HIGHER EDUCATION POLICIES IN TRANSITION: WHAT DRIVES TRENDS IN THE RESTRUCTURING OF UNIVERSITIES?

Pero Maldini
Odjel za komunikologiju, Sveučilište u Dubrovniku

Pregledni rad
Primljeno: rujan 2011.

Summary This article tries to examine the major aspects of current trends that impact higher education policies in ongoing processes of universities' restructuring, particularly higher education system transformation in Europe (Bologna process), with an emphasis on postcommunist societies. Globalization, internalization and marketization are identified as main exogenous factors, while massification, national specificities (political and cultural), educational legacies, and local government capabilities are the most significant endogenous factors that determine reforms of higher education systems. The author examines the trends of universities' restructuring under conditions of change of traditional relations between them and the social environment, particularly the state. They are characterized by diminishing of the key role of the nation-state in current social and economic development, as well as gradual decomposition of the welfare state and reduction of its core functions, including a significantly reduced support to higher education. Both processes push policy makers toward market-led policies on higher education, which causes problems, whether of higher education sustainability, or quality and competitiveness, or accessibility and equity. The author argues that the exogenous factors largely impact (or directly create) trends that affect changes in higher education systems, particularly in the universities' role and mission, while the endogenous factors are mainly responsible for the success of reforms in certain societies.

Keywords higher education system, globalization, marketization, massification, nation-state, welfare state, public policies, Bologna process

Introduction

The accelerated processes of economic, social and political change that marked the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century have actuated the reconsideration of the mission and functions of universities in the new environment. Public debate on changes in

the higher education system, particularly on the reform of universities and rethinking of their role in contemporary society,[1] is increasingly pronounced. It is an essential part of academic hearings, but even more a part of political discourse, actually – a very significant part of public policies.

Those policies, although at the level of national governments, are strongly influenced by the global trends that inevitably impact all of them. Their main goal is a reform of the higher education system in order to adapt it to the challenges and demands of the global environment (competitiveness), to fulfill public expectations in their own societies (educational and social), and to achieve sustainability (in terms of economic viability). Although most of the higher education policies start from those or similar reasons – due to the various higher education systems, educational legacies, practices and actors – their effectiveness and results are different. Because of the increasing need of adjustments to fast and large-scale changes that occur in the political, economic and social environment both nationally and globally, universities as the central institutions of higher education systems are going through a transitory crisis.

Therefore, this article will try to examine the main aspects of current trends in ongoing processes of universities' restructuring, pointing out particularly the Bologna process as a major reform of the higher education system in Europe. It will try to determine the key factors which drive those trends and basically examine both its background and directions. In so doing, there will be a distinction between the exogenous and endogenous factors that play a crucial role in higher education system reforms. Globalization, internalization and marketization would be considered as the main exogenous factors, which consist of a complex set of various processes causing large-scale changes both at global and national levels, including the higher education systems as well. Massification, as a product of modernization and democratization, national specificities (political and cultural), educational legacies, long-lasting practices, and local government capabilities and engagement – could be considered as the most significant endogenous factors that determine reforms of the higher education system. One might assume that the former factors largely impact trends that affect changes in higher education systems, while the latter factors are mainly responsible for the success of reforms. This will be examined further in the article.

Globalization and its Impact on Higher Education System Transformation

There are many reasons for the transformation of the contemporary higher education systems. Yet, most of them arise from a substantially altered social environment that emerges under the im-

[1] Universities serve many purposes in contemporary societies and have direct and indirect impacts on the whole society. They are multifaceted and essential public-good institutions that serve as engines of the knowledge economy, but also as a base for realization of the humanistic and cultural goals of society and of individuals. Although education and research are the basic and the most prominent roles of universities, no less important is their role in overall social development in terms of socialization, participation and social mobility through the education of citizens (cf. Newman, 2000).

pact of various factors – whether those that are imposed from outside of individual societies, or those that arise from internal (national) specificities. But it is no exaggeration to say that most of them are coming from (or are induced by) the globalization and the knowledge-based economy that demand (or rather force) transformation of the traditional type of universities, not only in terms of their educational content and organization, but also in terms of their mission and social role generally. Globalization exerts a strong pressure that pushes toward the changes, and in many ways creates the trends that directly affect the transformation policies in certain societies, not only the higher education system and universities as an important segment of the public sphere, but also the national public policies in general.

Globalization, as a complex structure of multiple economic, political and cultural processes,[2] rapidly and fundamentally changes the nature of the academic enterprise to a degree that until recently seemed almost unimaginable. It acts as an impersonal and inevitable force in order to justify certain policy directions (like internationalization, privatization or marketization). It is not just a set of (economic, cultural, political) processes, it is also an ideology. In this sense, one of its effects has been the intensification of debate over the most desirable structures for governing national economy, state institutions (including the higher education system as well), and even the political system.

From the political point of view, what is most obvious is that globalization processes strongly impact nation-states as classic forms of political community, and it is reflected through a decomposition of their sovereignty and authority. Their role and position under the new circumstances are significantly transformed. The changed position of the nation-state is visible through the objectively reduced (divided) and substantially different form of sovereignty, through the forming of new political identity and legitimacy of the political community, and through the new relationships within the international political community (a "new world order"). Among other things, political decision-making processes, guidance and control over the national economies are no longer the exclusive rights of nation-states as classic political communities. In many ways, they are shared with different supranational institutions or/and at least taking into account diverse interests from the international environment.

In other words, worldwide integration inevitably leads to diminishing capacity of national governments to control the economic and social activities within their countries. Power is shifting from traditional political systems to a global economy beyond full control of

[2] Globalization is primarily an economic process, but also political and cultural, and communication linking of different societies and states that are establishing a historically new type of their multiple connections, relationships and interference. It is a phenomenon of space located on a continuum between the local at the one end, and the global at the other. Decisions and actions within a community are increasingly affecting the lives of other communities, often having global repercussions. Globalization affects a series of political, social and economic activities which are becoming interregional or intercontinental, and intensifies the mutual relationship, both within and between states and societies (cf. Giddens, 1990; Parry and Moran, 1994; Castells, 1996; Maldini, 2008).

the nation-states, limiting the ability of governments to function successfully under the old rules (cf. Mohrman *et al*., 2008: 21). Once a very important territorial control (as an expression of sovereignty) becomes less important than control and access to markets, which in turn is linked to education by the capacity to build new technology, maximize human resources, and generate and use new knowledge. In that context, globalization is more often associated with competitive education markets and commercial knowledge-transfer rather than with vanishing national borders.

In the changed political, economic and cultural environment, national identity ceases to be the most important social glue, and therefore its production, cultivation and inculcation – ideals that stood behind the modern university – cease to be crucial social tasks. The university seems to be no longer capable of maintaining its modern role as a cultural institution closely tied up with the nation-state of Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment Europe.[3] In the globalizing world of today, references made to national culture as the *raison d'être* of the university sound less and less convincing, especially considering the fact that the state itself, undergoing transformation, disregards its tradition. The university in its traditional modern form is no longer a partner of the nation-state as it is incompatible with the perspective of global consumerism. Therefore, together with the decline of modernity as a social, political and cultural project, the political and economic role of the nation-state decreases in the global circulation of capital, and the decreasing role of the state goes hand in hand with the decreasing role of its modern ideological arm – the university (Kwiek, 2000: 3-4).

Within the modern nation-state as the dominant form of sovereign political community, the university had a central role in promoting national culture, consciousness and education. Dissolution of traditional forms of national state and change of the function of its institutions – significantly alter the role of universities. It is obvious that universities – deprived of their modern culture and nation-state-oriented mission – are lesser partners to the state, and no longer have such a role. In the global environment, which is increasingly international, national determinants play a less important role. National pride – formerly used to guide the public attitude to higher education – is not of prime importance any more. In such a situation, when there is no longer a nation-building-oriented ideal of higher education (national culture and consciousness) with universities as its main holders and hence strong arms of the nation-state – there emerges the question of appropriateness of higher education system public financing.

This is closely related to the weakening of the functions of the welfare state, which is manifested through the invasion of economic rationality and corporate culture into the public sector

[3] In the era of Enlightenment, the ideal of education was cultivation, or culture, i.e. producing a responsible, autonomous and mature individual – with strong emphasis on national education ("bildung"), i.e. inculcating nation-state consciousness and national aspirations, producing citizens of emerging nation-states. Universities were considered as national treasure contributing to national consciousness and national identity, therefore as central national institutions of the highest national importance, and their prosperity was of national interest (cf. Kwiek, 2000: 3; 2003: 6).

(neo-liberal concept in economy).[4] A public sector reform – which has been the hot topic and significant part of public policies in many countries in the last two decades – implies a reformulation of the scope and responsibilities of the state for the public sector in general. As a consequence, there is a decomposition of the welfare state, i.e. considerable reducing or cutting down of its functions and/or privatization (marketization) of some traditionally public (state) sectors, which certainly includes lesser government support to higher education, particularly universities. Namely, the core argument in this context is the inability of the state to finance public higher education, especially in the situation of its massification, enhanced complexity, and highly grown costs. So, the financial burden is increasingly transferred to the users through various kinds of cost-sharing arrangements or similar mechanisms.[5] It is the same as in other segments of the public sector that undergo similar treatment (e.g. healthcare, pensions, social care, and primary education).

Besides, in the situation of diversification of higher education institutions, there is increasing public attention to the mission and accountability of public universities. It is present especially in postcommunist societies, which are experiencing both transformation of old public universities (usually according to the Bologna process) and emergence of various new higher education institutions, mostly private and specialized for vocational education. The reluctance of

[4] Although such impact is strong and has a factual basis, responses to global challenge to the welfare state are not uniform across countries. They depend mostly on whether a particular country passively accepts such pressures or seeks ways to limit the destructive tendencies which globalization may hold for the welfare state. Namely, according to the evidence, multiple responses to globalization pressures are possible and the fate of the welfare state depends on institutional structures and policy decisions rather than on inevitable capitulation to global forces (cf. Bowles and Wagman, 1997: 332-333).

[5] As far as cost sharing in higher education is concerned, Johnstone argues that "recent years have seen a dramatic, albeit uneven and still contested, shift in the burden of higher education costs from governments or taxpayers to students and families. Thus, we can observe cost sharing entering into the public policies of countries with totally different social-political-economic systems and at totally different stages in their expansion of higher educational participation: e.g. China, Vietnam, the UK and Austria" (Johnstone, 2003: 352). Expenditure on educational institutions in terms of percentage of GDP illustrates the priorities a country places on education in relation to its overall allocation of resources. According to the OECD study "Education at a Glance" published in September 2010, total expenditure (public plus private) of GDP on higher education in the United States was 3.1% of GDP, in Canada 2.6%, in France 1.5%, in Germany 1.2%, and in UK 1.1%. If we consider only the state allocation account, the data are somewhat different: Canada 1.5% of GDP, France 1.2%, U.S. 1%, Germany 1%, UK 0.7% (cf. OECD, 2010: 208-220). Private expenditures, in terms of percentage of total higher education spending, are visible from another international comparison: Chile 76%, Korea 83%, Thailand 67%, the United States 53%, Australia 44%, Canada 43%, the United Kingdom 37%, France 14%, and Germany 8%. State intervention can be highly restrictive in terms of granting or denying posts and budgets (according to B. R. Clark, cf. Pritchard, 2006: 99-100).

public universities and academic staff to adapt to the new situation, immunity to criticism, and relative lack of transparency – raise questions of their accountability and justification of public funding of their institutions. They are losing public trust and credibility, particularly with regard to significantly enhanced possibilities of choice between various types of education provided by newly--emerged higher education institutions. Such a situation in turn suits perfectly the trends of reducing support to higher education institutions, which simply closes this vicious circle.

In this context, it is very important to consider the consequences of massification, the process that makes it increasingly difficult to maintain the higher education system. Massification emerges as a direct product of the modernization process (significantly fostered by democratization that has opened up new channels of social mobility and enabled wider social groups to access higher education). It is caused by a relatively constant economic growth and associated social development in all highly developed and middle developed societies at the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st. Postindustrial societies, among others, are characterized by a strong growth of the middle class, by diversification of professions and jobs, and by a strong increase in the number of people participating in the tertiary stage of education. Namely, the economic, technological and social developments have caused the need for increasing numbers of highly educated professionals as well as the variety of different and new professions and jobs. Accordingly, the number of appropriate higher education curricula (as well as the number of universities) has also increased in order to meet the needs of such social development. Certainly, it has directly affected the growing number of students at universities.[6] A direct implication of such a process was significantly increased public expenditure for higher education.

Furthermore, massification has brought about a change in the structure of students. Namely, besides the usually prevailing structure of regular students (usually aged 18-24), the new structure is increasingly characterized by diversity in ages (almost all age groups) and types of students (regular, working, returning, and life-long learning students) (Eurydice/Eurostat, 2002: 16-18, 91--115). In this way, the changed structure required appropriate adaptation of studies (curricula, organization, and faculty) to different segments of the student population, which in turn also produces increased costs.

To this should also be added the increased costs of the university level educational process by itself, because it is more sophisticated and technologically advanced than ever before, needs more faculty to be engaged, and more facilities. Such costs become unbearable for state budgets, especially in countries where higher education systems (particularly universities) are completely or dominantly publicly funded. This situation, with the tendency of further increase in the number of students, faces governments with the serious problem of sustainability – both the state

[6] Over the 1998-2006 period, the student population in tertiary education continued to rise steadily in the European Union. In all, the number of students in the EU increased in these years by 25%, or by an average annual growth rate of 2.8% (Eurydice/Eurostat, 2002: 108).

budget and the higher education system.

Coping with such a situation, they try to find solutions. In order to cut the state budget expenditures and to provide further maintenance of the higher education system – most of the policy makers are oriented toward introduction of different forms of marketization. Economic rationality increasingly pushes higher education policies in that direction; the more as the financial crisis and problems of sustainability deepen. Economic rationality and the market logic are imposing the primacy of economy over politics, the public good, and general (particularly social) interests.[7] Such principles implemented to the higher education system are directing governments to finance public higher education only partly, and pushing universities to transform from public institutions into academic enterprises organized on a corporate-like basis, which includes introduction of management and profit-oriented activities.

Market-driven forms of administration in higher education are based on the classical postulates of microeconomic and macroeconomic management in companies or in economy. This is the way the role of the contemporary university is understood. The long present concept of education as a public good in terms of market competition is replaced by the concept of education as a private commodity, the "raw" or "enriched" (value added) form. As in the classical market trade of goods and services, the universities have to trade commodities, primarily knowledge. Therefore, it is possible to determine the constitutive elements of supply and demand for higher education. Thus, we can say that there is a "student market", an "academic market", a "market of educational services", and a "market of research". Such understanding also points to a market-led organization of education (as it is common in Great Britain), and a market-led definition of higher education contents, which are oriented towards the needs of an "employment market" (that's common in most of the other countries). The concept, expressed in such a bare form, certainly seems rough and inappropriate to academic institutions such as universities, particularly in the context of the (continental) European tradition. However, rapid changes brought about by global trends and changes within the higher education system inevitably revise the long-lasting model of state support to the public sector and the higher education system as its significant part, and force governments to implement policies which consist of certain market-oriented mechanisms.

Seen from that perspective, it seems that there are many reasons to introduce market mechanisms in higher education. One of the most important is undoubtedly the need for greater economic (and not only economic) efficiency of higher education, particularly in the situation

[7] Globalization of higher education is ultimately based on the market-driven fundamentals. Deregulation rather than state control, liberalization of trade and capital circulation, privatization of public enterprises – these are the strategic parts of public policies of governments. Global competition is increasingly being used as a rationale for governmental policy options. The politicians in charge often have no choice but to cut spending in areas where no powerful interest groups prevent it. Among such areas are cultural facilities, schools and universities (cf. Yang, 2003: 272, 276).

of huge massification and increasingly grown costs. It is achievable through market competition in higher education which takes place through prompt and permanent innovation and adaptation of educational content to the omnipresent changes in society. In an increasingly competitive world, there is less and less space for universities whose educational quality and research achievements are not up to the peers and to public expectations. More and more, they will have to prove themselves individually in the competition arena – which can be offered in most aspects only by the market.[8]

But such adaptation needs administration in higher education which is quite different from the traditional ones, particularly those typical for government control and state funding. Although significant reforms are undertaken, especially in the European educational area, most of the higher education institutions and policy makers are not quite ready for the upcoming changes. Namely, both search for mechanisms which are more stable and regulated, and which can provide more certainty for higher education institutions – unlike the market, which is in that sense merciless. Although the commitment for change and adaptation of the higher education system is clearly expressed in the Bologna process, there is also a fear of leaving the higher education system to uncontrollable market forces, which could destroy some important and long-lasting institutions, particularly by exposing them to global competition. This could be like sailing between *Scylla* and *Charybdis*, both for policy makers and for higher education institutions. But there is no doubt that reluctant and hesitating higher education institutions surely will be losers if they don't find a way to cope with these challenges and adapt to the new situation where the best already dominates and sets the rules of the game.

Marketization and privatization have become buzzwords that policy analysts and policy makers promote as a solution and core part of higher education reform in the global environment. But things are not so simple, and different societies have different approaches. American universities, already adapted to the highly competitive environment within their own society, find it much easier to cope with global challenges; moreover, the best among them impose global benchmarks of academic excellence. European societies – aware of the global environment's challenges while conducting higher education system reforms – at the same time try to preserve their authenticity and legacy. But marketization, in one way or another, seems unavoidable, and universities in the European higher education area have to find an appropriate balance between maintaining their legacy, high quality and sustainability in a rapidly changed environment (cf. Newman and Coutu-

[8] "Colleges and universities are being tested on a marketplace. The fiscal problems they face, in our view, are directly related to whether they offer good value to the public. The claim can no longer be made that such institutions 'deserve' support because they have good reputations or big libraries or prestigious faculty. The inexorable changes we are now witnessing – both economically and politically – place the burden of proof directly on each college and university to show how and why it is worth supporting." Their aim is to "provide an attractive product at a fair price – giving society value for its money" (Leslie and Fretwell, 1996: 26).

rier, 2001: 4-11; Clark, 2004: 9-96; Geiger, 2004: 7-27, 232-274).

Privatization is actually another name for marketization, which is a notion used in Great Britain and America rather than in other European societies, although the meanings are essentially not different. Namely, while marketization means that university functions are subjected to market forces,[9] privatization in the European context is understood as a gradual process where higher education leaves the public sector of purely state-supported services and moves towards greater self-sustainability. The modes and degrees of privatization may vary, and different kinds of privatization may occur. So, diverse models of partnership with various industries and corporations are desired, as well as increases in students' participation through higher tuition fees.

One of the essential questions that appears over the last few decades is whether higher education is a public good – one which adds value to society by educating its people, who will then be productive citizens, or a private good – one which mainly benefits individuals, who earn more money and enjoy other advantages as a result of their education (cf. Bloom *et al*., 2006). In other words, if education is a private good, then those who benefit from it (i.e. students) have to pay for it, just like for any other good on the market that has usable value. If it is a public good, then it should be funded publicly, by the state, since the responsibility for the common good lies with the state and government. When such criteria are applied in the knowledge sector, this defines the educational content and students are regarded as consumers, or as human resources who have to be made fit for the employment market. In both cases, the actors (students and their families, the state and, to some extent, private companies) are considered entrepreneurs who regard education as an investment.

In addition, within the European area, particularly in postcommunist societies where the citizens were accustomed during the decades of socialism to the state's strong support to the public sector (particularly social benefits that includes completely free education at all stages), it is difficult to accept the changes brought by marketization of the higher education system (cf. Johnstone, 2003: 356). Policymakers are therefore inclined to compromise in order to maintain social peace and strengthen their position of power, regardless of ideological and party affiliation.

Another outcome of marketization is its diminishing of positive impacts of massification, particularly the increased access to higher education for wide social groups, and consequently a rise of inequity. Many until recently deprived social groups (racial, religious and ethnic minorities, women and low-income groups) were enabled for higher education. Scholarships and loan programmes, as well as a variety of other similar mechanisms have been put into place in order to facilitate wide access to higher education, which was recognized as an important social goal. However, social groups with a higher socio-economic status still have greater ac-

[9] The marketization of higher education is closely related to privatization. The functions of the university are increasingly subjected to market forces. Knowledge that can earn income is valued and supported. Fields that produce little income are de-emphasized or even discarded (Altbach, 2008: 11).

cess than others, while certain social groups are still facing large social differences that act as obstacles to their admission to higher education. This is more present at the global level than at the national level (differences between the most developed and others, particularly undeveloped). Namely, middle and undeveloped countries cannot afford adequate quality of high education, of either teaching or research, not even near to that in the highly developed countries. Their universities cannot compete; they cannot even be compared with those in the most developed countries.[10] Despite the widest ever access to higher education, disparities and social inequity will not decrease, quite the opposite. Marketization trends are deepening these disparities and compromising the higher education's goal of giving a chance to obtain appropriate education to all those deprived – whether in terms of the lack of financial sources or just the low quality of educational programs they could afford.

In this context, the cultural impact of globalization could be seen at least from two viewpoints. The first encompasses the global level, where certain structures, patterns, values and norms from the most developed (Western) societies are transferred to other world's societies (usually referred to as "westernization").[11] Quite simplified, it means that the most successful universities originated in the most developed Western societies serve as templates for others, regardless of their legacies and cultural compatibility. The second viewpoint has to do with the national level, i.e. the above-mentioned gradual decomposition of nation-state sovereignty and the welfare state social functions, which are part of (particularly European) cultural heritage. Both levels of this impact significantly influence higher education systems and the driving policies of their transformation. Although economic reasons are usually put forward, the cultural impact is even more prominent, especially in the long run. It seems that globalization is the most fundamental challenge which European universities face in its long history.

Finally, on the margins of the economic aspects of globalization's impacts on higher education, but by no means less important, is the use of economic standards as benchmarks.[12] This in turn has

[10] In general, these universities have modest entry requirements so as to provide fairly wide access to students. They focus mainly on teaching, but often have some interest in research, and are frequently involved in a range of social service activities. Mass higher education has brought with it greater inequality in academic systems – disparities between the high-quality universities at the top and the many modest or low-quality mass-access institutions at the bottom. It is likely that the top institutions have improved in industrialized countries, while worldwide the bottom sector has declined in quality (Altbach, 2008: 7).

[11] From the cultural aspect, globalization can be understood simply as westernization, i.e. as global diffusion of Western modernity. Though there is a lot of truth in such a claim, a distinction should be made between them. There are many relevant explanations of globalization which are beyond this narrow comprehension, highlighting the complex intersection between a multiplicity of driving forces, embracing economic, technological, cultural and political changes (cf. Giddens, 1990; Robertson, 1992; Scholte, 2000).

[12] The idea of evaluating and ranking knowledge is congruent with the paradigm of

led to emphasis on the practical (technical) values of education, i.e. usability and market valuation whether of the acquired knowledge in the educational process or of research results. Such a situation produces tensions between the profitable, market-oriented institutions (often elite, private-funded, technologically oriented research universities) and those that are not (such as liberal arts or humanities, as well as publicly-funded or financially weaker institutions that cannot sell their educational programmes or research results on the market, hence getting weak and lower quality). Another consequence is a simplification of scientific standards and their identification with the results of applied science (which are judged according to their usability and market valuation). This in turn leads to the benchmarking of scientific outputs by measuring in numbers (number of scientific papers, publications, grants, graduates, etc.), which means setting aside scientific quality or educational values.

business and economic viewpoint according to which schools and universities had to be transformed to companies suitable for measuring according to market-oriented results. The underlying idea is restructuring the higher education sector in order to "no longer be driven by the knowledge, scientific curiosity, and academic freedom but by efficiency, utilization, control, high efficiency and adjustments". The process of economization of knowledge and its directing toward the criteria of applicability are particularly emphasized. Thus, science and education in a knowledge society are reduced to the level of instrument for expanding the market, economic growth, acquiring the necessary job qualifications and increasing mobility of services (Liessmann, 2008: 74, 124-136).

The Bologna Process – European Answer to Global Challenges

Language barriers, different educational legacies,[13] and the long-lasting closure of education systems within national borders are the main reasons that Europe has not used all of their competitive potential[14] at the global knowledge market. Consequently, this made them weaker compared to the American, Australian and rapidly evolving Asian (particularly in Japan, China and India) higher education systems. Awareness of the necessity of Europe's joint action at the global education market in order to strengthen their position by organizing their educational potential has led to the significant reform of national education systems toward mutually

[13] The major European educational legacies are French, German, British, and Scandinavian. While the latter is confined to a relatively narrow area, the other three have had significant impact far outside of societies in which they emerged. Thus the French tradition is extended to the Mediterranean and to some Eastern European countries, while the German (Humboldtian) tradition influenced the shaping of higher education systems in most of the Central and East European countries. The British (Anglo-Saxon) tradition, however, is rather idiosyncratic, although very influential. Outside Europe, the American higher education system, though inheriting European legacies, presents a quite original model. Because of its vitality and success, it has become very influential and serves almost as a template at the global level (cf. Ash, 2006a; Altbach, 2008; Serbanescu-Lestrade, 2005; Scott, 1995; Kwiek, 2001).

[14] Europe has more than 530 universities, about one hundred million students in 41 countries, and is the world's largest center of knowledge (Eurydice/Eurostat, 2002).

compatible and structurally harmonized higher education systems.

The Bologna Declaration[15] was the most important document that initiated large-scale reform aimed at establishing a European Higher Education Area[16] by 2010 in which students and academic staff can move with ease and have fair recognition of their qualification degrees. The underlying documents of the Bologna process[17] – that specify the content, methods and objectives of reform – reflected the gradually evolving attitude that Europe can increase the international competitiveness of the European higher education system and compete with the increasingly powerful and advanced rivals in the global field of science and education only by uniting resources.[18]

The Bologna Declaration was an expression of the idea of necessity of international cooperation aimed at achieving a unified higher education area in Europe with distinctive educational standards, and with the common goal to create a European higher education area in order to enhance the employability and mobility of students and faculty and to increase the international competitiveness of European higher education.[19] In the Bologna Declaration, inter alia, European education ministers affirmed their intention to: adopt a system of easily readable and comparable degrees with diploma supplement; implement a system based essentially on two main cycles (bachelor and master with duration of 3+2 years; the third is added later – the postgraduate or doctoral cycle with duration of 3 years); establish a system of transferable credits (ECTS) including life-long learning; support the mobility of students, teachers and researchers; promote European cooperation in quali-

[15] The Bologna Declaration was signed in 1999 by 29 European national ministers of education. In 2010, the Bologna process encompassed 47 participating countries (cf. Bologna Secretariat, 2010).

[16] The envisaged European Higher Education Area is meant to ensure more comparable, compatible and coherent systems of higher education in Europe. It has to facilitate mobility (of both students and education staff), prepare students for their future careers and for becoming active citizens in democratic societies, and offer broad access to higher education (in a way between competitiveness and solidarity).

[17] The Bologna Declaration encompassed statements and intentions from several previous declarations that were made over the first decade (Magna Charta Universitatum 1988, Lisbon Recognition Convention 1997, Sorbonne Declaration 1998), and was broadened and completed in the next few ministerial conferences through the next decade (Salamanka Convention and Goteburg students' Declaration 2001, Prague Communiqué 2001, Berlin Communiqué 2003, Bergen Communiqué 2005, London Communiqué 2007, Leuven Communiqué 2009, and Budapest-Vienna Declaration 2010).

[18] For more, see: Haug and Kirstein, 1999; Pechar, 2007.

[19] As a part of a wider European integration process, the Bologna Declaration "reflects a search for a common European answer to common European problems. The process originates from the recognition that in spite of their valuable differences, European higher education systems are facing common internal and external challenges related to the growth and diversification of higher education, the employability of graduates, the shortage of skills in key areas, the expansion of private and transnational education, etc. The Declaration recognizes the value of coordinated reforms, compatible systems and common action" (CRE, 1999).

ty assurance; and promote the European dimension in higher education (in terms of curricular development and inter-institutional cooperation).

However, it did not come from national governments or universities themselves, but from the top of the EU as a significant part of the European integration process. As stated in the Declaration, it is "not just a political statement, but a binding commitment to an action programme to all signatories". This fact has drawn attention to potential problems: the question of agenda-setters in the Bologna process implementation and the reluctance of higher education institutions to implement the reform.

Being a reform implemented from the top, without consultation with the academic community or possibility to choose for higher education actors, particularly universities – the design and implementation of the Bologna process has remained almost exclusively in the domain of policy makers.[20] They imposed themselves not only as the principal agenda-setters, but also as those who mainly conduct the reform. Thus the Bologna process became a significant part of European national governments' public policies. The already existing control of the state over the higher education system in Europe, and hence the latter's limited autonomy – became even more pronounced. But now, through the reform's intervening in the curriculum design and structure, even the academic autonomy was threatened. On the other hand, this has caused different reactions of academics and universities, but there was more skepticism, criticism and reluctance toward changes than acceptance and praise. It was particularly so because they were placed in a position of passive recipients rather than active participants in the reform, and because of numerous problems that the reform brought to universities at the implementation level. From that standpoint, one can argue that the whole reform is rather a policy process than an academic process that causes increasing government interference, direct and indirect.

Regarding the policy process in the European higher education sector (relying on the key Bologna documents) it could be considered at three levels: supranational (European), national (nation-states), and institutional (higher education institutions). Actors from the three levels could be deemed as main policy drivers in implementing the reform. Supranational level actors (European Commission) regard the reform process as an aspect of European integration and collaboration in order to reduce the risks of the competitive global environment; hence they use the opportunity to be the dominant agenda-setter. Their agenda in turn is focused on endogenous horizontal coordination within the European higher education area. National level actors (nation-state governments/ministries of education) –

[20] Many scholars and relevant analyses confirm Bologna as a top-down process. It started as an intergovernmental initiative at the EU level, and it was conducted predominantly by national governments according to the key EU guidelines and (political) decisions, whether as a part of EU integration policies or/and as a reform (Europeanization) of national higher education systems, particularly in postcommunist countries (cf. Duhs, 2011; Kozma, 2008; Kwiek, 2004; Great Britain Parliament, 2007; Ohanyan, 2011; Välimaa, Hoffman and Huusko, 2007; Szolár, 2011; Suárez and Suárez, 2005; Trondal, 2002; Pechar, 2007, as well as numerous studies which these authors rely on).

acting within the EU common policies framework and processes of higher education systems harmonization – determine the pace of reforms in their countries as the integral part of their policies. Despite the multi-level structure of this policy process, they are usually recognized as the main agenda-setters in the higher education sector because they act at the national level with direct implications of their policies. Finally, at the institutional level, we have universities and other higher education institutions with very little opportunity of being policy makers (or to have any significant impact on the policy-making process), instead of mere implementers of policies already determined from above.

Since a detailed analysis of problems regarding the implementation of the Bologna process goes far beyond the scope of this article, the attention must be paid only on the most prominent and common for most countries within the European higher education area.

One of the most visible changes was the abandonment of the classical Humboldtian model of university, which was perceived among many academics as "Americanization" of good old European tradition that will, among other things, undermine the freedom of teaching and learning, separate undergraduate teaching from research, and thereby degrade university study to high professional school, lower the quality of education and diminish the dignity of the academic profession (cf. Ash, 2006a, 2006b; Serbanescu-Lestrade, 2005; Liessmann, 2008). Yet, dissolution of the traditional Humboldtian idea of the unity of teaching and research, and the current orientation of European higher education systems based on Bologna principles – could be regarded as two sides of a single process. The Bologna process redefines the roles, missions, tasks and obligations of contemporary university in rapidly changing and increasingly market-driven and knowledge-based European economies. Under such circumstances, teaching and research are undergoing substantial transformations and the institution of the university, which until recently has been almost exclusive in hosting the two interrelated activities, will not be able to avoid the process of substantial, partly planned and partly chaotic, transformation of its functioning (cf. Kwiek, 2001, 2004).

The division of study on bachelor and master levels established by the Bologna process was the biggest change in the academic structure. It was an attempt both to adjust education to market demands and provide vocational education, and to improve the European education as a market product, thereby gaining new international students, spreading European influence abroad, and bringing foreign spending money into the European market. But is it possible to have a quality education at the bachelor level that is both: a sound foundation for a top-level scientific education at the master's and PhD levels, and vocational education giving people skills which make them employable? Furthermore, could the bachelor degree obtained through a three-year cycle be equal to the American four-year BA? Namely, the argument stressed most often is the fact that a short (3 years) bachelor diploma does not assure both a sufficient disciplinary background for a professional occupation recognized by the market and a sufficient background for postgraduate studies. What remains is an obvious compromise, because the European labor market still doesn't clearly recognize bachelors, and compatibility with

the American (or global) model of education is not achieved (cf. Liessmann, 2008; Ash, 2006b).

Regarding the main outcomes of the Bologna process, it is necessary to consider mobility in the context of the barrier-free Higher Education Area that was one of the most important goals of the entire reform. In theory, the Bologna process with the level system stimulates mobility. In practice, mobility in Europe is largely insufficient. If we look only at the Erasmus programme, as one of the most important mobility mechanisms, it is obvious that its impact was very limited. Namely, its objective of 10% student mobility in practice was only 1% of students that are mobile. At the same time, most of the academic staff do not believe in a better international interrelationship. Their point of view is that interrelationship always exists through links between researchers. The major part of staff members think that the students' mobility won't grow significantly (cf. Serbanescu-Lestrade, 2005: 9-10).

One of the main guiding ideas of the Bologna process was to offer more possibilities for graduates to continue their studies. By expanding their offerings (particularly on the master level), they hope to increase their importance. Thus universities have transformed the structure of their study programmes in order to meet such goals and become more competitive. However, this required increased resources, both academic facilities and academic staff (due to the student-centered orientation in the situation of substantial increase in the number of students). It didn't contribute to reducing costs (on the contrary), or to an increase in quality of the lecturing process. In addition, the costs of accreditation have slowed down the development of new degrees. At the same time, demands and expectations addressed to universities were increased, which resulted with pressures toward marketization and other modes of greater self-financing of universities.

It is obvious that the Bologna process has produced a number of positive effects, primarily in terms of intensified cooperation, partnership (enhanced study offer, stimulated mobility, better recognition), and improvement of international comparability/compatibility. Despite various assessments, the positive effects are undoubtedly modularization of curricula and creation of transparency (course evaluation, diploma supplement, transferable credits), as well as quality assurance standards and mechanisms. Although the improvement in that area may not be significant, it is notable that effective study duration is reduced, while practice-orientation is considerably enhanced.

On the other hand, it is obvious that the Bologna process has remained incomplete in certain aspects, and the higher education system has not become sufficiently competitive in relation to world leaders as it is supposed to be. At the same time, through standardization and harmonization, it abandoned certain elements of the educational legacies that once used to be part of the national/European identity and a comparative advantage over the others. Besides, it failed (more or less) in achieving a curriculum design in accordance with the desired competences/abilities of graduates (Karseth, 2006: 278), in providing mobility of students/academic staff, and in providing bachelor background sufficient for continuation of study at higher levels. In addition, the reform has stimulated additional bureaucratization of higher

education; some newly-established procedures act as barriers to innovation and to creation of new degrees (e.g. accreditation); mutual recognition between different universities and quality assurance are still not as developed as they were supposed to be; and most industries and the labor market still don't recognize new profiles, particularly bachelors (cf. Reichert and Tauch, 2003: 27-32).

Transformation of the Higher Education System in the Postcommunist Context

In postcommunist countries, the Bologna process was adopted as a model of higher education system reform and instantly became a significant part of public policies led by transitional political elites (cf. Duhs, 2011; Kozma, 2008; Kwiek, 2004; Ohanyan, 2011; Szolár, 2011; Krištof, Pisk and Radeka, 2011). That reform in turn was characterized by specificities of the process of democratic transition.

Regarding the implementation of the Bologna process in postcommunist countries, one should distinguish between those that have already became its members (since the fifth EU enlargement), accession countries, and those that are not, but have adopted the reform in accordance with the Bologna principles. Namely, the level of acceptance and the dynamics of implementation differ in relation to that status. Without going into detail, especially not into the differences among the various postcommunist countries, only some features common to most of these countries will be indicated.

First, the commitment of those countries towards the introduction and implementation of the Bologna process was a clear political message of support to the European integration process. Second, it was an expression of urgent need to reform the old and inert higher education systems shaped in the communist regime and completely unprepared for the global competitive environment. Third, it was a sign of identification of national political elites who largely legitimized their policies by almost unquestionable adherence to European politics, and in that way made themselves recognized by the domestic public as pro-European democrats. These are the main reasons why the Bologna process was quite eagerly adopted in postcommunist countries as higher education system reform after 1989.

Another important reason was the absence of their own original ideas and concepts about how to reform their higher education systems. Political elites – leaders of democratic transitions in postcommunist countries – usually tried to import as templates the various models (not only educational) developed in the West, and apply them in their own social and political space. However, this one, like many other imported arrangements, in many respects did not meet expectations, nor did its application go smoothly and without problems. National specificities in different countries – in this case, characteristics of the previous higher education system, in particular the overall socio-cultural context – played a crucial role in determining the overall degree of success in implementing the Bologna process.

After the fall of communism and the dissolution of the bipolar Cold-War world, postcommunist countries have become independent players on the global stage. So, the higher education system transformations were doubly affected – not only by the local post-1989

transformations, but also by profound global transformations. The global environment imposed the need for prompt and adequate action in order to make them able to cope with new, global challenges. Understandably, the pressure significantly contributed to the adherence of postcommunist societies to the Bologna process, since they saw in it a certain amount of protection against these global impacts, which they were not ready for.

But, while EU countries are responding proactively to global challenges in higher education with the Bologna reforms, most of the postcommunist countries seem to be just reacting to the European initiatives. Such reactive, instead of proactive policies, facilitate mostly formal changes, while a significant part of the content and habitual practices remain essentially untouched, just reshaped, and therefore not quite compatible with those in the EU, or as competitive as it was expected. This is visible through the issues of quality assurance, accreditation process, predominantly one-way student mobility, and a significant burden of the past in the approach to curricula design (cf. Reichert and Tauch, 2003: 31-34, 45-49, 60-89; Crosier, Purser and Smidt, 2007: 34-46, 53-56, 69-73). Implementing the Bologna system only as a structural or institutional reform can weaken the education systems, unless policy makers recognize that such a reform requires essential changes in the approach to both content and organization. Besides, funding problems and reluctance of the academic community to accept and implement changes additionally slow or even undermine the implementation process.[21]

Being a part of the overall (transitional) policy, the Bologna process in postcommunist countries shares the same socio-cultural context that is characterized by a discrepancy between the needed civic culture (which is still undeveloped) and the authoritarian legacy (which is still, more or less, dominant). Incongruence between the institutional structure of the newly-established democratic system and patterns of the dominant political culture is manifested as a deficit of socio-cultural prerequisites necessary to accomplish democratic transformation. It acts as one of the most significant obstacles to the democratic consolidation of postcommunist societies (cf. Maldini, 2006). The discrepancy between the proclaimed goals and policy makers' practices and priorities in their implementation – as a consequence of that situation, as well as of poor governance and weak institutional capacity to implement the Bologna process in many postcommunist countries (cf. Ohanyan, 2011: 9) – significantly determines its (lack of) success. So, it can be argued that no successful reform will be accomplished unless there is sufficient commitment to appro-

[21] Higher education in Central and Eastern Europe has been in a state of permanent crisis since the fall of communism, and there has not been enough general reflection on its transformations. The Bologna process could be a useful policy agenda, but it is not because it does not meet the expectations of the academic community in the region; it is unclear in its visions, and consequently in its recommendations for action. While it may be quite successful in promoting its agenda in Western Europe, it could fail in the transition countries, especially because of the combination of old and new challenges and because of chronic underfunding of national higher education systems (Kwiek, 2004: 763, 768, 771).

priate values underlying both the goals and decision-making in the higher education system reform. Certainly, differences between various postcommunist countries are considerable – from those who completely transformed their higher education systems which are not particularly different from those within the EU (most of them in the meantime became EU member states) to those whose achievements of democratic transition, and regarding the reform of higher education, are relatively modest.

In many respects, the Croatian experience in the implementation of the Bologna process shares similar characteristics with other postcommunist countries, but it also has a number of its own peculiarities. The adoption of the Bologna process in Croatia was an expression of declared pro-European orientation of political elites, and the best (if not the only) solution in a situation with no coherent national strategies and plans for reforming various parts of the public sector, including the higher education system. Lacking its own higher education policies – based on analysis of previous experiences and deliberately defined goals – Croatia adopted the Bologna process as part of the national policy process and an undisputable recipe for transformation of the higher education system in order to achieve harmony with the European Area of Higher Education. Although relevant laws for conducting the Bologna process were enacted, as well as certain strategic documents in which the higher education system has a very important place (cf. Government of RC, 2006), reform implementation faced many problems and it was not adequately realized. Policy makers made decisions regarding the Bologna process implementation without proper preparation, and without selective and deliberative incorporation of previous practices that have proven to be good and effective. Decisions were reached under pressure of daily politics' interests rather than corresponding to thoughtfully and clearly defined transition goals. Consequently – they were not systematic. A sort of self-sufficiency of political actors (mostly socio-culturally determined), a lack of both understanding and appropriate reaction of the public, and the weakness of the academic community – allow the dominance of the government in setting the agenda of higher education transformation policy. In addition, the reform was carried out fairly quickly and intensely (with regard to the scope of change that was introduced), while the encompassed institutions and academics were unprepared.

At the same time, in spite of the rhetoric ("knowledge society development"), universities are not treated as places where future has to be created, but rather as budget expenditure items. Hence, the efforts of policy makers towards marketization of the higher education system became an integral part of their policy, even in spite of the 2008--2009 students' protests (against marketization and for free education), followed by the 2010-2011 protests of the awakened academic community (against the government's proposal of new laws on higher education). Although the protests have been successful in their criticism of the neoliberal agenda and in making the public more sensitive – they were more reactive than proactive, since they offered no clear alternative solutions. That is why they failed to impact government policy and received insufficient public recognition and support.

On the other hand, at universities and in the academic community there is a general disappointment with the Bologna process implementation, although for different reasons (whether related to content or organization, to personal or institutional interests). Being a top-down reform and led almost exclusively by policy makers, it seems that the reform managed to change merely the form of the higher education system (reconfiguration of the study into a three-cycle system, introduction of ECTS points and quality assurance mechanisms), while the learning outcomes and qualification levels are not significantly changed compared to the old system (cf. Rodin, 2009). However, there has essentially been no substantive change in content and structure of institutions as well as accustomed practices of the academic staff. Reluctance and skepticism toward the Bologna system – evident among a significant part of the academic community – has significantly contributed to this. It is mostly due to the lack of prior preparation to the reform, widespread criticism of the new system, unwillingness to change, and distrust due to remembrance of failed reforms in past periods.

In addition to these factors, Croatian universities also suffer from other (mostly structural) problems. The most significant are the absence of clear and distinctive mission and policy, poor high school preparation (reduced quality of enrolled students' knowledge), the disintegration of the four major universities (which blocks their quality work), lack of funding and equipment, lack of concern about the employment of assistants and non-teaching staff, lack of interest and motivation of students, unequal representation of all stakeholders in the university authorities, insufficient information on the work of key university bodies, underdeveloped international cooperation, and neglected science. The implementation of the Bologna process has created additional problems, in particular too much burden on faculty staff, inappropriate curricula, poor allocation of ECTS credits (which is complicating successful study), insufficient quality of education, decline of criteria in students' evaluation, poor employment of bachelors, lack of external evaluation of the Bologna process, dissatisfaction of the academic community with poor implementation of the Bologna process, low mobility of students and faculty, and lack of the student-centered learning principle (cf. Krištof, Pisk and Radeka, 2011).

One of the general indicators of the success (or failure) of the Bologna system and its integration in social and economic reproduction in Croatia (so far) is reflected in the fact that the majority of bachelors continue their studies instead of going to work, while the labor market still doesn't recognize "baccalaureates", even after seven years of Bologna model implementation.

Conclusion

The previous considerations have tried to explore and explain the trends that drive the restructuring of contemporary universities and shape the public policies of higher education systems' transformation. The main factors, particularly the exogenous, that cause rethinking of the contemporary universities' role and mission are tied up with globalization and its growing impact on change of almost all relevant economic, social and political structures and cultural patterns. In the global environ-

ment and with changes that globalization brings into many spheres of society, further survival of traditional, philosophy-inspired, nation-state oriented, and welfare state supported university is not to be expected. Today's universities are asked to adapt to more complex societal needs and increased expectations in a situation of generally reduced resources. They have to be more responsive to challenges coming from a much broader environment than ever before, and to cope with rapid and profound social changes. Various trends, particularly economic, but also political, social and cultural – significantly reshape the environment in which universities act. These trends in turn push them to be more market, performance, and student oriented, to be more cost-effective and accountable to their stakeholders, and to be competitive with other higher education providers – more numerous than ever, and now on the global scene. In their modern history, universities never experienced such a challenge. It is obvious that universities and the higher education system in general are changing their traditional relations with the social environment – the state, the market, and the public – with increased expectations different than before.

The impact of global factors on the transformation of higher education is visible through two main and interrelated processes. The first is manifested through a diminishing of the key role of the nation-state in its social and economic development. It implies a reduction of national governments' capacity to control the economic and social activities within their countries, and a shift of power beyond the national borders. Along with that, the long-lasting vision of higher education as a national treasure which contributes to national consciousness and culture is also diminished. The second process closely follows the first and it is visible through the gradual decomposition of the welfare state and the reduction of its core functions. Due to increasingly low financial capabilities of the state, significant parts of the traditionally state-funded public sector are subjected to marketization (privatization) and economic rationality. It certainly includes the higher education system, particularly in the situation of its rapid massification, enhanced complexity, and consequently highly grown costs. In order to ensure its continued sustainability, policy makers increasingly shift the financial burden from the state to the users (most notably, through increased tuition fees) and introduce various forms of market-led arrangements into the universities' management and operation (self-financing, commercialization, privatization). At the same time, the financing of research is increasingly being channeled toward applied science projects, and through linking universities and research institutes with various kinds of industries and enterprises which have a direct economic benefit from them.

Marketization, under which national governments cede direct control over the higher education system and move to more of a steering role, makes education increasingly characterized as a commodity, i.e. rather a private than a public good. The neo-liberal concept of cutting public expenditures has been largely introduced in the space of traditionally public higher education systems in European societies. Those who advocate education as a private good are motivated, above all, by the economic reality and pragmatics, which have an

increasingly rational foundation in today's world of global market economy and internationalization. Problems with state funding and sustainability of higher education systems in a situation of increased demands for a broader access to the tertiary level of education make their influence even stronger.

Regarding the national specificities, particularly educational legacies, it is obvious that they significantly affect the modes and pace of transformation. Specifically, liberalism, diversity and independence (especially economic) are tradition in America, which has enabled their universities not only to adapt quickly to the global trends, but also to determine the trends or even impose benchmarks (especially the best ones). On the other hand, the European tradition inherits the concept of public education as part of the welfare state (which is both political and social issue in Europe, particularly in postcommunist countries), as well as the public funding – and therefore has a difficult time adjusting to the global trends.

Thus the Bologna process is an attempt to simultaneously preserve the traditions and excellence and adapt to the global trends, especially to the highly competitive environment (America and, increasingly, Asia). From the very beginning, it was an integral part of the European integration process and an expression of the need for international cooperation aimed at achieving a unified higher education area in Europe with distinctive educational standards. Its main goals were to create a European higher education area, facilitate mobility of students and faculty, enhance employability, prepare students for their future careers and for active citizenship in democratic societies, and offer broad access to higher education (in a way between competitiveness and solidarity). Being a top-down reform and without any significant influence of academic community and universities – its implementation remained almost exclusively in the domain of policy makers as dominant agenda-setters. Thus the Bologna process became a significant part of the European national governments' public policies, which enabled even greater state control over their higher education systems. On the one hand, it caused a more controlled and unified reform implementation, but on the other it caused skepticism, criticism and reluctance toward changes among a significant part of the academic community (mostly due to the fear of losing their autonomy, freedom of teaching and doing research, of lowering the teaching/learning quality and running their universities by state funding as it was during the past decades). Thus the reform success varies in different countries, depending of the national specificities, educational legacies, and commitment of both the political actors and academic communities to reform realization.

In the postcommunist context, to all of the above must be added the problems which emerge from the deficit of socio--cultural prerequisites and from weak institutional capacity – which makes transformation even more complex. This is so since it is not possible simply to transplant templates originated in the developed European democracies into the transitional and socio-culturally different context of postcommunist societies. However, what is crucial in those particular countries is the motivation and capability of political actors, as well as the willingness of the academic community, not only to be passive observers

of changes or mere responders to policy makers' decisions, but their active creators. Passivity, inherited mostly from the authoritarian past, does not contribute, but rather leaves the entire space of decision making to policy makers – which are not always competent enough, and usually are driven by (daily) political interests.

Based on previous considerations, it could be argued that exogenous factors (globalization, internalization and marketization) largely impact, and even directly create trends that affect changes in higher education systems, particularly in transformation of the role and mission of universities. At the same time, the endogenous factors (massification, national political and cultural specificities, educational legacies and long lasting practices, as well as national government's capabilities and institutional capacities) are mainly responsible for the success of higher education transformation processes in certain societies.

Clearly, not all will succeed in restructuring universities and transforming the higher education system in response to those challenges. That will certainly depend on how policy makers recognize the importance of knowledge, science and education, as well as on the capability and adaptability of the particular academic communities. However, what is common to all is that further development of individual societies in many respects will depend on exactly how the knowledge and science as main drivers of social development will be positioned on the policy agenda, and whether the universities will succeed in restructuring and adapting their mission in the conditions of significantly altered environments.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P. G. (2008) The complex roles of universities in the period of globalization, *Higher Education in the World 3: New Challenges and Emerging Roles for Human and Social Development*, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan and GUNI: 5-14.

Ash, M. G. (2006a) Bachelor of What, Master of Whom? The Humboldt Myth and Historical Transformations of Higher Education in German-Speaking Europe and the US, *European Journal of Education*, 41 (2): 245-267.

Ash, M. G. (2006b) The Humboldt Illusion, *The Wilson Quarterly*, 30 (4): 45--49.

Bloom, D. E., Hartley, M., Rosovsky, H. (2006) Beyond private gain: the public benefits of higher education, in: Forest, J., Altbach, P. G. (eds.), *International Handbook of Higher Education*, Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands: 293-308.

Bologna Secretariat (2010) *Welcome to the European Higher Education Area: The official Bologna Process website 2007–2010*, Benelux Bologna Secretariat, Brussels, http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/ (August 21, 2011).

Bowles, P., Wagman, B. (1997) Globalisation and the Welfare State: Four Hy-

potheses and Some Empirical Evidence, *Eastern Economic Journal*, 23 (3): 317-336.

Castells, M. (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Clark, B. R. (2004) *Sustaining Change in Universities: Continuities in Case Studies and Concepts*, Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

CRE (1999) *The Bologna Declaration on the European space for higher education: an explanation*, Confederation of EU Rectors' Conferences and the Association of European Universities.

Crosier, D., Purser, L., Smidt, H. (2007) *Trends in Learning Structures in European Higher Education V*, European University Association.

Duhs, R. (2011) The Bologna process: A case study of pedagogical change, *Education Sciences and Society*, 2: 149--161.

Eurydice/Eurostat (2002) *Key Data on Education in Europe*, European Commission, Luxemburg.

Geiger, R. L. (2004) *Knowledge and Money: Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Government of the Republic of Croatia (2006) *Strategic Development Framework for 2006 – 2013*, Central Office for Development Strategy and Coordination of EU Funds (CODEF).

Great Britain Parliament – House of Commons – Education and Skills Committee (2007) *The Bologna process: fourth report of session 2006-07*, London: The House of Commons.

Haug, G., Kirstein, J. (1999) *Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education I*, European University Association.

Johnstone, D. B. (2003) Cost Sharing in Higher Education: Tuition, Financial Assistance, and Accessibility in Comparative Perspective, *Czech Sociological Review*, 39 (3): 351-374.

Karseth, B. (2006) Curriculum Restructuring in Higher Education after the Bologna process: A new pedagogic regime? *Revista Española de Educación Comparada*, (12): 255-284.

Kozma, T. (2008) Political Transformations and Higher Education Reforms, *European Education*, 40 (2): 29-45.

Krištof, M., Pisk, K., Radeka, I. (2011) Istraživanje o primjeni Bolonjskog procesa na hrvatskim sveučilištima, *Nezavisni sindikat znanosti i visokog obrazovanja*, http://www.nsz.hr (July 29, 2011).

Kwiek, M. (2000) The Nation-State, Globalization, and the Modern Institution of the University, *Theoria – A Journal of Social and Political Studies*, 47 (96): 74-99.

Kwiek, M. (2001) Globalization and Higher Education, *Higher Education in Europe*, 26 (1): 27-38.

Kwiek, M. (2003) The State, the Market, and Higher Education. Challenges for the New Century, in: Kwiek, M. (ed.), *The University, Globalization, Central Europe*, Frankfurt a/Main and New York: Peter Lang: 71-114.

Kwiek, M. (2004) The Emergent European Educational Policies under Scrutiny: the Bologna Process from a Central European perspective, *European Educational Research Journal*, 3 (4): 759-776.

Leslie, D. W., Fretwell, E. K. Jr. (1996) *Wise Moves in Hard Times. Creating and Managing Resilient Colleges and Universities*, San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Liessmann, K. P. (2008) *Teorija neobrazovanosti: zablude društva znanja*, Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk.

Maldini, P. (2006) Političko kulturalni preduvjeti demokratizacije, *Politička misao*, 43 (3): 87-108.

Maldini, P. (2008) *Demokracija i demokratizacija*, Dubrovnik: Sveučilište u Dubrovniku.

Mohrman, K., Ma, W., Baker, D. (2008) The Research University in Transition: The Emerging Global Model, *Higher Education Policy*, 21 (1): 5-27.

Newman, F. (2000) Policies for Higher Education in the Competitive World, *The Futures Project: Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World*, Providence, RI: Brown University: 1-19.

Newman, F., Couturier, L. (2001) The New Competitive Arena: Market Forces Invade the Academy, *The Futures Project: Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World*, Providence, RI: Brown University: 1-42.

OECD (2010) *Education at a Glance 2010: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing.

Ohanyan, A. (2011) Westernization in the Post-Soviet World: Risks and Benefits of Bologna Process, *International Higher Education*, (63): 9-11.

Parry, G., Moran, M. (1994) Introduction: problems of democracy and democratization, in: Parry, G., Moran, M. (eds.), *Democracy and Democratization*, London/New York: Routledge: 1-17.

Pechar, H. (2007) The Bologna Process – European Response to Global Competition in Higher Education, *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 37 (3): 107-123.

Pritchard, R. (2006) Trends in the Restructuring of German Universities, *Comparative Education Review*, 50 (1): 90-112.

Reichert, S., Tauch, C. (2003) *Trends in Learning Structures in European Higher Education III*, European University Association.

Robertson, R. (1992) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, London: Sage.

Rodin, S. (2009) Razmišljanja o provedbi bolonjskog procesa u Hrvatskoj, Forum Znanje (ni)je roba?, *Revija za socijalnu politiku*, 16 (2): 202-203.

Scholte, J. A. (2000) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Scott, P. (1995) *The Meanings of Mass Higher Education*, Buckingham and Bristol PA: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Serbanescu-Lestrade, K. (2005) Staff reactions at the Bologna process: Four cases studies, in: Proceedings of Second International Euredocs Conference *Transformations of higher education and research policies, systems, and institutions in European countries*, Bergen: Rokkan Center.

Suárez, C. I., Suárez, V. L. (2005) The Impact of the Bologna Process on Disciplinization – Comparative Report, in: EC Research & Innovation – SSH Project Report *Changing Knowledge and Disciplinary Boundaries through Inte-*

grative Research Methods in the Social Sciences and Humanities (CIT2-CT-2004-506013).

Szolár, E. (2011) The Bologna Process: The Reform of the European Higher Education Systems, *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, 11 (1): 81-99.

Trondal, J. (2002) The Europeanisation of Research and Higher Education Policies: Some Reflections, *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 25 (4): 333-355.

Välimaa, J., Hoffman, D., Huusko, M. (2007) The Bologna process in Finland: Perspectives from the Basic Units, in: Tomusk, V. (ed.), *Creating the European Area of Higher Education: Voices from the Periphery*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht: 43-68.

Yang, R. (2003) Globalisation and higher education development: A critical analysis, *International Review of Education*, 49 (3/4): 269-291.

Politike visokog obrazovanja u tranziciji: što usmjerava trendove u restrukturiranju sveučilišta?

SAŽETAK Članak nastoji istražiti glavne aspekte suvremenih trendova koji utječu na politike visokog obrazovanja u tekućim procesima restrukturiranja sveučilišta, poglavito pitanje transformacije sustava visokog obrazovanja u Europi (bolonjski proces), s naglaskom na postkomunističkim društvima. Globalizacija, internalizacija i marketizacija su utvrđeni ključnim egzogenim faktorima, dok su masifikacija, nacionalne specifičnosti (političke i kulturalne), obrazovne tradicije te kapaciteti lokalnih samouprava utvrđeni kao endogeni faktori koji određuju reforme sustava visokog obrazovanja. Autor istražuje trendove restrukturiranja sveučilišta u uvjetima promjene tradicionalnih odnosa koje ona ima s društvenim okruženjem, poglavito državom. Spomenute trendove naročito karakterizira smanjena uloga nacionalne države u provođenju društvenog i ekonomskog razvoja te dekompozicija socijalne države i smanjivanje njezinih temeljnih funkcija, što je za posljedicu imalo signifikantno smanjivanje potpore sustavu viskog obrazovanja. Oba procesa gurnula su kreatore politika u smjeru politika visokog obrazovanja zasnovanih na djelovanju tržišta, što uzrokuje niz problema – bilo da se radi o pitanjima održivosti visokog obrazovanja, o pitanjima njegove kvalitete i kompetitivnosti, ili pak o pitanjima pristupa visokom obrazovanju i njegovoj pravičnosti. Autor ističe da na promjene u sustavima visokog obrazovanja prije svega utječu (ili ih čak izravno kreiraju) egzogeni faktori, napose s obzirom na ulogu i misiju koju imaju sveučilišta, dok su endogeni faktori prvenstveno odgovorni za uspjeh reformi u pojedinim društvima.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI sustav visokog obrazovanja, globalizacija, marketizacija, masifikacija, nacionalna država, socijalna država, javne politike, bolonjski proces