labour market, sought by so many, is a matter of great interest. What could adaptation to a labour market that is completely deregulated and under conditions where the state continually reduces funding mean? To the two findings

mentioned above we should add a third. If as we saw, the Greek HEI provide degree certificates with value in the international labour market and many of their graduates end up going to other countries to find employment, what effects could this situation have on the graduates?

In summary, while the European proposal according to which public HE constitutes a signifying factor in socio-economic development and innovation, is a proposal with universal and long-term acceptance, the current developments in Greece raise questions and lead us to rethink the role of the University more generally. What could the finding that the University constitutes an element of social and economic development mean today, in conditions of economic crisis and paralysis of the social network?

Chapter 4

The Council of Europe action for a sustainable democracy: the role of University

4.1 Introduction

The two great events for Higher Education Reform in Europe, the Bologna Declaration (1999) and the EU's Lisbon Strategy (2000), considered the university to be a fundamental factor for the promotion of Europe to a leading and competitive economic power on a global level. At the same time, European education policy, chiefly through the decisions that followed the Bologna Process, promoted democratic issues, such as citizenship, social cohesion, equal opportunities, and so on. However, this policy gradually distanced itself from its commitments to democracy and focussed on the E.U.'s economic development. The role of the university was defined as serving the growth of competitive markets, placing their role in the development of active citizens, social cohesion and solidarity, and the passing on of a humanistic culture, in an inferior position (Olsen and Maassen, 2007).

As a result of this, in Europe today, the values of solidarity, equality, and social justice have been put aside. In a recent publication entitled 'Living in dignity in the 21st century – Poverty and Inequality in societies of human rights: the paradox of democracies (2013), the Council of Europe raises objections to the marginalization of these values, due to economic policy in Europe.

The Council of Europe is the only European institution that reacts and highlights the democratic deficit as much in the European social space as in the space of education, and especially Higher Education. The Council of Europe finds that the universities in Europe do not do enough for the promotion of a democratic culture (Weber in Humber and Harkavy, 2007:33), while its activity is more decisive and consistent in the promotion of democracy through education, mainly since it places emphasis on action and demonstrates greater sensitivity to the democratic future of Europe. Sjur Bergan, a researcher at the Council of Europe, highlights that "no society can be truly democratic except through practice and democratic practice is fostered through education for citizenship" (Bergan, 2004:5), while Frank Plantan, editor of the Final General Report (2002) of the Council of Europe project

'Universities as sites of citizenship and civic responsibility' highlights the need 'to identify good or "best" practices in university governance and administration and the teaching of democracy and civic responsibility' (Plantan, 2002:5-6). The Council of Europe's actions underline the need for an education policy that will promote democracy more effectively and at the same time can be considered a warning "that higher education is failing to contribute to the development and sustainability of democracy in Europe" (Bacevic, xxxx:3).

In this text, we will present the philosophy and action of the Council of Europe and we will attempt to show that it constitutes the most significant institution for the defence of democracy in Europe. We will chiefly show, in comparison with the policies of the E.U, the dedication of the Council of Europe to a sustainable democracy, which is perceived in a wider sense and includes solidarity and social justice, social cohesion, and the cultivation of skills for democratic citizenship, as well as the idea of a sustainable economy and a sustainable natural environment. We will also analyse the institution's policy of defending democracy by using education as an practice and mainly through the role of the university and its contribution to the promotion of a sustainable democracy. In the light of this analysis, we will examine the example of Greece to show the difficulties and limits of Council of Europe interventions for a democratic culture through education, particularly in a period of economic crisis and the rise of extreme ideologies across Europe.

4.2 The Council of Europe and the creation of a democratic culture through Education: the contribution of the University

Since its founding in 1949, the Council of Europe set as its fundamental goal the creation of a Union of European states which would take on the duty of the promotion of human rights and the basic freedoms and peace in Europe. Initially, and according to the first articles of its charter, the objectives of the Council of Europe have a general character and aim chiefly "to achieve a greater unity between its members for the purpose of safeguarding and realizing the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress". However, after 1950 the Council's action would become more specific with the adoption of the International Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. What is characteristic of this Convention is that it doesn't restrict the definition of the rights and freedoms or an ethical approach to them, but at

the same times creates bodies for their implementation, the most significant of which is the Committee of Ministers.

The European Council, differentiated from its formal engagements, adopts from the outset a philosophy of implementation of democratic principles and values in action with the aim of creating a democratic society founded on human rights and fundamental freedoms. For this reason, the Council of Europe was soon occupied with the promotion of human rights through education, which it considers to be one of the most significant factors in their diffusion and implementation in society. However, the Organization's education policy turned to the promotion not only of human rights, but also the development of a democratic culture through education which would constitute the foundation for the development of democracy in Europe.

From the end of the first decade of the 21st century and on, the Council of Europe has been placing more and emphasis on the role of education in the creation of a democratic society, something which emerges chiefly out of the organization of international conferences, special meetings, publications or research and education programmes. These works are carried out under the auspices of the Council and to a large extent express its philosophy, despite the reminder that "the opinions expressed in these works are the responsibility of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe". From a study of the texts from the Council of Europe, and the content of the topics of the actions mentioned above, which were inspired by the relevant formal decisions of the Committee of Ministers (meeting 989, 06/2/2007), it emerges that the Council of Europe assigns especial significance to education as the most significant tool in the building of a European community of democracy, justice and freedom (recommendation 1849)[10], which was bound up with the creation of a democratic culture.

In the thinking of the Council of Europe, democratic culture has a mainly practical dimension and links the values and beliefs of the citizens with their social practices and behaviour, and in this sense requires the development of democratic competences, skills and attitudes through education. According to this reasoning, it is obvious that education is perceived of as the foremost institution for the development of a democratic culture and at the same time for its diffusion across society and its implementation in social practices. It should also be noted here that education is understood in the wider sense, which is not to be confused with formal education and its restrictions, and which is especially clear in recent Council of Europe actions.

---

[10] Report of the Committee on Culture, Science and Education, rapporteur: Mr Glavan. Text adopted by the Assembly on 3 October 2008 (36th Sitting).

Evidence of this orientation in education is the Pestalozzi programme, which has been developed in recent years by the Organization. The Pestalozzi programme places emphasis on the development of a democratic culture through the engagement of all the groups within education and their acquisition not only of knowledge but also skills for the promotion of democracy in real life: “The program targets teachers, school principals, inspectors, educational advisors, teacher trainers, textbook authors and other educational professionals and supports them in the development of knowledge, skills and attitudes they need in order to guide and facilitate the learning of the young members of their societies” (Vitkova, 2013).

At the same time, especial weight is given to educational practice and its link with education policy, so that here it can be transposed into everyday practice: “The fundamental principles and values of the Organization need to be reflected not only in education policy, but above all they need to influence the day-to-day practice of education”, acknowledging the crucial role of educational professionals “to bear fruit for politically, socially, economically and environmentally sustainable, democratic societies in the Europe of today and, above all, tomorrow” (Huber and Mompoint-Gaillard, 2011: 11).

In addition, in common with the trends on an international level, the Council of Europe believes that learning about democracy and its values is a continuous and life long process, and is entrusted to the activity not only of teachers at all levels, but also to the total of social and political institutions and actors who act in the spaces of the society of citizens: “Learning in education for democratic citizenship and human rights education is a lifelong process. Effective learning in this area involves a wide range of stakeholders including policy makers, educational professionals, learners, parents, educational institutions, educational authorities, civil servants, non-governmental organisations, youth organizations, media and the general public” (Conseil de l’Europe, 2010).

However, emphasis is placed on formal education, which is considered to play a special role in the formation of the citizen’s personality. For this reason, the training of educational professional in pre-school, primary and secondary education in democratic values constitutes a basic prerequisite for democratic citizenship and human rights education.

This training could take place first of all in the universities. Over recent decades in particular, a powerful trend has been taking shape within the Council of Europe, which tends to view the University as the chief educational institution for the promotion of a democratic culture in Europe (Council of Europe, 2010). The legacy the European universities leave, and their main mission which is their social

usefulness, grants them a role that no other institution can take on, and which is "the development of the fundamental competencies and values without which our societies can neither develop nor survive" (Bergan, 2004:7).

Consequently, the universities' social role is extensive. Their nature makes them capable of offering future citizens "converging competences", in other words abilities which cover the whole person of the future citizen. In this sense, the training of students and future teachers or education professionals shouldn't ignore the acquisition of competences for the labour market, which should constitute one of the basic aims of the contemporary university. The recognition however of the role of the university in the economy should be linked with the needs of the democratic society, and that's why these abilities should be supplemented by the education of the future democratic citizen, his personal development and the development of his personality through the acquisition of knowledge (Bergan and Damian, 2010).

It seems, as we shall see now, that the Council of Europe, influenced by its colleagues from the universities, sees the training of the citizens from within an overall view of the personality, without separating the skills that are necessary for access to the labour market from the skills that shape the democratic citizen. Similarly, the development of these abilities requires an holistic pedagogy, and, from this point of view, the methodology on which the learning process of the Council of Europe's current Pestalozzi Programme is founded, is indicative (Huber and Mompoint-Gaillard, 2011:13). Emphasis is placed on democratic competences which comprise the foundation for the development of a democratic culture.

The University is the most appropriate educational institution that can contribute to the development of a democratic culture (Barrera and Soares, 2010), since by nature it can offer not only professional training for the labour market, but also opportunities for the education of the democratic citizen (Bergan, 2011). First and foremost, the University can develop the abilities of the active citizen in future teachers, in other words, sense of responsibility, conscientious obedience to the laws, participation in matters of common interest and respect for human rights, which comprise component parts of a democratic culture (Bergan and Van't Land, 2010). Consequently, for the Council of Europe, the University's mission in the development and maintenance of the democratic society as well as the promotion of its values is extremely significant, and the development of democratic competences and knowledge can have decisively positive consequences for the wider democratic society (Bergan and Damian, 2010).

This belief, according to which the University can play a central role in the development and diffusion of democratic values in European societies, is founded on the argument that historically the University played a similar role in European

societies through the cultural legacy that the western universities left at various periods of European history. The realization of the significant role that the universities have played in the production and diffusion of the legacy of a democratic culture in European societies is considered to be an important factor in the collaboration between the European countries as they face a series of common problems related to the issue of the strengthening not only of democracy but also social cohesion (Sanz and Bergan, 2007).

Through the philosophy and actions of the Council of Europe the development and stabilizing of democracy is closely associated with social cohesion and the development of the social space. This can be seen mainly in the fact that the European Social Charter was established to support the European Convention on Human Rights, and, in this sense, to support the Council of Europe's entire policy plan for the promotion of democracy in Europe.

4.3 The Council of Europe and the social space

It is clear that the Council of Europe doesn't constitute a European institution that is essentially differentiated from other European institutions as far as the ideological coordinates that pass through it are concerned and the value objectives that it has set as an element of its action. This is because on the one hand it is a product of the same processes that took place in Europe after the war aimed at the shaping of the conditions for a united democratic Europe, and, on the other hand, since within its folds the same governments and the same political powers that form the other European institutions, mainly the European Union, are represented. From this point of view, the latter, as much as the Council of Europe are registered on the European and political and ideological state of being within which two basic political and ideological directions and two political discourses, the discourse on the market and the discourse on the social space, which nevertheless are oriented to the goal of the creation of a peaceful and democratic Europe, are formed.

However, the Council of Europe is significantly differentiated from the European Union, which in recent decades, while not neglecting the issue of the strengthening of democracy and the shaping of a European social and democratic space, places emphasis more on the function and needs of the market and, consequently is inspired by a neo-liberal conception of democracy and citizenship (Karalis and Balias, 2007).

In contrast, the Council of Europe seems to follow a more 'independent' policy, giving more and more weight to the need for a democratic society with social rights

for all the citizens with the aim of achieving social cohesion. On the other hand, the institution of the Council of Europe itself comprises a field of contradictions, negotiations or even conflicts regarding the policies which concern its social policy, as this is given shape in the European Social Charter. These conflicts are echoed in real life in the dominance of the economic priorities of the European political institutions over the social policies (Venieris, 2002). However, from its first steps and with noteworthy stability, the Council of Europe has followed a policy of support for the European social space, which is closely connected to democratic development in Europe.

Firstly, it is worth noting the review of the European Social Charter in 1996 (which had been adopted initially in 1961), according to which all European citizens have social rights without discrimination. A little later, in 1998, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe set out the Strategy for Social Cohesion[11], which began in 2000 and was completed in 2004, and set as its goal the study of the reform of European societies and its consequences for social cohesion, proposing ways for dealing with poverty, social inequalities and social exclusion. The European Committee for Social Cohesion (CDCS) which was formed for this purpose, advanced to the creation of a programme of actions through special meetings which started in 2004 and continue to be renewed until the present day. These activities include all kinds of interventions, from conferences, special meetings and publications, to proposals to the member states of the Council of Europe at the level of legislative arrangements. This programme posed questions concerning social cohesion and problem solution related to social security and social rights, the increase in social inequalities, unemployment, the family and the child (Council of Europe, 2007).

Within the context of these Council of Europe activities, another European Committee for Immigration was set up, which was concerned with issues to do with the protection of vulnerable groups of immigrants, placing emphasis on their rights and their dignity (Council of Europe, 2008). Moreover, in its official texts the European Committee for Social Cohesion highlights the need for the peaceful and harmonious co-existence of the various minorities and identities within the context of European societies, believing it to be an essential precondition for social cohesion (Council of Europe, CDCS, 2010).

On the other hand, the 'Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education' moves firstly in the direction of the

[11] Social cohesion is seen by the Council of Europe as 'the ability of a society to guarantee welfare for all its members, reducing inequalities and avoiding marginalization', Report of High Level Task Force on Social Cohesion in the 21st century, Strasburg 28/1/2008.

learning of the rights and duties of citizens amongst themselves, the goal of which is the creation of suitable conditions for a democratic life. It highlights in particular that "An essential element of all education for democratic citizenship and human rights education is the promotion of social cohesion", believing that the prevention of violence, racism, xenophobia and discrimination comprises an important prerequisite for social cohesion (Conseil de l' Europe, 2010:13, 15).

At the same time, reference is made to economic and social rights, as well as the role of higher education in the training of the teachers who will be entrusted with the duty of teaching the youth the democratic values of participation and human rights, something which demonstrates that the Council of Europe is gradually turning to a point of view that sees the University as a key factor in the matter of the promotion of democracy through social cohesion (Conseil de l' Europe, 2010: 15).

What one can observe by examining the above official texts of the Council of Europe Committees is that all the more, the issue of social cohesion is linked to human rights, in the broad sense of the term, which include social rights for a dignified life for all the members of a democratic community without discrimination and without exceptions. In this sense it appears that the Council of Europe is attempting to link social cohesion with the tradition of human rights that have constituted the fundamental ideology and value background of the Council of Europe since its establishment. The close connection between human rights and social cohesion leads to the thinking that governs the CoE's actions for a perception of democracy which, to be sustainable, requires the combination of social policy and the development of a democratic culture through education.

4.4 Towards a sustainable democracy: the contribution of the University

With a central reference to the need for the development of a democratic society which guarantees its members' human rights and dignity, the Council of Europe moves slowly but surely towards the idea of a sustainable democracy, which is understood as a cohesive social space that ensures the welfare and the enjoyment of human rights and freedoms to their full extent and to all its members on a stable basis.

The concept of a sustainable democracy appears more and more frequently in the actions, the official texts and the publications of the Council of Europe, chiefly over

the last decade. In the official texts, the decisions and the actions which are developed by the Council of Europe over this period, the content of the sustainable democracy is broadened in a direction which includes social as much as cognitive and value terms for the development of a democratic society. We will refer to a series of representative texts and actions which are indicative of this direction.

First of all, the European Committee for Social Cohesion action programme which was adopted at meeting 1039 on 22nd October 2008 refers to the necessity for a "sustainable democracy", while in the New Strategy for Social Cohesion which was adopted on 7th July 2010 by the Committee of Ministers there is mention of a "democratic and sustainable development progress" (Council of Europe, 2010). In addition, in the international two-day meeting which took place in Brussels from 28th February until 1st March 2011, emphasis was placed on the promotion of democracy, social justice, sustainability and social cohesion (Council of Europe, 2011).

At the same time, over the past decade, the Council of Europe has adopted a strategy of promotion of democracy through education, which is linked closely to the concept of a sustainable democracy. From 2005 until 2007 the Council of Europe advanced with three publications related to the teaching of democratic citizenship and human rights, which was entrusted to university researchers, while at the same time it drew up the action "Learning and living democracy for all" within the context of the programme "Education for democratic citizenship and human rights" (2006-2009).

According to this programme, education "has a key role to play in the development of a sustainable form of democracy and respect for human rights in society. Education is also a major contributor for community cohesion and social justice, and one of society's strongest bulwarks against the forces of violence, racism, extremism, xenophobia, discrimination and intolerance". Also, education encourages people "…to defend their human rights and the human rights of others. It develops values, confidence and a sense of responsibility, as well as practical knowledge and skills" (Conseil de l'Europe, 2010).

It is worth noting that the concept of sustainable democracy and its relationship with education is underlined with great emphasis in the current Council of Europe Pestalozzi Programme, where the key role of education for a sustainable democracy through the development of a democratic culture which is founded on knowledge, the understanding and implementation of democratic values, such as human rights and intercultural dialogue is particularly highlighted.

The coordinators of this Programme believe that the maintenance and strengthening of democracy in Europe depends on the ability of education to make the new generations capable of handling the "world" in which they live and which is

to be found in a constant state of flux, through their participation in public life. Democracy can be sustainable, claims Claudia Lenz, when the new generations learn to be not only receivers of knowledge, but its producers, and for this to happen, education has "to be a space in which learners are given instruments for investigating and negotiating knowledge". Consequently, the sustainability of democracy is directly associated with citizens who can negotiate knowledge and, by extension, the established truths which comprise obstacles for the development of a democratic culture. "Thus, education which is concerned with sustainable democratic societies has to provide learners with the ability to cope with the relativity of truth" (Lenz, 2011: 24).

It is clear that the problem of knowledge and its management by autonomous and critical citizens is seen by the writers of the study as a crucial factor for a sustainable democracy, in which all its members could coexist, work together and express themselves freely. It is equally clear that the university is considered to be the chief institution that can develop these skills for the negotiation of truth and dialogue, which constitute fundamental characteristics of a democratic culture and by extension a sustainable democracy. The role of the university in the development of a sustainable democracy through the development of competences, as described in the aforementioned programme, is to be found in, and characterises, the actions of the Council of Europe itself, something which demonstrates that it echoes the thinking and the views of the Council of Europe for a sustainable democracy.

In the final text of the international Forum organised by the Council of Europe in Strasburg on 2nd-3rd October 2008, in cooperation with the "US Steering Committee of the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility and Democracy" on the subject "Converging Competences: Diversity, Higher Education and Sustainable Democracy", the contribution of Higher Education to the maintenance and development of a sustainable democracy through the development of a series of converging competences is emphasized. These competences are related as much to the needs of the economy as to the needs of democracy and citizenship.

The spirit of this Forum's approach is that the universities have the ability "to understand and align these converging competences, while also providing the structures, teaching methods, curricula and opportunities for students to apply their knowledge in real world situations" (Council of Europe, 2008). In this sense, the concept of sustainable democracy is linked as much with the competences that concern the space of the economy as with competences that concern democracy and the development of democratic life and indeed, the real world of the societies.

The same reasoning and thinking can be found in other parallel Council of Europe actions. For example, in texts published by the Council of Europe or which make up its decisions, the importance of the role of the University is highlighted, in environmental, social and economic sustainability issues. This trend, which can be uncovered as much in older as in more recent Council of Europe publications that analyse the positions of the researchers from the academic space, places emphasis on the development of knowledges and competences that will permit the participation of the citizens in social, political and economic life, in parallel with the promotion of human rights, aimed at the shaping of the conditions for a sustainable democracy.

Already in 2007, in a Council of Europe publication (Humber and Harkavy, 2007), a broader concept of sustainability is introduced, which is linked not only with the development of a democratic culture but also with the natural environment. "Environmental sustainability" demands, according to the writers, the contribution of the citizens through their daily action, as well as through their action as voters, as citizens and as political actors in general. The sustainable democracy is consequently equivalent to environmental sustainability, which in turn requires economic, social and cultural sustainability. All these forms of sustainability are linked together and are interdependent, in such a way that the absence of one undermines the others.

However, sustainability in all its forms depends on the University, which is seen as the chief institution for the formation of the terms for a sustainable democracy. Dramatizing the role of the University in the introduction of the text, the editor of the Higher Education Series Sjur Bergan believes that "the University's duty is the transmission of knowledges and values, the understanding and *savoir faire* which will make our societies sustainable, as much in the sense of the fulfilment of the minimum criteria for the continuation of their existence, as in the sense of the satisfaction and mobilization of all its citizens" (Bergan and Damian, 2010: 7-8).

The writers of all the texts place emphasis on the crucial role of the University for the sustainability of democratic societies, highlighting particularly that the values of the democratic society and the University are held in common: "Democratic societies and higher education share the values of tolerance, inclusion, respect of differences and a strong disposition to honour and celebrate human creativity" (Teune in Humber and Harkavy, 2007: 25). Along a similar line of reasoning, Frank Rhodes claims that the University, due to the fact that it can develop within its folds the democratic spirit and democratic culture, is the institution that can, more so than any other institution, contribute to the development of a sustainable democracy (Rhodes, 2007).

Finally, Luc Weber refers to the special role of the universities, highlighting the fact that their research mission can act out a significant role in the development of research in sectors that concern democracy and human rights, especially within cognitive subject areas such as common law, history, political science and sociology. In other words he refers to the role of the human and social sciences, as part of the universities' analytical programmes, essential for the development of democracy, something which occupies the international academic community today.

In addition, he believes that sustainability can be perceived in two ways: on the one hand as linked to economic development and protection of the environment, and on the other, as the ability of an economic and political system to remain stable across the generations. Understood in the second way, sustainability is involved in the concepts of democratic culture, human rights and social cohesion, as well as with the educational mission of the University as far as the provision of knowledge to the aforementioned sectors is concerned. Seen from this perspective, sustainability goes beyond its traditional meaning and includes as much the environment as the economic and political sustainability of democratic societies (Weber in Humber and Harkavy, 2007: 31-33).

As the above analysis of the Council of Europe texts appears to show, the trend imprinted in the institution's most recent texts is that of the increasing importance of the institution of the University in the shaping of the terms for a sustainable democracy. The role that has been given to the University is linked to a new, broader perception of the sustainability of the democratic society, in which, beyond human rights and democratic values which ought to comprise the components of citizenship, an important position is also held by a sustainable economy and a sustainable natural environment.

4.5 Council of Europe policy and its limits: the example of Greece

From the moment of its establishment, the Council of Europe has expressed the European tradition and conscience for a democratic Europe with social justice, freedom and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. In recent years the Council of Europe has endeavoured to promote a sustainable democracy in Europe, through the tool of education, and especially higher education. The results of this policy are however perhaps shabby, as Council of Europe research shows, which highlights the distance between the proclaimed educational policies and the actual promotion of democracy in European societies (Council of Europe, 2005).

The European Union has set similar goals, but focuses on a Higher Education which will contribute to the competitiveness of the economy. Its difference with the Council of Europe is that it has at its disposal mechanisms for the implementation of its policies, while that here is restricted to decisions, studies and conferences which at best can function as legitimizing ideas for social movements demanding rights. This is not something to be ignored, as these not only exist, but are also powerful.

Let's quote P. Bourdieu, who wrote that "there is no social policy without social movements capable of enforcing it" (Bourdieu, 2002: 82), so Council of Europe policy remains problematic, and indeed concerning the chief goal it set itself, in other words an effective democracy and a democracy through practice.

This is especially true for countries of the South, like Greece (Mouzelis, 2002), where the social movements and the associated society of citizens is particularly weak and state – and party – control of the universities is stifling, not leaving any room for the rational development of the universities. If to this we add the recent economic crisis, then it becomes clear that the problem becomes bigger, given that the economic crisis has multiple effects on the development of democracy and the educational institutions.

The economic crisis in Greece which has lasted for six years, led first of all to the reduction of funding for education, and especially the universities, something which resulted in the reduction of their educational staff and the suspension of the development of their study programmes. In fact, following international trends, the repercussions of the economic crisis were even more significant in the area of the human and social sciences, through which democratic values and human rights could have been cultivated and promoted. Beyond and independent of the economic crisis however, the Greek universities' promotion of democratic values and human rights ran into huge obstacles within the universities themselves, which, as social institutions, can be viewed as a part and an expression of Greek society and citizens, and consequently have the same or similar characteristics to the latter. For example, the factionalism and the clientelism which characterise Greek public administration, and, by extension, higher education, undermine the development and action of a powerful society of citizens in the Greek university which would favour the promotion of democratic issues.

Consequently, independent of the difficult economic context, it is important to investigate just how much the Greek university has been sensitised to and has incorporated activities which promote the views and positions of the Council of Europe, regarding education in democracy, in a coherent and effective way. In fact, it is even more important that this be ascertained in the case of the initial training of

the teachers in primary and secondary education, since they are the new generations' future teachers.

As research conducted at the University of Patras revealed, there has never been a complete, thorough policy for the adoption, support, monitoring and evaluation of the introduction of Education on Human Rights in Greek university institutions. Although in Greece the official texts of the international Organizations have been adopted and diffused, including those from the E.U. and the CoE, which concern Education on Human Rights, an enormous want in the education of future primary school teachers, as well as secondary school teachers on these issues can be observed (Balias, 2013). This research chiefly showed that Education on Human Rights doesn't occupy a particularly important and significant place in the curriculum of Greek universities and that there is no systematic and methodical learning and pedagogical intervention at the level of Greek universities.

Other research at the same university reached more or less the same conclusions. It revealed that the introduction of teaching on human rights into Greek universities, although it exists and appears to follow the developments in the international space, is found mainly in the Pedagogical Departments, while in all the others, and chiefly those of the sciences, it is non-existent. In addition, students in the Pedagogical Departments have relatively better knowledge of human and political rights, compared with the other students. Despite this, the fact that only three Pedagogical Departments out of a total of 19 have integrated Education on Human Rights as an independent cognitive subject matter into their Study Programmes is revealing. Another significant finding from the research is that the majority of students draw their knowledge on human rights from sources outside the university (school, family, the mass media), and not from the university, with the exception of students from the Pedagogical Departments. Finally, from the above research it appears that the vast majority of students in the Pedagogical Departments who received teaching on human rights "reshape" their cognitive level and not especially the level of their attitudes, views and that of their activation as advocates and supporters of human rights in their everyday and school life (Pitsou, 2013).

The research mentioned above shows more or less what is commonplace in Greek society, in other words, that the position of the teaching of human rights in Greek Higher Education, and by extension, in the whole education system is limited and has essentially been neglected as much by the universities themselves as by the state's official policy, despite the fact that the Greek Ministry of Education distributes the texts and decisions of the international bodies to the educational units, including those from the Council of Europe.

We believe that the case of Greece is not unique or exclusive in Europe, but demonstrates that the Council of Europe's policies in the area of education on democracy are not being incorporated adequately and effectively into national educational policies and don't significantly influence social practices, which is one of the Council of Europe's central objectives.

4.6 Conclusions

All the aforementioned reveal a struggle on the European continent (and not only there) between a view that prioritizes economic efficiency and the needs of the market and another that sets Democracy, sustainability and social cohesion as the major issues. It is obvious that this contradictory presentation of the two views is of analytical and not research value, since reality is more composite. In fact, in the purest neo-liberal approaches the assurance of social cohesion is seen as a prerequisite for the smooth operation of the economy. On the other hand, development is important for the welfare of a society and by extension for the proper functioning of its institutions.

As far as the latter is concerned, the Council of Europe's role is central since with its decisions and interventions it legitimates the action for the demand for the effective functioning of democratic institutions and the protection of human and social rights, which are understood of as a term for the sustainability of a democracy. The CoE places special emphasis on education and in particular on the role of the university as a tool for the shaping of a democratic culture, believing in its effectiveness for a sustainable democracy which it has consistently defended from the moment of its establishment until the present day.

However, the contribution of the Council of Europe will be restricted, like that of education more generally, if the particular institutions in European societies are not activated simultaneously. The CoE believes that the university is the institution that could play a significant role in the defence and development of democracy, and it is not the only international body that holds this belief but, at least in the European space it is, as we have claimed in this text, the most consistent.

However, equally important is the question of whether the university manages to play the role intended of it and so desired by the CoE. Consequently, despite the enormous pressures and challenges it comes in for from the policies that link it directly and exclusively with the labour market, it is important to investigate the degree to which the university itself has been sensitised and mainly whether it has

incorporated activities which promote the related views and positions of the Council of Europe on democracy into its analytical programmes.

The example of Greece which we examined shows that the universities, beyond the fact that the economic crisis has weakened their potential for making a successful contribution to the development of democracy, face a lot of resistance and difficulties, some of which are inherent and others which stem from the governments' priorities. The main difficulties however originate in the society of citizens, and especially in whether it is possible for institutions and social forces to exist, not only in society but also in Higher Education, which support the universities' democratic mission.

For this reason, actions of this kind will, in our opinion, have results so long as they are multiplied and linked to others on the level of the society of citizens – as in any case the Council of Europe indicates – particularly in countries where there is a significant want of democracy and the democratic values are in crisis. Nevertheless, the Council of Europe, especially together with the promotion of the University to central factor for the promotion of a sustainable democracy, can play, under the conditions mentioned above, as well as others probably too, a crucial role for democracy in Europe.

The question which is posed here, and which will occupy us in the next chapter, is how the university will combine the two totally opposing roles it is called on to play in contemporary democratic societies, that is to say, its contribution to economic development and to the development of a sustainable democracy, to use the CoE's terminology.

Chapter 5

A critique of economic reason: critical pedagogy and educational Leadership as agents in the democratization of the university

5.1 Introduction

It is the consensus view that today's university, as an institution for the production, use and diffusion of knowledge, is oriented first and foremost towards support of economic growth and the use of knowledge within the framework of a knowledge-based economy. On the other hand, the use of knowledge for the shaping of the active citizen and the development of common values which would facilitate coexistence and the smooth operation of democracy has been relegated, and as a result the university's democratic role in society has been neglected. For many scholars, this fact raises the issue of the democratization of the university. What would this democratization mean?

The democratization of the University preoccupied Jurgen Habermas at the end of the 1960s, and he tried to demonstrate the relationship between knowledge and democratic decision-making, within the framework of free dialogue, critical competence and recognition of pluralism (Habermas, 1971: 6). Today democratization of the university is linked to similar issues, as well as to values, morals and democratic practices which constitute the fundamental elements of a democratic culture, with the meaning attached to the term by the Council of Europe, as we saw in the previous chapter. Patrick Blessinger believes that democratizing higher education means that the university should become more inclusive, more participatory, and representative and rooted in practices of shared values and a political, social and economic ethos (Blessinger, 2015).

How, and through which processes can the university move towards democratization in order to be able play its democratic role in society?

The university today is undergoing fundamental change and reform due to external pressures which originate as much in the space of the economy as in the space of society. Due to these external pressures, it is forced to change, but the changes it undergoes serve the economy first of all. The question which arises here is whether

the university can develop an internal dynamic for change in the direction of democracy, so as to be able to carry out its democratic role in society. A precondition for achieving this goal is its democratization, as much at the level of the use of knowledge as at the level of social practices.

Hence, what is highlighted first of all is the need for the development of critical thought and a corresponding critical pedagogy within the university which will promote the use and diffusion of knowledge with a view to the support and development of democracy in society.

In addition, democratization of the university, precisely because it concerns the change in the relationships, social practices and the values within it, requires chiefly the mobilization of all the members and agents of the university community. Essentially it requires an educational leadership which is perceived of as activation and participation of all the agents in the university community with a collective objective, that of the democratic reform of the university institution.

Based on the above, we will first examine the role of knowledge in the university, comparing its use in the economy with its use for citizenship and a stronger democracy. We will then examine the relationship between the university and the needs of the market and the objectives of democracy and the extent to which compromise between them is feasible. In the third and fourth part we analyse, respectively, critical pedagogy and educational leadership as agents for the democratization of the university. In particular we examine theories of educational leadership, investigating their soundness and comparing the positions that are defended with the characteristics of university governance today, chiefly the priority given to economic efficiency at the expense of democratic growth. Through this analysis we attempt to show the limits and related pathologies in the university which constitute significant barriers to its democratization.

5.2 The University and knowledge: democracy and critical thinking

Today the universities are undergoing profound changes and are under pressure to reform due to many factors, such as the internationalization of studies, the demand for citizens' greater access to education and the cooperation and understanding between civilizations, but mainly due to developments in the field of the economy. These changes are the result of changes on an international level.

These changes are tending to shape a new social reality with characteristics such as the increasing importance of knowledge, cultural pluralism, social exclusion and

social discrimination, but also on the other hand, the rise in demands for respect for the rights of minorities and the disabled, for the protection of the natural environment, and so on (Evans, 2003). These changes have widened the discussion on the desired reforms that must take place in the university, and mainly the challenges that the university needs to respond to as much in order to survive in a competitive environment as to satisfy the new needs that are arising for the societies and the people.

In the new conditions that are taking shape, increased interest in the democratization of higher education and in an educated citizen who is better informed on the problems in the world and society and more able to contribute to dealing with them, can be observed. Hence, the development of a system of higher education, open and equal for all citizens acquires an all the more weighty importance and becomes essential if the potential as much for greater social and political participation as for the self-determination and personal development of the citizens, is to be increased (Anchan, 2015: 6-9).

In addition, the university is a crucial institution for the strengthening of democracy since it is "an institution that shapes habits of knowledge and doing, constructs the ways in which graduates see the world in which they live, and contributes to social norms in terms of understanding self and others" (Simpson, 2014: 7). The democratic role of the university, then, depends on knowledge and chiefly on its use for the shaping of citizens and the advancement of those perceptions of life and human relationships that promote democracy.

However, the knowledge that the university produces today is essentially perceived as a means for economic growth and profit, assigning in this way, either directly or indirectly, an almost exclusively economic value to human existence and intellectual activity.

In reality, knowledge is transformed into that which Christian Laval called "privatization of knowledge" ("privatisation de la connaissance"), and a s a result the university departs from the classic humboldtian model of the university based on encyclopaedic and altruistic knowledge which Humboldt understood as an attitude of mind, a skill and a capacity to think rather than specialized knowledge (Laval et al., 2012).

Thus, the university is today called on to give priority to the serving of private economic interests, neglecting its democratic mission.

Henry Giroux claimed that the dominant neo-liberal rhetoric in university strips society of the knowledge and values necessary for the development of a democratically engaged and socially responsible public. In this way neo-liberalism

promotes a market pedagogy which cultivates a culture of civic irresponsibility and avoids raising issues regarding the relationship of knowledge and power (Giroux, 2014).

Undoubtedly, knowledge has social significance and value, given that it is directly linked to power and consequently is decisive for democracy and its values. Social inequality, the crisis of democratic values and the violations of human rights, are linked, in one way or another, to the social use of knowledge. Consequently, the issue of knowledge, although today it is mostly associated with education and the university, is not a purely educational issue that can be seen in isolation from the wider problems of contemporary society, its institutions, its moral values and its quality.

Knowledge chiefly constitutes a means of power and domination in the space of society, as well as in the space of the university, which is the first and foremost institution that produces and diffuses it in society. From this point of view, the works of Michel Foucault, which demonstrated that knowledge and power are inseparable in a way that one strengthens the other and has an impact across the whole range of social relationships (Halsay et al., 2003), are of vital importance. In the same way, Claudia Lenz points out that "sustainable democratic societies need citizens who are aware of the relation between knowledge and power… Consequently, education has to address learners not only as receivers but also as producers of knowledge. In order to achieve this, education has to be a space in which learners are given instruments for investigating and negotiating knowledge" (Lenz, 2011: 22).

Consequently, the direct relationship of knowledge with the need for a critical university discourse which will promote the university institution as a democratic public sphere and vital source of civic education is demonstrated. The university, due to the fact that it is the primary institution within whose folds a critical way of thinking that raises issues concerning the theoretical, the moral foundations of knowledge and the relativity of truth, can be fostered, was considered to be the most important field for the critical appraisal of knowledge.

The problem of the relationship of scientific knowledge with moral knowledge, human values and democracy are not new of course and it has been highlighted by researchers during previous decades (Janicaud, 1987). John Dewey was one of the first to connect the moral dimension of knowledge with democracy and citizenship, at the beginning of the 20th century. For Dewey, knowledge has a moral dimension and is linked to quality of human life and constitutes the nucleus of the humanism that characterizes a truly democratic society (Dalton, 2002: 14-16). From this point of view, Dewey was one of the most important contemporary thinkers who linked

knowledge to democracy and influenced later research and contemporary thought concerning the role of knowledge in a democratic society.

More recently, a discourse has developed on higher education which focuses on the moral role of the university and scientific knowledge as far as the cultivation of citizenship, the strengthening of democracy and the promotion of social justice are concerned (Levin, 2006).

In recent decades, the issue of the moral role of the university is being raised with greater and greater intensity because of the huge importance scientific knowledge has acquired in contemporary society and this leaves the universities, the researchers, the teachers and their leadership facing enormous moral responsibilities towards the democratic society, the citizens and humanity.

Discussion in the academic space on higher education in recent years has started to focus more and more on the dangers for democratic growth which are linked to the spread of economic reasoning in social life and the society of citizens, as well as vital social institutions, like the university. According to some researchers, in a democratic society the primary role of the university is the creation of a just, critical and caring society, persuading its citizens that public causes are not the same as economic interests (Newman, Courturier and Scurie, 2004). In addition, other researchers claim that the university should chiefly promote useful programmes and public causes not only through economic development for the satisfaction of society's material needs, but through the shaping of critical and active citizens too (Taylor, Barr and Steele, 2002).

The issue that these approaches raise is that the university's primary mission is to promote the common good, democracy and democratic values through the shaping of active citizens, the chief characteristic of whom should be their critical capacity. Consequently, one of the most important purposes of the modern university is the "moralisation" of the knowledge it produces through its critical operation, through which the validity and the tenability of the moral choices as much at the level of the production of knowledge as at the level of its public use and usefulness, could be examined and investigated. The predominance of the economic agenda in the contemporary university that has been observed in recent decades puts the development of democracy in second place, something that has reignited international discussion on the social role of the university and the need to find a balance between its relationship with the market and its democratic mission.

5.3 The University caught between the logic of the market and the needs of democracy

The university's turn towards the market and the entry of market representatives into university governance, which we analysed in the previous chapter, are echoed to a great extent in the university's departure from its democratic mission. This turn gave rise to public discussion in liberal democracies, which raised the issue of whether the university should serve first and foremost the economy, or democracy, and how much compromise is possible. This discussion essentially provokes a dilemma which, from one point of view, is not new since democracy, particularly after the Second World War, and the growth of the welfare state, is closely linked to economic growth.

Today it is commonplace to say that without economic growth and the assurance of a satisfactory standard of living for the citizens, democracy itself cannot function effectively, if social coherence and its legitimization as a political system are weakened. Martin Lipset was one of the first thinkers to highlight the importance of economic development for the legitimization and strengthening of democracy (Lipset, 1959), while according to later studies, economic development aids employment and supports redistribution policies, and hence strengthens the legitimacy of democracy since the citizens are satisfied with its operation (Ethier, 1999).

Derek Bok, referring to the role of the university in American society posed the question of "how to build a society that combines a healthy, growing economy with an adequate measure of security, and well-being for its citizens…and "at present, we are faltering in both aspects of this enterprise" (Bok, 1990: 4-5). This question remains valid today, and occupies western democratic societies, since it has been realised that without economic development neither employment nor social cohesion are possible, nor even the maintenance of the social state at satisfactory levels, something which, at least in Europe, is linked directly to the democratic rights of the citizens and the legitimacy of democracy.

The question of the relationship between the needs of the market and the needs of the democratic society and its citizens constitutes a field of continuous ideological and political conflict in contemporary democratic societies, mainly between neo-liberal policies, and the supporters of the social state. On the other hand, it is worth noting that from time to time, there has been agreement between the main political powers in the democratic societies of the west, concerning the belief that education is the key to economic affluence and by extension to the improvement in the life of the

citizens, something which would strengthen the legitimacy of the governments (Drucker, 1993).

In the period we are going through, this agreement has broken down mainly due to the dominance of the neo-liberal model in the economy, a fact which provokes tension in the ideological juxtapositions, mainly in western democratic societies. The domination of the neo-liberal model in the economy had important effects on the university and the role it is called on to play at the level of the economy and the social use of the knowledge it produces, and by extension, democracy. The state's, and by extension, the university's turn towards the market, despite the positive effects it may have for the increase in overall wealth and employment, has turned the university into an institution that has been colonised according to Habermas, by the state's priorities and the imperatives of the economy (Fleming, 2006: 104). Other writers, like Apple and Beane and more recently Aronowitz support the same view, believing that the interests of industry and businesses are the preeminent goals of educational systems (Apple et al, 1995; Aronowitz, 2008). More recently, referring mainly to American higher education, Martha Nussbaum claimed that the university is organised and governed primarily as a commercial enterprise aimed, as she recently claimed, at direct profit rather than the promotion of public goods that serve the democratic society, the citizens and their needs.

According to Nussbaum, the economic appraisal of university studies results in society departing from the objective of growth that will incorporate the provision of fundamental public goods that would contribute to the building of a democratic society with egalitarianism, justice and dignity for all citizens. This is clear from the fact that the university, having placed a lot of weight on competences that help the operation of the economic system and productivity, is now led to the relegation of intellectual, moral and political cultivation of the citizens and ultimately to the depreciation of active citizenship. This relegation emerges from the all the more obvious secondary position occupied by the human sciences as "useless" studies in universities today on an international level. The same trend can be observed in the European space, as we saw in the second chapter.

Nussbaum believes that the downgrading of the human sciences in the contemporary universities and the strengthening of the sciences through their funding aimed at profit and economic growth results in the weakening of the citizens' democratic education and the downgrading of competences that are essential for cooperation on equal terms, solidarity, a critical attitude, social responsibility, a logical disposition and mutual understanding among people. Although she recognizes that humanistic studies, in today's economy and geopolitical reality lead

to the unemployment of graduates from these university departments, she believes that the downgrading of humanistic studies will be catastrophic for the future of the democratic society (Nussbaum, 2010). It is worth noting that Pierre Bourdieu had expressed a similar position. He defended the importance of social sciences and particularly of "sociology for the development of a truly democratic political action" and in fact in comparison with the highly charged role of the economists and the economy in the governments decisions (Bourdieu, 1996).

Nussbaum's, as much as Bourdieu's attitudes, echo a deep, and, in reality, old ideological contradiction, which is expressed not only in the university but in all the sectors of public life, among the supporters of the dominant neo-liberal paradigm and the supporters of a developed democratic society. This conflict returns today with especial intensity and provokes ideological conflicts and moral-political dilemmas, in which the university becomes unavoidably entangled.

The dilemma we referred to above between on the one hand the need for economic growth and on the other the need to meet the needs of the citizens and of democratic growth, resurfaces once more, although on different terms and in different circumstances. In a global economic environment which is extremely competitive for the survival of each body, the question is, how possible is it to find a balance and a compromise or a suitable combination of economic and socio-democratic role for the university so that the major objective of the democratic society, which is a good standard of living for all citizens, can be achieved?

In reality however, as Nussbaum claimed, we are not obliged to choose between a university that promotes profit and a university that promotes the education of good citizens, since a good economy requires the same competences that are demanded of citizenship. These are competences such as the interactive relationship, communication and cooperation, sensitivity and a positive attitude to difference and the ability to question power relations, which form a mesh of competences of the citizen which are at the same time economic competences as they aid economic efficiency. Consequently, according to this approach, the cultivation of democratic competences could indirectly contribute to the growth of a strong economy which would serve the whole of the democratic society and the needs of the citizens, and not one-sidedly the needs of the capitalist market. By extension, the human sciences not only don't undermine economic growth, but are an important instrument for its success and at the same time for the strengthening of democracy. In this way, the balance between the two sides of the dilemma we referred to previously can be achieved.

Following Nussbaum's problematic, one could claim that for such a balance to be achieved, and for the social and democratic role of the university to be strengthened, then the strengthening, through the human sciences, of a democratic and critical pedagogy which would aim at the implementation of democratic values in the real life of the university community, a fact that could have a positive impact as much on the economy as on democracy and wider society, is of vital importance.

Today, in western democracies, there is strong acceptance of the fact that the participation of citizens in public matters as well as their enjoyment of equal rights, are in decline, and consequently the question arises of how democracy can be revived. How can the university serve democracy? How can the necessary changes in the university be put into motion, in a world that is changing rapidly, so that it can contribute to democratic growth? In what direction should the university change especially in relationship to the produced knowledge and the way it is used in the learning process, so as to shape better terms for the cultivation and emancipation of the democratic citizen? What is the role of critical pedagogy and the teachers in the democratization of the university?

5.4 Critical pedagogy, teachers and democratization of the University

At the beginning of the 20th century, William Rainey Harper wrote: *The university, I contend, is this prophet of democracy, the agency established by heaven itself to proclaim the principles of democracy […]the university is the prophetic school out of which come the teachers who are to lead democracy in the true path […] it is the university that must guide democracy into the new fields of the arts and literature and science […] the university, I maintain, is the prophetic interpreter of democracy; the prophet of her past, in all its vicissitudes; the prophet of her present, in all its complexity; the prophet of the future, in all its possibilities* (Harper, 1905: 19-20).

The position that Harper expressed at the beginning of the 20th century for the university, beyond the limited idealism that defines it, assigns the institution a vital role in the growth of the democratic society, mainly through scientific knowledge and democratic learning, which he believes should be taken on by the teachers. He believes that the university is an institution that determines the whole of education, and which in turn constitutes the foundation for all democratic progress. His basic idea is that the university has a vital pedagogical role in everything concerning the shaping of teachers at every level, whose mission is to guide the young to democracy and as a result the education system in its entirety is seen as a pillar for the growth of

democracy. This idea of Harper's is not only one of the most important legacies of modernity, but one of the views supported by many later thinkers.

We know that the tradition of modernity considered education an essential prerequisite for progress in society and the emancipation of citizens and for this reason it was closely connected with democracy. This emancipation can be achieved firstly within the university, where the critical examination of knowledge is stronger than in any other institution. The development of critical pedagogy in the space of higher education is a basic prerequisite for the emancipation of the citizens and the support of democracy as it can link education to the demands of a critical democracy. Consequently, the emancipation of the citizens requires, primarily, the competence of critical discourse, through which the subjects can comprehend that knowledge, is not objective, but a social construct and that it is linked to powers that develop in all the spaces and institutions of society (Giroux, 2003).

The idea of critical pedagogy, as an active attitude in the face of knowledge and as a questioning of its use in the development of power relations, permeates Habermas' thinking, sine he believed that the purpose of the university is to promote and meet the needs of the democratic society, through critical reasoning. Habermas, in his critical social theory, supported the potential for a more just and more democratic social form of life through emancipatory and reforming democratic learning, which can develop primarily within the space of the university. According to Habermas, the university functions as an institution that promotes the critical transmission of culture, political consciousness and social integration. The role of the university is to be shaped as a community of communicative practice within the framework of which the domination of instrumental discourse can be weakened and critical discourse can be developed through which emancipation and social change can come (Fleming, 2006:112-113). Fleming points out that through Habermas' arguments, we can see the university as a community of reason and social criticism that questions the monopolising position of the economy in people's lives as well as the view that society's needs can be met only through economic growth.

From this point of view, critical thought is a fundamental prerequisite for an examination to be possible concerning the validity and the purposes that the scientific knowledge that the universities produce, serves. For this critical activity to be realised, the university can create the suitable conditions for a democratic society, which exist in our understanding of the university as a society of communicative action, like a community of communicative practice. For Habermas, Fleming concludes, the university is a lifeworld, colonized by the economy and the state, and it needs to be de-colonized through free and critical dialogue.

Habermas' approach to the university as a space where free rational communication, critical competence and practice, understood as rational human action, can develop, refers to an emancipation of the individual and his potential to direct his action freely, and, ultimately, to reform his social world. Consequently, the university constitutes a springboard and the foundation for building a democratic society which is not restricted to the university but extends to all its institutions. From this perspective, the individual is transformed into a subject of social change, so into a subject capable of acting not only within the university but within all social institutions, the purpose of which being the strengthening of the democratic characteristics of society through a change in the anti-democratic attitudes and practices that are bound up in social relationships.

This is a perception of the university and education in general, according to which democracy is not restricted to the level of political decisions but is a concern of all citizens, since everyone has a well understood interest in building a democratic society, transforming society in all its institutions and in all its aspects.

This perception of education and democracy follows the tradition of democratic thought of which John Dewey was a pioneer.

Dewey claimed that education constitutes a continuous process that is diffused across all social institutions and social fields and aims at what he himself defined as a "democratic way of life", which is characterized by free communication and free experiences (Dewey, 1916). This perception of education is logically connected with his perception of democracy, which he believes to be primarily a form of governance, as well as a form of human association, which ceaselessly creates a freer and more human experience which all share and to which all contribute (Dewey, 1897). Insofar as democracy is not limited to the political level, it is a matter for all, not only the political elite. The positions that Dewey develops propose a way of thinking and a method for understanding the role education in general, and the university in particular, is called on to play today.

Dewey's main idea, that democracy is a way of life that embraces all aspects of society and that democratic education must, in a similar way, be directed towards all institutions, clearly highlights that the space of education should constitute a spatial continuity with the external, the social world and consequently is an activity which concerns all institutions and all citizens. In other words it is, necessarily an activity of active and democratic citizens who will be activated in all institutions and aspects of social life, acting as pedagogues of democracy (Jenlink, 2009).

Dewey sees teachers as social and cultural workers in the service of the democratic society and its moral objectives. More specifically, the role of the teachers is to

contribute to the cultivation of mental and emotional dispositions which are acquired through reason and form the active and responsible citizen. For Dewey it is important that education leaders are shaped through the democratic use of knowledge, in other words a knowledge which will be in the service of a democratic society and not the market (Jenlink, 2009: 37). Dewey places emphasis on an educational leadership that will use knowledge within the framework of a critical pedagogy and which will be translated into practice with a view to social change and the promotion of democratic ideals.

The question that arises here is of whether the university can, and under which conditions, promote democracy through the exercise of an educational leadership as Dewey intends it, in other words a leadership in which all the members of the university community are activated as social and cultural workers, aiming through communication and critical pedagogical knowledge at social reform and the promotion of a democratic way of life in the university and in society too.

The issue of educational leadership, while not new, has reappeared in recent years in the international bibliography and it is believed that it constitutes one of the most significant factors not only for efficient governance of educational organizations, but for the strengthening of democracy and the cultivation of democratic values in the university and by extension, in the whole of society. To that effect, we will also examine under what conditions and to what degree a democratic educational university leadership can contribute to the democratization of the university.

5.5 Educational leadership and the University: theory and reality

In recent years, the theory of democracy has occupied international research to a large degree, while the topic of the relationship of the leadership with democracy has been relatively neglected. This can be explained by the fact that the concept of leadership is hard to reconcile with the concept of democracy. For example, leadership, in its traditional sense (strong leadership), that is to say, as the power to enforce the will of the leader is opposed to the democratic concept of equality, as well as freedom. The ability of the leader to enforce his will is closely linked to the authority that allows him to coordinate and organize collective-political action, something which requires him to make decisions and have the power to enforce them. The authority of the leader to make decisions and to enforce them is supported by the legal/bureaucratic structure of the power he exercises, and consequently he has the ability, as well as the duty, to take anti-democratic decisions, in other words decisions

which do not have the consent of the governed. Consequently, the concept of leadership is opposed to democracy (Danoff, 2010).

On the other hand, it is obvious that the leader, through his practices, shapes values and objectives, shows us what is desirable and encourages us to adopt certain ideals. From this perspective the leader can shape the rules for social life which constitute a point of reference for the practices that the members of a community or institution must follow, and, consequently he plays a pedagogical role. So long as the leader is seen as an individual that defends the common good and public interest or embodies rules and values, such as for example democratic values, and promotes these through his practices, then the leader can be considered to be teaching democracy.

The question that arises then is whether there are types of leadership that can strengthen democracy through a pedagogy which tends to promote democratic values and establish democratic practices in educational organizations, including the university.

Brian Danoff, inspired by Alexis de Tocqueville's idea of the democratic "moralist", supported the concept of the public intellectual who exercises democratic leadership insofar as he aims at the moral and political education of the citizen (educative leadership), and hence represents a kind of educational leadership (Danoff, 2010: chapter 5). Leadership of this type as a public-altruistic leadership which sees society's interests as identical to its own interests and consequently it is addressed to all citizens, like the workers, parents, students, and every individual who acts in the public sphere. Such an educational leadership could be democratic if it aims at the moral and political education of the people and the development of competences and perceptions that are implicit in democratic reasoning. Educational leadership, in this sense, can be exercised in every group, community or organization, such as school units and educational institutions, and consequently in the university too. Such a leadership is inspired by moral objectives and works for the realization of the moral objectives of the democratic society, with reasoning similar to that expressed by thinkers like Dewey.

Many scholars linked educational leadership with democratic objectives like freedom and social justice, the cultural and moral shaping of the active citizen (Grace, 2003), decisional rationality in all the educational body (Woods, 2005), the free exchange of ideas by all members of the educational community (Trafford, 2003), or the distribution of leadership roles, duties, accountability and participation in the educational events by all the members of the educational organization (Harris, 2014).

Certain of these theories focus on the formation of the contemporary democratic citizen and the development of a democratic culture. However, the majority of them refer in general terms to educational bodies, describing, it seems, and the coordinating and organizational role of educational leadership as far as collective action is concerned, rather than its educational role and its pedagogical features which are essential for the promotion of democracy in these bodies.

According to some, such theories tend simply to propose a set of relationships without explaining or investigating the deeper dimensions of these relationships within which the subjects interact, so as to grant the educational leadership substance (Dimmock & Walker, 2005). These theories tend in essence to promote an ideational situation in the educational bodies without taking into account their sociological features, like the hierarchical structures, the culture and the interests, and chiefly without incorporating a theory of change and reform of their internal power relationships through a critical rationality (Woods, 2005: 117).

On the other hand, the approaches to university leadership that were developed in recent years, place emphasis on the efficiency of the educational bodies, which is perceived primarily in economic terms and, in addition, is contrary to democracy, as we saw in the first chapter. This trend made its appearance in the 1990s and is linked to the growth of stronger managerial structures and to a strong trend towards the abandonment of the democratic-compensatory or participatory model, something which could be put down to the belief of governments "that institutions of higher education should assume responsibility for their own futures" and "…are invited to demonstrate an effective use of resources and that the objectives set have been attained" (Brawn and Merrien, 1999: 14). The efficiency of university management is placed as the main objective of their operation, in the name of which it seems that their democratic mission is abandoned in favour of the principle of accountability. However the objective of efficient management doesn't necessarily mean that it is considered incompatible with certain elements of democracy, which however are understood more as tools for greater efficiency rather than for the promotion of democracy.

Hence, more recent trends in the academic space incorporate the development of communication, the organizational culture or even the participation of the students in university governance (Bergan et al., 2011). However, even when creativity, common values, change within the framework of democratic processes, or the active participation of the members of the university community in the production of knowledge are included among the objectives of academic leadership, they are oriented mainly towards the adaptation of the university to the conditions of the

external environment and they don't assign it a vital role in the development of democracy within it and its diffusion in society (Hendrickson et al., 2013).

This trend reflects at the same time the real management of today's universities, where emphasis is placed firstly on their economic efficiency in combination with certain democratic elements, such as collectivism and the representativeness of the university community in decision making, as well as the participation of social partners, including representatives of the market. This fact suggests that the concept of efficiency in university governance today acquires an almost exclusively economic significance (Kladis, 2011). Efficiency in this sense has almost absolute priority over democratic objectives, to which the latter are ultimately subordinated and which they are called on to serve. Thus, in essence leadership is reduced to a form of governance, with superficial democratic elements.

Obviously, what chiefly concerns the governance of academic bodies today is their efficient management and adaptability to the economic environment, and not the development of democracy within it. It is equally clear they see democracy more as a tool and a means for the efficiency of their management rather than as a moral objective. It seems that the criticism that Habermas, Apple and Nussbaum as well as others expressed regarding the dominance of the market in education systems, chiefly the university in recent decades, is confirmed.

In addition, this perception is dictated by the idea that democracy is in opposition to the efficiency of educational bodies and that the entrance of market forces into education will prove beneficial for them. It has been claimed for example that educational democratic leadership tends to be bureaucratised and because of this fails to promote the objectives of the educational units and academic effectiveness, and that a strong educational leadership can better achieve academic goals in market conditions which the educational leadership must serve (Grace, 2003).

It is a fact that the bureaucracy of educational bodies, especially the universities, mainly due to their huge dimensions, is a problem that the theories of democratic educational leadership as a whole haven't taken into account, and from this point of view it is a problem and a barrier to the growth of democracy in the university and its promotion in society. The bureaucracy of educational bodies in combination with the growth of power relationships through the economic use of knowledge place enormous obstacles in the way of the growth of a democratic culture through the exercise of the version of leadership that Dewey developed, which is identical with the activation of the whole of the education community and its enlistment in democratic ideals.

Already in previous decades, the power of the universities to commit themselves to human values and promote democracy had been doubted, because of their bureaucracy. Jim Binder had already claimed in the 1980s that in the university "…the growth of educational bureaucracies that reward the professors for hasty and dirty lessons […] without showing any interest in their educational mission" can be observed, and that one of the main problems that universities face today is "…the lack of commitment in the academic professional as a result of the huge growth of the universities, which creates people of the organization rather than devoted teachers" (Binder, 1984: 29-30). Binder also claimed that in these conditions, freedom and responsibility are undermined and bureaucratic values, like productivity, formalism, order and conformity, are promoted.

Almost two decades later, the situation doesn't seem to have changed radically: according to Frank Plantan, author of the Final General Report (2002) of the Council of Europe project "Universities as sites of citizenship and civic responsibility", the research findings of the project in question show that "Both faculty and students, even at sites with relatively well developed participatory mechanisms, were generally found to have high levels of cynicism and apathy about the extent of democratic decision making and their ability to influence the process" (Plantan, 2002: 64). The research also found that "While university constituents believe in democratic decision-making, they generally agreed "that the university does not act like a democracy" due to too much hierarchy, bureaucracy and processes of exclusion" (Plantan, 2002: 66).

Today the university retains many of these features, although the traditional bureaucracy has changed and the professors-producers of knowledge have achieved important autonomy from the bureaucratic structures due to the economic value that university research and academic excellence have acquired. At the same time, the power of the professors-producers of knowledge has been strengthened to the extent that they retain the power to choose the most gifted students-colleagues thus reproducing elitism in the space of the university and, in order to maintain their advantages, they create teams which they control through the development of comparatively independent professional bureaucratic structures. This power allows them to exercise significant influence on university governance as well as in their daily life. According to Isabelle Barth, in today's universities, closed interest groups (clans) have developed, which have established a kind of "university feudalism" and their objective is the maintenance of the system. University leadership takes the shape of the power of "competences" in the name of academic excellence, downgrading however pedagogical excellence, something which leads to the creation

of inflexible, conservative structures which tend to reproduce the system and react to change, as well as reform, which, according to Barth, are considered to be impossible exactly because they threaten established interests (Barth, 2013).

The democratic crisis that the contemporary university now finds itself in, despite the rhetoric or the programmes and educational interventions which can be observed for example in the space of the European Union, has been further strengthened by the economic reasoning of neo-liberalism which is predominant today in the capitalist economy and has decisively influenced the sociological reality of the institution of the university. The predominance of interests, partial strategies and authoritarian practices at the expense of the common good have shaped within the folds of the university a community where democracy and human values are marginalised and its incumbent powers are relied on more as a guise and as a legitimating element of their power rather than as a moral priority. In these circumstances, the role of the teacher and especially of the educational leadership in the university clash in a painful and ineluctable economic and sociological reality that doesn't leave much room for substantial changes in the university.

5.6 Conclusions

It is obvious that the democratization of the university faces insurmountable difficulties, not only due to the growth of internal bureaucratic structures, but also because of the predominance of an economic rationale in whatever concerns the use of knowledge and the study programmes, in which as we saw, a downgrading of the social sciences can be observed. Although the phenomena mentioned above are more or less common to all western universities, we believe that the democratization of the university is interwoven mainly with the peculiarities and features of each country, given that the universities, as cultural institutions are embedded in society. The conclusions of the Council of Europe project "Universities as sites of citizenship and civic responsibility" to which we referred above, show that democratization of the university is a complex matter and is fraught with an enormous variety of problems and obstacles. Among these, the political culture, the political and social structures and traditions, the larger national economic conditions, as well as the structures within the university institution, often constitute barriers to change and play a decisive role in the ability of the university to promote democratic values or greater civic engagement.

Regarding the national characteristics, we saw in the previous chapter that in the case of the Greek university, factionalism and clientalism that characterise public

administration in general, can also be observed in the space of higher education. In addition, we saw that the teaching of human rights has been neglected in higher education as much by the universities themselves as by the official state policy, a fact that can be put down as much to the national political culture as the established social perceptions and a "culture of disinterest". These perceptions are linked to and strengthened by, as we claimed in the second chapter, the predominance of a view on democratization of the university which is restricted to "democratization of access", in the sense of the massification of the university. This "massification" was the result of social ambitions cultivated not based on the actual needs of the economy or aimed at the democratic cultivation of the students, but based on the need of the clientelist system to respond to the social demands that it itself had created through its rhetoric. Nevertheless, the massification of the university in this way was not a Greek peculiarity, but is observed all over the world, the difference being that in contrast to Greece, elsewhere it is linked primarily with the needs of the economy.

It is true that in previous decades democratization of the universities was chiefly linked to open access to higher education for the populace. The growth in the economy created new employment needs for a period of time, an element which is linked to the widening of university access, creating in this way conditions for social evolution insofar as the widening of access made it easier for lower class children to get into higher education.

Today interest has shifted to efficient university governance, which is seen mainly in terms of economic profit, while at the same time certain elements of democracy, such as the participation and representation of society in university governance, are incorporated. Within this framework, democracy is not a value or an end in itself but serves economic efficiency, at the expense of human and social sciences which constitute the pillar of the democratic mission of the university. This trend seems to more or less characterise universities on a global level.

International bodies, such as OECD for instance, assess the future of today's universities directly and indirectly according to economic criteria, such as economic benefit, economic growth, professional skills, efficient leadership and excellence without any reference to the growth of democracy (Glass, 2013, 2014). On the other hand, as much within the framework of Community institutions as within the framework of the creation of the EHEA, social cohesion, active citizenship, the development of common values for the safeguarding of democracy, as well as the social dimension of studies can be objectives, and often, depending on the times, marginalised, insofar as the economic dimension overrides everything and predominates. Thus, whatever provisions for democracy there are, they are more

general manifestos or appeals to governments to promote democracy in the national educational institutions rather than programmes or coordinated interventions aimed at substantial democratic reforms. It is clear that democracy in the university today is not a value in itself and is not among its priorities. From this perspective, democracy in the university, and in general, in the education systems of western democracies, is very far from the view that Dewey, as well as later thinkers like Aronowitz, Habermas and Nussbaum developed. It is true that today's shift in higher education towards market demands is dictated by a dire global situation, mainly economic. However, the future of democracy will depend to a great extent on the ability of the universities to link these needs to the needs of the democratic society and its citizens.

References

Aggelopoulos, G. (2013*)*. Policies promoting interdisciplinarity. Towards a typology of interdisciplinarity in postgraduate study programmes in greek universities. Doctoral thesis. Patras: University of Patras.

Anchan, P. J. (2015). An introduction to democratizing Higher Education. In Patrick Blessinger and John P. Anchan (eds), *Democratizing Higher Education*, New York: Routledge, 1 – 14.

Anderson, R.D (2004). *European Universities. From the Enlightenment to 1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Apple, M.W. & J.A. Beane (eds.) (1995). *Democratic Schools.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Aronowitz, S. (2008). *Against Schooling - Towards an Education That Matters.* Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers.

Balias, St. (2013). *University, Citizenship and Human Rights. Study on the Introduction of Human Rights Education and Citizenship into Study Programmes of the Pedagogical Departments 1995-2010*. Patras: University of Patras Publications (in Greek). [Study funded by "Karatheodoris Programme" of University of Patras]

Barrera, D. and V. M. Soares (2010). *Advancing Democratic Practice: A Self-assessment Guide for Higher Education (Council of Europe higher education series, no 14)*. Strasburg: Council of Europe Publications.

Bergan, S. (2004). Preface. In S. Bergan (ed), *The University as Res Publica.* Strasburg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Bergan, S. (2011). *Not By Bread Alone. (Council of Europe higher education series, no 17)*. Strasburg: Council of Europe Publications.

Bergan, S. and H. van't Land (eds) (2010). *Speaking Across Borders: The Role of Higher Education In Furthering Intercultural Dialogue. (Council of Europe higher education series, no 16)*. Strasburg: Council of Europe Publications.

Bergan, S. & R. Damian (eds) (2010). *Higher Education for Modern Societies: Competences and Values. (Council of Europe higher education series, no 15).* Strasburg: Council of Europe Publications.

Bergan, S., E. Ergon-Polak, J. Kohler, L. Purser & M. Vucasovic, (eds). (2011). *Leadership and Governance in Higher Education - Handbook for Decision Makers and Administrators.* Berlin: Raabe Academic Publishers.

Binder, J. (1984). Which future, university or bureaucracy?, *Innovative Higher Education*, 8 (1), 29 – 37.

Birnbaum, R. (2003). The end of shared governance: looking ahead or looking back, ERIC: 1-31.

Blessinger, P. (2015). The future of higher education: towards a democratic theory of higher education. In Patrick Blessinger and John P. Anchan (eds), *Democratizing Higher Education*, New York: Routledge, 199 – 213.

Bok, D. (1990). *Universities and The Future of America*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Boland, J. A. (2005). Student participation in shared governance: A meαns of advancing democratic values?, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 11: 199–217.

Bourdieu, P. (1996). Sociologie et démocratie. *Tribune Libre,* No 3.

Bourdieu, P. (2002). Pour un mouvement social européen. In *L'euro sans Europe, Manière de voir.* Le monde diplomatique, Janvier-fèvrier.

Braun, D. (1999). New managerialism and the governance of universities in a comparative perspective. In D.Braun, F.X. Merrien (eds), *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A Comparative View*, London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 239 – 261.

Brawn, B. & F.X. Merrien (1999). Governance of universities and modernization of the state. In D.Braun, F.X. Merrien (eds), *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities?* London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

CHEPS (2008a). *Governance Reform. Volume 1: Executive summary main report.* Brussels.

CHEPS (2008b). *Governance and Funding Reform. Volume2: Methodology, Performance Data, Literature Survey, National System Analyses and Case Studies.* Brussels.

Conseil de l'Europe (2005). *Étude Paneuropéenne des Politiques d'Éducation à la Citoyenneté Démocratique*. Strasbourg : Editions du Conseil de l'Europe.

Conseil de l'Europe (2010). *Charte du Conseil de l'Europe sur l'Éducation à la Citoyenneté Démocratique et Aux Droits de l'Homme*. Strasbourg: Éditions du Conseil de l'Europe.

Council of Europe (2009). *How All Teachers Can Support Citizenship and Human Rights Education: A Framework for the Development of Competences*. Strasburg: Council of Europe Publications.

Council of Europe (2013*). Living in Dignity in The 21st Century – Poverty and Inequality in Societies of Human Rights: The Paradox of Democracies.* Strasburg: Council of Europe Publications.

Council of Europe CDCS (2010). 23ed meeting, Strasbourg: 24-25/2/2010.

Dalton, C. Th. (2002). *Becoming John Dewey. Dilemmas of a Philosopher and Naturalist.* U.S.A.: Indiana University Press.

Danoff, B. (2010). *Educating Democracy. Alexis de Tocqueville And Leadership in America.* New York: State University of N.Y. Press, Albany.

David, M., V.Hey, & L. Morely (eds) (2011). Challenge, change or crisis in global higher education, special issue *Contemporary Social Science: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences 6* (2).

De Boer, H. (2007). Change and continuity in Dutch internal university governance and management, in Towards a cartography of higher education policy change, A Festschrift in Honour of Guy Neave, University of Twente, The Netherlands: CHEPS, 31 – 37.

Dewey, J. (1897). *The Political Writings.* Indianapolis & Cambridge: Hackett Publishing.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education.* Massachussets: IndyPublish.

Di Simone, M. R. (1996). Admission. In W. Ruegg, (ed.) *A History of The University in Europe, vol. II, Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800*), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 285 – 325.

Dimmock, C., & A. Walker (2005). *Educational Leadership:Culture and Diversity.* London: Sage Publications.

Drucker, P. (1993). *Post-capitalism Society.* London: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Duderstadt, J.J. (2014). Research universities to fulfil their global promise. In L. E. Weber and J.J. Duderstadt (eds), *Preparing Universities for an Era of Change*, Paris: Economica, 3 – 13.

Estermann, T. & A.L. Clayes-Kulik (2013). *Financially Sustainable Universities. Full-Costing: Progress and Practice*. Brussels: EUA Publications.

Estermann, T., E. Benetot Pruvot & A.L. Clayes-Kulik (2013). *Designing Strategies for Efficient Funding of Higher Education in Europe*. Brussels: EUA Publications.

Ethier, D. (1999). Does economic adjustment affect the legitimacy of democracies? *International Journal of Comparative Sociology, Vol 40, No1*: 425 – 453.

European Commission. (1991). *Memorandum on Higher Education in The European Community*. COM (91) 349 final. Brussels.

European Commission. (2011). *Modernisation of Higher Education in Europe. Funding and The Social Dimension*. Brussels.

European Commission. (2012). *Citizenship Education in Europe.* Brussels.

European Commission. (2013). *Towards a Mobility Scoreboard: Conditions for Learning Abroad in Europe.* Brussels.

European Commission. (2014). *Effects of Mobility on the Skills and Employability of Students and The Internationalization of Higher Education Institutions.* Brussels.

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2015). *The European Higher Education Area in 2015: Bologna Process Implementation Report.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Student's Union (ESU) (2010a). *Student Centered Learning. Survey Analysis for Student Centred Learning*. Bucharest.

European Student's Union (ESU) (2010b). *Student Centered Learning. An Insight into Theory and Practice*. Bucharest.

European Student's Union (ESU) (2010c). *Student Centered Learning. Toolkit for Students, Staff and Higher Education Institutions*. Brussels.

Eurydice (2000). *Two Decades of Reform in Higher Education in Europe: 1980 Onwards. Greece, National Description*, Brussels.

Evans, N. (2003). *Making Sense of Lifelong Learning*. New York: Routledge-Falmer.

Feidas, Ch. (2014). The state of university professors' salaries in Greece. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (in Greek).

Fleming, T. (2006). The university and democracy: Habermas, adult learning and learning society. In T.A.F. Kelly (ed.), *What Price The University?: Perspectives on The Meaning and Value of Higher Education.* From The National University of Ireland Maynooth. Maynooth: Department of Philosophy, 81 –95.

Gerbod, P. (2004). Relations with authority. In W.Ruegg (general editor), *A History of the University in Europe, vol. III*, W. Ruegg (ed), *Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800-1945)*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 83 – 100.

Gibbons, M. et al.(1994). *The New Production of Knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications.

Giroux, H. (2003). Crossing the boundaries of educational discourse: modernism, postmodernism and feminism. In A.H. Halsey, H. Lauder, Ph. Brown, & A.S. Wells, *Education : Culture, Economy, Society.* New York: Oxford University Press, 113 – 130.

Giroux, H. (2014). *Neoliberalism's War On Higher Education.* Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Glass, A. (ed) (2013). *The State of Higher Education.* OECD.

Glass, A. (ed) (2014). *The State of Higher Education.* OECD.

Government Offices of Sweden (2007). *Key Issues for the European Higher Education Area – Social Dimension and Mobility.* Report from the Bologna process working group on social dimension and data on mobility of staff and students in participating countries.

Grace, G. (2003). Politics, markets, and democratic schools: on the transformation of school leadership. In A.H. Halsay, H. Lauder, Ph. Brown, & A.S. Wells, *Education: Culture, Economy, Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 311 – 319.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Toward a Rational Society. Student Protest, Science, and Politics.* London: Heimann.

Habermas, J. (2013). The european crisis and social Europe democracy, solidarity and the european crisis. In *Roading to a social Europe*. A.M. Grozelier, B. Hacker, W. Kowalsky, J. Machnig, H. Meyer and B. Unger (eds). Social Europe Report, 4-13.

Halsay, A., H. Lauder, Ph. Brown & A.S. Wells (2003). The transformation of education and society: an introduction. In A. Halsay, H. Lauder, Ph. Brown, & A.S. Wells, *Education: Culture, Economy, Society.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1 – 44.

Harper, W. R. (1905). *The Trend in Higher Education.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Harris, A. (2014). *Distributed Leadership Matters: Perspectives, Practicalities and Potential.* California: Corwin.

Hendrickson, R. M., J. E. Lane, J. T Harris & R. H Dorman (2013). *Academic Leadership and Governance of Higher Education.* Sterling: Stylus Publishers.

Henkel, M. & B. Little (1999). Concluding remarks. In M. Henkel & B. Little (eds), *Changing Relationships Between Higher Education and The State*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 338 – 343.

Huber, J. & P. Mompoint – Gaillard (2011). Preface. In J. Huber & P. Mompoint – Gaillard (eds), *Teacher Education for Change: The Theory Behind The Council of Europe Pestalozzi Programme (Pestalozzi Series no 1)*. Strasburg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Huisman, J., H. De Boer & L. Goedegebuure (2006). The perception of participation in executive governance structures in Dutch universities, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 12: 227–239.

Huisman, J & M. Van der Werde (2004). *On Cooperation and Competition. National and European Policies for The Internationalization of Higher Education*. Bonn: Lemmens.

Huisman, J & M. Van der Werde (2005). *On Cooperation and Competition II. Institutional Responses to Internationalization, Europeanisation and Globalization.* Bonn: Lemmens.

Humber, J. & I. Harkavy (eds) (2007*). Higher Education and Democratic Culture: Citizenship, Human Rights and Civic Responsibility (Council of Europe higher education series, no 8)*. Strasburg: Council of Europe Publications.

Institut Thomas More (2009). *Vers Quel Classement Européen des Universités? Étude Comparative du Classement de Shanghai et des Autres Classements Internationaux.* Note de Benchmarking 4. Bruxelles.

Janicaud, D. (1987). *Les Pouvoirs de la Science: un Siècle de Prise de Conscience.* Paris: J. Vrin.

Jarausch, K.H. (1983). Higher education and social change: some comparative perspectives. In K. H. Jarausch (ed), *The Transformation of Higher Learning (1860-1930). Expansion, Diversification, Social Opening and Professionalization in England, Germany, Russia, and the United States*. Stuttgart: Klett Cotta, 9 – 36.

Jenlink, P. M. (ed.) (2009). *Dewey's Democracy and Education Revisited. Contemporary Discourses for Democratic Education and Leadership* . New York: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Karalis, Th. and St. Balias (2007). Citizenship and life – long learning in modern democratic societies. *To Vima ton Koinonikon Epistimon (in greek), no 50*:143 – 161 (in greek).

Kavasakalis, Aggelos (2011). Greek universities and evaluation. Quality assurance in the european higher education area. Doctoral thesis. Patras: University of Patras.

Kavasakalis, A. & G. Stamelos (2014). *EHEA and Quality Assurance in Greek Universities: A twofold inquiry*. Saarbrücken: LAMBERT Academic Publishing.

Kiprianos, P. (1995). Diplômes et Etat: sur la passion de l'école dans la Grèce contemporaine, *Revue Tiers Monde,* vol. 143 : 598-619.

Kladis, D. (2006). The social dimension of the Bologna process: principles and concepts. In *Bologna Handbook.* Supplement I, September 2006, Editors EUA and RAABE Academic Publishers.

Kladis, D. (2011). Democracy vs. efficiency in higher education governance. In *Leadership and Governance in Higher Education Handbook*, Volume I, March 2011, Editors CoE, IAU and RAABE Academic Publishers, 1 – 22.

Kladis, D. (2012). University governance: democracy and/or efficiency? *Journal Academia, A Publication of Higher Education Network*, vol. 2. No. 1:5-29.

Klemencic, M. (2012). The changing conceptions of student participation in HE governance in the EHEA. In Adrian Curaj, Sir Peter Scott, Lazăr Vlasceanu, Lesley Wilson (eds), *European Higher Education at The crossroads – Between the Bologna Process and National Reforms*. Heidelberg: Springer: 631 – 653.

Kohler, J., J. Huber, & S. Bergan (eds) (2006). *Higher Education Governance Between Democratic Culture, Academic Aspirations and Market Force*. Council of Europe Higher Education Series. Strasbourg.

Lambrianidis, L. (2012). Highly skilled migration: what differentiates the 'brains' who ares drained from those return in the case of Greece?". Population, *Space and Place. 19*: 472 – 486.

Lapworth, S. (2004). Arresting decline in shared governance: Towards a flexible model for academic participation, *Higher Education Quarterly*, vol. 58, October: 299-314.

Larsen, I. M., P. Maassen & B. Stensaker (2009). Four basic dilemmas in university governance reform, *Higher Education Management and Policy*, volume 21/3, OECD: 1-18.

Laval, Ch. et al. (2012). *La Nouvelle Ècole Capitaliste*. Paris: La Découverte.

Lenz, C. (2011). The key role of education for sustainable democratic societies. In J. Huber & P. Mompoint – Gaillard (eds), *Teacher Education for Change: The Theory Behind The Council of Europe Pestalozzi Programme*. Pestalozzi Series, no 1. Strasburg: Council of Europe Publishing, 17 – 24.

Levin, Y. (2006). The moral challenge of modern science. *The New Atlantis No 14* : 32 – 46.

Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 53, No 1: 69 – 105.

Liu, N.C. & Y. Cheng (2005). Academic ranking of world universities – Methodologies and problems, *Higher Education in Europe*, 30(2). http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.126.3066&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Lockwood, J (2011). Management and resources . In W. Ruegg (general editor), *A History of the University in Europe, vol. IV*, W.Ruegg (ed), *Universities since 1945*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 124 – 160.

Menon, M. E. (2005). Students' views regarding their participation in university governance: implications for distributed leadership in higher education, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 11: 167–182.

Moutsios, S. (2013). The de-europeanization of the university under the Bologna process, *Thesis Eleven* 119(1): 22–46.

Mouzelis, N. (2002). *From Change to Modernization.* Athens: Themelio. (In greek).

Newman, F., L. Couturier & J. Scurie (2004). *The Future of Higher Education: Rhetoric, Reality and The Risks of The Market.* San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not For Profit: Why Democracy Needs The Humanities.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

OECD, (2004). *Education at a Glance 2004*, Paris: OECD.

OECD, (2011). *Education Policy Advice for Greece. Strong Performers and Successful Reformers in Education.* Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2013a). *Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes. Feasibility Study Report. Volume 2 – Data Analysis and National Experiences*. Paris: OECD.

OECD (2013b). *Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes. Feasibility Study Report*. Volume 3 – Further Insights. Paris: OECD.

OECD, (2015), *Education at a Glance 2015*, Paris: OECD.

Olsen, J. & P. Maassen (2007). European debates on the knowledge institution: The modernization of the university at the european level. In P. Maassen & J. Olsen (eds), *University Dynamics and European Integration.* Dordrecht: Springer, 3 – 23.

Olsen, M. & M. A. Peters (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism, *Journal of Education Policy*, 20 (3): 313 –345.

Pitsou, Hariklea (2013). *UN policies on human rights education (1995-2009): implementation of the educational model of the "cognitive pyramid" in greek university departments for teachers and pre-school teachers*. Doctoral thesis. Patra: University of Patras (in greek).

Planas, A., P. Soler, J. Fullana, M. Pallisera & M. Vila (2011). Student participation in university governance: the opinions of professors and students, *Studies in Higher Education*: 1-13.

Plantan, F. (2002). Universities as sites of citizenship and civic responsibility. In *Final General Report*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Ponten, A. (2007). Is the Bologna process for everyone? The social dimension – A key issue for the future of the european higher education area. In *Bologna Handbook,* Supplement VI, December 2007, Editors EUA and RAABE Academic Publishers.

Portelli, J.P. & A.B. Vibert (2013). Standardization and equity in education. In W. Hare and J.P. Portelli (eds), *Philosophy of education: Introductory readings* (4th ed.). Edmonton AB: Brush Education.

Rhodes, F.H.T. (2007). The role of higher education for sustainable democratic culture. In J. Humber and I. Harkavy (eds), *Higher Education and Democratic Culture: Citizenship, Human Rights and Civic Responsibility (Council of Europe higher education series, No 8)*. Strasburg: Council of Europe Publications, 39 – 47.

Ringer, F. (1979) *Education and Society in Modern Europe*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Ruegg, W.& J. Sadlak (2011). Relations with authority. In W. Ruegg (general editor), *A History of the University in Europe, vol. IV*, W. Ruegg (ed)*, Universities since 1945*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 73 – 122.

Sanz, N. & S. Bergan (eds). (2007). *The Heritage of European Universities. (Council of Europe higher education series, no 7).* Strasburg: Council of Europe Publications.

Scott, P. (2007) The "Nationalisation of UK universities 1963-2007", in Towards a cartography of higher education policy change, A Festschrift in Honour of Guy Neave, University of Twente, The Netherlands: CHEPS, 59 – 66.

Sianou – Kirgiou, E. (2010). *From The University to The Labour Market: Facts of The Social Inequalities*. Athens: Metaixmio (in Greek).

Simpson, J. S. (2014). *Longing for Justice: Higher Education and Democracy's Agenda*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Skarpalezos, A.K. (ed). (1964) *From the History of The University of Athens* (historical texts and historical data), Athens (in Greek).

Slaughter, S. & G. Rhoades (2009). *Academic Capitalism and The New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education.* Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Stamelos, G. (1990). Le phénomène « étudiant étranger ». Le cas des étudiants hellènes dans les universités françaises. Thèse de Doctorat Nouveau. Paris VIII. Paris.

Stamelos, G. (2009). *Education Policy*. Athens: Dionikos.

Stamelos, G. & A. Vassilopoulos. (2014). Les compétences comme notion normative : vers la construction du nouvel individu en UE et le rôle de l'université, *Penser l'éducation*, N.34 : 127 – 148.

Stamelos, G., A.Vassilopoulos & A. Kavasakalis (2015). *Introduction to Education Policies.* Athens: e-book Kallipso.

Stamelos, G. & K. Karanatsis (2002). Allusions to the past and the present of the Greek University, introduction to the greek edition of the book by RENAUT A., *Les revolutions de l'universite. Essai sur la modernisation de la culture.* Athens: Gutenberg.

Sternsaker, B. (2012). Re-inventing shared governance – Implications for culture and identity, Keynote resented to the 34th FAIR Forum, University of Stavanger, 5-8th September: 1-17.

Stone, L. (1975). The size and composition of the Oxford student body, 1580-1910. In L. Stone (ed), *The University in Society* I, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3 – 119.

Taylor, R., J. Barr, & T. Steele (2002). *For a Radical Higher Education: After Postmodernism.* Buckingham: Open University and Society for Research into Higher Education.

Trafford, B. (2003). *School Councils, School Democracy, School Improvment: Why, What, How*. Leicester: Secondary Heads Association.

Venieris, D. (2002). *European Social Charter: The Social Policy of The Council of Europe*. Athens: Ellinika Grammata. (in greek).

Vinokur, A. (2005). Avant-propos, *Cahiers de la recherché et sur l'éducation et les savoirs*, no 1: 7-13.

Vos, L. (2011). Students movement and political activism. In W. Ruegg (general editor), *A History of the University in Europe vol. IV*, W. Ruegg (ed), *Universities Since 1945,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 276 – 318.

Weber, L. & S. Bergan (eds.) (2005). *The Public Responsibility for Higher Education and Research.* Council of Europe. Higher Education Series. No. 2. Strasbourg.

Woods, P. (2005). *Democratic Leadership In Education.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

E-references

Bacevic, J. (xxxx). Higher education and citizenship in central and South – East Europe: Exploring the links [on line]. Available: http://www.herdata.org/public/JBacevic_ECPR.pdf [15/2/2016].

Barth, I. (2013). L'impossible réforme de l'Université : une analyse par les sciences de gestion. http://blog.educpros.fr/isabelle_barth/2013/05/21/_limpossible-reforme-de-luniversite-une-analyse-par-les-sciences-de-gestion

Council of Europe (2007). Terms of reference for the european committee for social cohesion (CDSC) [on line]. Available:https://wcd.coe.int/wcd/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1098735&Site=COE [10/2/2016].

Council of Europe (2007). Terms of reference for the european committee on migration (CDMG) [on line]. Available: https://wcd.coe.int/wcd/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1324501&Site=CM [10/2/2016].

Council of Europe (2008). Invitational forum on converging competences: Diversity, higher education, and sustainable democracy [online]. Available:

http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/ Forum7 _Converging_competences/Programme_EN.pdf [14/2/2016].

Council of Europe (2010). New strategy and council of Europe action plan for social cohesion [on line]. Available:http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/ socialpolicies/ default_en.asp [11/2/2016].

Council of Europe (2011). Shared social responsibility: securing trust and sustainable social cohesion in a context of transition, Brussels: 28/2/2001–1/3/2011 [on line]. Available: http://www.coe.int/ t/dg3/ default_en.asp. [12/2/2016].

Eurostat, Statistics explained [on line]. Available: http://ec.europa.eu/ eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/
File:Number_of_tertiary_education_students,_2013_%28thousands%29_ET15.png

KANEP/GSEE (2016). The key figures of education 2015. Athens [on line]. Available: http://www.kanep-gsee.gr/sitefiles/files/2015_ekth.pdf

Kiprianos, P., I. Kamarianos, G. Stamelos & S. Balias (2011). Market and the higher european educational policies: when the markets fail-the case of Greece, *Revista Educação Skepsis*, n. 2, São Paulo, July: skepsis.org:, 61-89 [on line]. Available: http://academiaskepsis.org/ revistaEducacao.html

Lambrianidis, L. (2013). The mutually reinforcing relation between international migration of highly educated labour force and economic crisis: the case of Greece. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*. 13(4): 525-551. DOI:10.1080/14683857.2013.859814.

Labrianidis, L. (2014). Investing in leaving: the Γreek case of international migration of professionals, *Mobilities*, 9 (2): 314-335. DOI:10.1080/ 17450101.2013.813723.

OECD (2014). Education at a Glance 2014: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing [on line]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2014-en

Stamelos G. (2014). The issue of the social legitimization of the Greek university: historical origins, future challenges (1974-today), *Academia,* 4(1): 200-236 [on line]. Available: http://academia. lis.upatras.gr/index.php/academia/article/view/2227/2346

Stamelos, G. & S. Paivandi (2015). Access to higher education in southern europe, *Academia,* 5(1): 1-17 [on line]. Available: http://hepnet. upatras.gr/index.php/el/published/articles?format=pdf

Vitkova, E. (2013). Teacher education for change: Pestalozzi programme [on line]. Available: http://www.afs.org/blog/icl/?p=3474 [13/2/2016].

http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/submitViewTableAction.do

http://data.uis.unesco.org/Index.aspx?queryid=172

http://www.imerisia.gr/article.asp?catid=26510&subid=2&pubid=113706179

http://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SJO01/