---------TRANSFORMATIONS IN --------
BUSINESS & ECONOMICS

GUEST EDITORIAL

DIFFERENT OBJECTIVES, DIFFERENT MODELS: THE CHALLENGE OF INTEGRATING EU AND CEE HIGHER EDUCATION

L. Denton Marks[1]
Department of Economics
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
c/o 4444 North Prospect Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53211-1773
USA
Phone/fax: +1-414-332 32 21
e-mail: marksd@uww.edu

George Tesar[2]
Umeå School of Business and Economics
Faculty of Social Sciences
Umeå University
901 87 Umeå
SWEDEN
Tel: +46-90-786 61 60
Fax: +46-90-786 77 64
e-mail: george.tesar@fek.umu.se

[1]**L. Denton Marks** (Ph.D., Princeton) is a Professor of Economics in the Department of Economics, College of Business and Economics, University Wisconsin-Whitewater, USA. His research has been in a number of areas in applied microeconomics including unemployment insurance, housing markets and rent regulation, topics in law and economics, economic analysis of the European transition economies, and the economics of higher education. He has presented and published numerous papers in these areas in scholarly journals and proceedings and has served as an editorial advisor and referee for a number of scholarly journals and publications.

[2]**George Tesar** (Ph.D., Wisconsin) is a Swedish Professor of Marketing and International Business at the Umeå School of Business and Economics, Umeå University, Sweden. He was previously a Professor of Marketing at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, USA. Dr. Tesar has been active in Europe as a management education and training specialist for a number of private firms and public institutions. His research focus has been global marketing, technology transfer management, product development strategies, marketing research studies, and cross-cultural training between Central European and Western managers. He has presented and published numerous papers in scholarly journals and proceedings and has published two books on international marketing.

Received: April, 2004
1st Revision: September, 2004
2nd Revision: February, 2005
Accepted: March, 2005

ABSTRACT. ***Can the academic communities of the EU and the CEEC work together with mutual benefit, despite or because of their different experiences over the last half century? This paper addresses that question through an examination of the compatibility between higher education policies such as the Bologna Declaration with their different academic environments. It develops a framework that identifies dimensions of integration and then compares the circumstances and prospects of the two communities. After discussing convergences and divergences, it focuses upon two issues – the gap in resources and the divergence in academic norms – and the prospects for resolving them.***

KEYWORDS: higher education, transition economies, market, European Union, Soviet Union.

JEL classification: I2, P2, D40, O52.

Introduction

Those who know more than one university realize that no two universities are alike. Of course, they differ in location and ambiance, but they also differ in their academic objectives- and perhaps even in their commitment to academic excellence as an objective. This variety reflects, among other things, the same diversity of activities and outcomes that different endowments of resources always produce. The university is limited by scarcity; and it, and the community that supports it, must choose how to allocate its scarce resources.

In this paper we examine the university and its objectives in two communities in Europe – those nations that are current members of the European Union (EU) and those that were recently dominated by the former Soviet Union. The former is a community by choice that has identified numerous common interests that have warranted the substitution of group sovereignty for individual sovereignty in several areas; the latter is a community at least in its common determination to escape its recent subjugation. European higher education faces a challenge in bridging the gap between the existing system of universities in the EU (largely Western Europe) and the system of universities currently operating in the Central and Eastern European countries (CEEC). An obvious impediment is the very different experiences of these two systems since the end of World War II which have led to this gap. How can one use those disparate experiences to build a Europe-wide system that builds upon the strengths of each tradition? This discussion acknowledges and examines the impact of the different contexts in which higher education has developed in the two regions. It also considers the role that different levels of resources have played in higher education in the two regions (e.g., widely different levels of support for different disciplines) and the resources needed to allow CEEC universities to become full participants in European higher education. The discussion considers a variety of organizational objectives and related organizational models which provide much of the structure of the analysis.

Ideally, we could identify a globally accepted set of organizational objectives for a university that involve maximizing some measurable outcomes - enrolments, endowment, research funding, value of physical plant, number and variety of doctorates granted - and then describe the two production methods that the two regions have adopted and compare the strengths and weaknesses of each. Our task is not so tidy. The objectives of universities are notoriously difficult to measure or even articulate; and, not surprisingly, capturing the essence of their production methods is no simpler (e.g., Winston 1999). Moreover, we focus not upon individual institutions but upon national systems of public higher education (we consider private institutions of minor importance in these regions), though we shall still refer to the system as "the university". Our interest in considering these systems from the two regions

means that we are forgoing the level of detail and apparent precision of, say, case studies of particular universities (e.g., Sabloff, 1999). However, in the same sense that the authors of the Bologna Declaration (1999) and the Prague Communique' (2001) articulate continent-wide objectives - what we shall designate as the EU model—we shall discuss the apparent objectives in these university "areas" and outline broadly how they have sought to achieve them.

At this level of analysis, we must also recognize that the university can represent more than a firm that produces a variety of products such as skilled workers and new knowledge. It can make a variety of contributions to its community. Because of the language barrier to easy mobility throughout the global system of higher education, the university trains or nurtures most of a nation's professionals, including political leaders, at least among more developed economies; and thus it may be a nation's primary leadership screening mechanism. This role may lead to a distinctly different role as a means of indoctrination and the exercise of political power, including the exclusion of some from power. Local faculty members may draw attention to the country through their discoveries and leadership. Its library and museum collections may hold national and international treasures, and their curators may be leaders in their fields. The university may also be a profitable business, contributing its surpluses to the public coffers. This variety of roles means that objectives focusing narrowly upon students and faculty, or teaching and research, may not capture fully what some nation's universities represent, and this may lead to conflict.

1. The Problem

In the Bologna Declaration and subsequent communiqués, 29 European countries agree to a new model of higher education in Europe. It is the most comprehensive statement of continent-wide higher education ever produced and identifies specific objectives that members must achieve to realize that vision. Its focus is the development of an educational infrastructure that allows students to study throughout the continent. Despite the model's appeal, it challenges the CEEC: in contrast to their western neighbours for whom the EU model is a reasonable next step in the era of European union, the CEEC signatories currently employ a different model reflecting the impact of over 40 years of Soviet domination.

The CEEC's ambivalence toward the EU model (e.g., Scott 2002, p.147) reflects immediately several factors imbedded in the public bureaucracies of the region: university funding levels far below those in the EU; a more tenuous connection between faculty and university, especially university administrators; and lack of student support reflecting a lack of continental awareness and a more tentative connection to university education during the unsettled transition period. These are symptoms of universities still dominated by the Soviet model of higher education which we discuss below.

The EU model transforms European higher education by expecting students to embrace a continental system in which individual faculty develop courses and programs for students. This model anticipates that faculty will cooperate closely with university administration to internationalize curricula and foresee the needs of students throughout the continent through cooperation with other EU universities. It is conceivable that the more dynamic European universities, distributed around the EU, will meet the model's expectations. It is more difficult to anticipate that CEEC universities will come along.

2. Approach and Methodology

The emerging EU "model" of the university reminds us that, perhaps more than many production technologies, the production of higher education takes many forms because,

globally, universities choose or are asked to provide a wide variety of products. The EU model narrows that range to highlight its version of higher education; the CEEC model narrows the range differently to achieve different results. In addition to comparing the two systems, we identify a standard to allow a determination of the approach that is closer to the traditional idea of a university.

We do not have rigorous and comprehensive models of the university as, for example, a firm because of its "awkward economics" (Winston 1999), although we have a growing theoretical literature on various features of higher education (e.g., academic standards as public goods (Marks 2002), externality effects of student quality (Rothschild and White 1995), educational performance as a positional good (Winston 1999, 2000), the "arms race" of universities competing for prestige (Winston 2000)) and, of course, a large literature on the economic effects of higher education. In contrast to business firms which seem to act as if they are indeed maximizing long-run profits, universities do not have such a straightforward objective function.

One way to appreciate this difficulty is to articulate the principles which, we believe, define the university and set it apart from other educational organizations, and producers more generally:

> *...the university must come to the aid of unprotected and timid reason. The university is the place where inquiry and philosophic openness come into their own. It is intended to encourage the noninstrumental use of reason for its own sake, to provide the atmosphere where the moral and physical superiority of the dominant [powers] will not intimidate philosophic doubt...*
>
> *Freedom of the mind requires not only, or even especially, the absence of legal constraints but the presence of alternative thoughts. The most successful tyranny is not the one that uses force to assure uniformity but the one that removes awareness of other possibilities, that makes it seem inconceivable that other ways are viable, that removes the sense that there is an outside...*
>
> *...it is necessary that there be an unpopular institution in our midst that sets clarity above well-being or compassion, that resists our powerful urges and temptations, that is free of all snobbism but has standards...*
>
> *The university's task is thus well defined, if not easy to carry out or even keep in mind. It is, in the first place, always to maintain the permanent questions front and center... without having the answers, the university knows what openness is and knows the questions. It also knows the regime within which it lives, and the kinds of threats this regime poses to its activity...the university risks less by having intransigently high standards than by trying to be too inclusive, because the society tends to blur standards in the name of equality...*
>
> *To sum up, there is one simple rule for the university's activity: it need not (discussion of market for higher education—suppliers, buyers, market outcomes, problems with market) concern itself with providing its students with experiences that are available in democratic society. They will have them in any event. It must provide them with experiences they cannot have there...*
> *(*Bloom, 1987, p. 248-256)

The university is that institution which protects and encourages openness, inquiry, and questioning; and maximizes awareness of alternatives: this is difficult to model. With its

emphasis on the university not being intimidated by the "dominant", one can see why it can often expect to be an "unpopular institution".

If, in contrast, universities simply provide vocational training and perhaps room, board, and social activities; then private enterprise can handle that function as a profit-driven undertaking: many private firms around the world currently supply various forms of education and training to corporations and public agencies for just that reason, sometimes selling their product as a residential program (e.g., in a hotel in a resort area). This reasoning is also consistent with the rationale for the adoption of increasingly popular voucher systems in primary and secondary education. The economic rationale for the public provision of universities is the public good nature of some of their outputs (esp. knowledge resulting from the aforementioned inquiry and awareness; reinforcement of various social norms, especially those producing "good citizenship" such as an appreciation of critical thinking about public issues) (Marks, 2002).[1] If universities are not producing public goods, then the state need not provide them: the private sector can, if one exists.

The standard suggested here states that the university, at its core, produces new knowledge, encourages intellectual curiosity, and teaches a critical approach to knowledge in an environment of open enquiry and protection from intimidation and censure. It also supports norms of behaviour (e.g., tolerance, openness) that facilitate these activities and treats learning as a lifelong process: formal education can be our best opportunity to understand how to learn, but we never know all we need to know, and we always benefit from access to that "outside". We shall note that knowledge production tends to be more of a faculty activity, but "learning to think" is the desired effect of the teaching process.

While a discussion of the global market for higher education is beyond the scope of this paper, it is worth noting the relevance of a market mechanism here. By promoting a continental system of universities, the EU encourages a more efficient allocation of resources. While its approach seems like one of increased cooperation among universities, it is likely also to encourage more competition (for example, for better students and faculty) as universities realize that students and faculty, facing greatly expanded choice, are "shopping" more for the best university: this idea is familiar to those who know North American higher education. Also, by promoting student mobility, the model is consistent with a more efficient allocation of learning and labour across the continent. Finally, there is no contradiction between the publicness of the university's core products and the existence of a market: the private sector is unlikely to produce public goods efficiently so we often turn to the public sector for their provision, but nothing says that public universities cannot compete for the best resources.

3. Higher Education in the EU and the Bologna Declaration

Of the 29 countries that signed the Bologna Declaration, 19 are European outside the CEEC – 15 EU members plus Malta, a pending EU member, and Iceland, Norway, and Switzerland which are not members. Almost all of these countries have a strong tradition of university education. Although the higher education policies of the EU members differ, the quality of their universities is broadly comparable: their best universities are among the

[1] The EU's support for student mobility raises an interesting question about the norm it seeks to strengthen. Increasing student mobility will likely increase citizen awareness and tolerance of other cultures, which seem desirable. That the EU would encourage this is not surprising. However, students will more likely forego their predecessors' experience of attending one of the home country's universities which might have nurtured a stronger sense of nationalism or patriotism as well as keeping students closer to the home labour market. Neither norm is "better", but the EU approach shows a clear preference.

world's best, and all are at least moderately selective in that they require students to (a) opt for and complete a pre-university secondary school curriculum and (b) pass an entrance examination that most secondary school students choose not to attempt. However, these universities exhibit a wide variety of organizational forms and cultures reflecting differing roles for students, faculty, and administrators; differing formal and informal relationships among these groups; and differing priorities. Because of their wide variety, we choose in this discussion to consider selected characteristics that are most germane to the goal of harmonization.

Scott (2002) suggests categorizing western European universities into three models—the Humboldtian model from Germany with its emphasis upon imparting "knowledge", the Anglo-Saxon model from the United Kingdom with its emphasis upon liberal arts, and the Napoleonic model whose emphasis is professional education. These models also show some correlation with the degree of autonomy of the university. Some countries (e.g. Germany and Sweden) manage their universities centrally through a ministry of education whose scrutiny may even cover textbook adoption, course content, and professor's qualifications. Others (e.g. UK) allow greater institutional autonomy through academic boards and committees. In addition, individual faculties and institutes in some countries (e.g. Italy, France, and Spain) develop and introduce their own courses and programs and even offer degrees without approval from senior administrators.

Regardless of the model, EU members have provided a wide range of educational programs in their universities – often remarkably broad program offerings at a single university. The concern, if any, about program offerings within, say, a national system of universities has been that the program offerings are too broad rather than too narrow: some are simply outside the intellectual bounds of university-level education in the spirit of the standard stated earlier.

Among the array of objectives that universities pursue, those most prominent in the Bologna Declaration involve teaching activities and student life and education. The Humboldtian model clearly assumes considerable distance between the students and the professor while the Anglo-Saxon model relies upon tutors to carry out a substantial portion of students' personal, academic, and social development. The Humboldtian model is the more prevalent across the continent and, by the way, has been the traditional model in the CEEC.

Because of their central role in the university's educational mission and their connection to students, it is also important to consider the appointment and teaching activities of faculty. In most European countries, the government appoints professors: very few universities have that power and responsibility, and students play no role in such decisions. In those countries where the university may appoint professors, decisions may reflect non-meritocratic administrative discretion and political influence. University professors are not necessarily required to do research. If they are, many universities and individual faculties lack guidelines or standards to evaluate this work. Often individual faculty members work in isolation and do not feel obliged to collaborate with colleagues. Their relationship to students need be no closer: the perception that "students are our customers" is much weaker in Europe than in North America. Teaching methods and learning objectives vary widely: most students hope to memorize enough to finish university, but many faculty hope they achieve greater intellectual development; and their teaching and examination methods reflect that goal.

European universities have never embraced or even approached the *in loco parentis* role of North American universities. Their responsibility is to provide the educational opportunity, and the student must determine how to derive the greatest benefit from that. Administrators and faculty typically remain aloof from students. Administrators in some countries (e.g. Germany and Sweden) suggest that this approach builds character,

independence, and coping skills and increases maturity. While we do not know how much this discourages students and results in withdrawals, those in countries where university education is valued and who persist seem to benefit overall from their university experience. Although in some countries (e.g. Sweden and Finland) students participate in educational administration and policymaking through course evaluations, program reviews, and even program development, their input is, by and large, given much less weight than that of faculty and administration.

Different student cultures mean that students' allocation of time varies in different universities. In some, students tend to focus on their studies and minimize involvement in university activities (France, Italy, and Spain). Where the system is less structured and follows non-traditional modes of instruction such as Sweden, where courses are typically scheduled in modules so students concentrate on one course at a time, students tend to participate more in administrative activities of faculties and departments.

Most older campuses are urban with university buildings spread around the city; they provide less of a physically defined community than some newer universities, which more closely resemble the defined campuses of North American universities. They may provide little sense of being and staying "on campus" since classes may be held in dispersed areas and may even change location from week to week. This discourages student gatherings for any but social purposes. At the same time, students are typically responsible for their housing needs. Few universities provide much student housing, and this generates a relatively complicated student social environment. Many students find their own housing, and some commute over relatively long distances to attend classes.

Student academic priorities at European universities are course credits, transfer of credits, grading, and examinations. Policies governing these issues vary dramatically, and transfers of credits and grades inadvertently discourage student mobility because of their complexity, which reflects the autonomy with which universities grant credits and assign grades. Examination procedures also vary and range, for example, from highly organized approaches where examinations are given under highly controlled conditions in special supervised examination rooms (e.g., Sweden) to individualized approaches where each student taking an examination may be asked one question and is expected to respond to that single question orally (e.g., Austria, Germany).

In addition, EU students have become accustomed to mobility – they never had to face the severe restrictions on educational choices and mobility of the CEEC during the Soviet era. They are more likely to be multilingual, either in some global language like English or Spanish or in another prevalent European language such as French or German after their native language.

The Bologna Declaration seeks to reduce inter-university differences and to facilitate and even encourage student mobility. Since its signing the educational environment has begun to change dramatically (Sebkova, 2002). Most signatories have at least begun internationalizing their programs and degrees as outlined in the Declaration (van der Wende, 2000). Generally, the participating governments and their universities take seriously their commitment to fulfill the provisions of the Declaration by 2010; interestingly enough, students are not well informed about potential opportunities and resources (Roth, 2003). Universities are signing cooperative agreements for student exchanges, faculty research, and awarding of multiple degrees. This trend is expected to continue because students have a right under the Declaration to attend any university that admits them. Although student loans and grants finance many study-abroad programs, an increase in student mobility will require greater faculty participation to encourage students to study for a time elsewhere and more publicity and encouragement from university administration to the faculty and students.

Two factors contributing to support for the Bologna policies are financial incentives and faculty loyalty. Faculty are finding lucrative financial inducements to facilitate achievement of the Bologna objectives, for example through EU-sponsored grant and sponsorship programs. Secondly, faculty loyal to their university hope that it develops an international reputation and therefore are eager to promote their university and encourage foreign students to attend.

4. Higher Education in the CEEC

Higher education in the CEEC looks, in some ways, like that in the EU. Many of the larger campuses are urban and diffused and include dramatic architecture and rich histories. Student life is, in many ways, similar if we allow for differences in standards of living. Distance exists between faculty and students, and this may tend to be greater in the CEEC, reflecting perhaps the greater influence of the Humboldtian tradition from the Austro-Hungarian empire. The more significant differences emerge from the different educational models that the two communities followed during the post-war period.

While we do not describe a caricature CEE university, we identify characteristics shared by many of these universities that highlight their differences with non-CEE universities, especially those in the existing EU. A number of these differences, especially those responsive to market forces (e.g., low faculty salaries), may recede with EU expansion eastward. Those more closely tied to the academic traditions of these countries over the last half century and the two generations educated during that time are more entrenched. It seems unlikely that adjustments will flow the other way since less of the CEEC tradition is consistent with the university ideal.

This discussion analyses the Soviet approach to higher education and some of the experience in transferring that model to CEE universities. It considers the transition of these universities in recent years and some institutional rigidities which linger but which will be challenged by EU accession. We refer to three caricature models of the university during the post-war period: Soviet (the model in the Soviet bloc), Western (the model in Western Europe), and North American (the model in Canada and the United States).

Universities were an integral part of the Soviet bloc in the post-war period and contributed significantly to the more highly skilled human capital of the particular economies; it is also reasonable to assume that, as a form of enterprise, they were managed as and shared many production characteristics with state-owned enterprises (SOE). However, in the CEE countries, "traditionally universities…had a monopoly on the creation of elites of all kinds…and the long-term stability of communist rule depended upon loyal elites…" (Connelly 2000: 142). Therefore, it was important to shape them to the ends of the regime in power; and, as we shall see, that virtually removed their ability to be true universities.

Like the contrasts among economic systems, the CEE universities during the Soviet era did not resemble models from either Western Europe or North America. While local variations existed (e.g., differing emphases upon recruiting "worker-peasant" students), they had a number of common structural characteristics which highlight their differences with Western and North American higher education. Some of the most important include (e.g., Fallenbuchl, 1996; Sadlak, 1996; Connelly, 2000; David-Fox and Pe'teri, 2000; McMullen and Prucha, 2000):

1. An institutional separation between the teaching function (university) and the research and research-degree-granting function (academies), with variations among different CEE systems (e.g., Hungary more so, Czechoslovakia and Poland less so);
2. An explicit orientation of both functions toward enhancing production in state-owned enterprises so that universities had a clear vocational training orientation and academies

favoured technical and scientific advancements in knowledge, resulting in the censorship or elimination of subjects considered impractical or subversive;
3. The requirement for advancement and even employment in either institution of ideological commitments and approved political loyalties and participation;
4. Related to the preceding, research and teaching, especially in the humanities and social sciences but also in the sciences (e.g., Michurinist biology) heavily oriented toward ideology (esp. dialectical materialism);
5. Final control by the state Communist Party and virtually no institutional autonomy;
6. A prescribed curriculum that allowed little or no flexibility to the student and potentially involved direct intervention by visiting Soviet specialists;
7. Instruction and evaluation of classroom work that stressed familiarity with lecture materials and facts rather than independent studies and a capacity for analytical thinking which could lead to innovative thought;
8. A focus upon certification rather than knowledge, upon ending one's education with the end of formal education, reflecting the prospect of lifelong employment in a given occupation in a given industry due in part to widespread labour hoarding; and
9. An ironic distaste for intellectuals as elites by Communist academics who formed their own elite class; and a corresponding preference for vocational programs over purely academic (in the Western sense) ones.

Any one of most of these features might disqualify an institution from the designation "university" in Western Europe or North America because of the affront to academic freedom, the explicit requirement of political commitment or deference to "the regime", the severe limits on and censorship of allowable curriculum, or the absence of autonomy of the institution and especially its faculty.

In considering these features of the CEE academic environment, and the related approach to production generally, it is worth remembering that they reflect one of the fundamental tenets of the Communist plan for modernization of the affected states - "a shortcut to modernity via state coercion", according to Pe'teri (2000, p. 278). The regime believed that intentional planning produced more efficient economic development than the uncoordinated, decentralized decisions of self-interested decision-makers – including academics and their students.

Universities were, in effect, another form of SOE with allocations of inputs and assignment of output targets—in particular, graduates with particular training. If one accepts the analogy of a command economy as one large firm (e.g., Nove, 1990, p. 188) with SOEs resembling plants or subcontractors, then universities would be part of the training division within "human resources". One author describes their status (in Hungary, in his example) as having been degraded "to the level of mere colleges of professional training" (Pe'teri 2000, p.288). Like SOEs, they had an incentive to understate their capacity so that they would not be assigned too ambitious a target of graduates. Second, as with goods and services, there was no market test of the value of the university's production such as the employment rate and capabilities of its graduates. All graduates would be assigned to employment so there was limited incentive to improve programs – an essential part of the university's production function. Correspondingly, the university could make adjustments to ensure that it met its production targets. Subject to the possibility of some form of external audit or competency test, it could alter its production of graduates by adjusting the academic standards it imposed upon its students (Ibid, p. 281) just as SOEs could adjust production to meet the letter if not the spirit of their output targets.

A number of authors have cited the central planning system's "weakness in generating and absorbing technological innovations" as one of the primary factors contributing to the demise of the Soviet empire (e.g., Kowalik, 1990, p. 46). Generating technological

innovations and increasing absorption by cultivating students' abilities and skills are, of course, two central functions of the university in the Western and North American models. Just as SOEs had little incentive to invite responsibility for innovation but were more inclined to see how little could be required of them, universities probably shared the same incentive.

Given this background, what has happened the Soviet-style universities since the elimination of the Communist regimes; and, in particular, have they embraced a new model, or are they also simply "in transition"? It is apparent that, as a group, these universities have neither embraced a new, identifiable, and distinct model nor have they clung rigidly to the past model, although there has been resistance to change, especially among those most invested in the former regime (e.g., Graham's (2000) discussion of the Russian example (p. 269-272)). No comprehensive analysis of the recent evolution of CEE higher education exists, but we can analyse some facts.

A profound change, shared with the larger society, is the return of relative autonomy and independence from the political regime. Pe'teri (2000) finds that the academies, as distinct from the universities, either have less power over academic work or have disappeared (East Germany), and universities are receiving increasing shares of research funding. While we lack a comprehensive audit of changes in CEE university curricula, some subjects have re-appeared in the curriculum; however, some of these represent "swift metamorphoses" (p.284) of existing personnel into new or returning subjects (e.g., scientific socialism becomes political science, Marxism-Leninism becomes philosophy). Universities have introduced new subjects which appeal to current students (e.g., Western languages, management); however, at least one author (Oleksy 2000, p. 90) warns that curricula may become too market oriented: their deviation from the traditional model makes other deviations more likely. More regime-driven fields such as historical materialism and Michurinist biology have shrunk or disappeared.

The size of more established disciplines has also shrunk or disappeared for both supply- and demand-side reasons. Many of the most talented personnel have emigrated westward or moved into industry. Other personnel were simply too far behind technologically, sometimes because of an absence of complementary inputs such as laboratories and equipment; and the relatively low priority of many scholarly fields that governments cannot afford to support in the face of more pressing needs. The long-term prospects for some fields are dim because of emigration, leaving a gap of a generation or more between existing practitioners and potential new entrants. (Pe'teri 2000, p. 282-287; Oleksy and Wasser 1999, p. 124) A corresponding demand-side effect is the low academic salaries of those remaining which encourages secondary non-academic employment that weakens commitment to a particular university or to an academic career.

Other employment shifts include, first, the widespread elimination of employment in copying and imitating foreign technology and science (esp. computer research). Also, senior scholars are often in an awkward position: "The old academic establishment has been handicapped by a loss of legitimacy and reputation in its efforts to efficiently and effectively represent and assert the interests of science when faced with the fiscal challenge [reduced funding]." (Pe'teri 2000, p. 287) Collaboration with the Communist regime, appointments for political and not meritocratic reasons, and lack of preparation for independent, peer review of research and requests for resources have disadvantaged many senior scholars and weakened the profession.

Another development has been widespread student participation in university governance such as significant student representation in the academic senate, the primary deliberative and decision-making body at many CEE universities, especially on matters of curriculum, research, and hiring (e.g., McMullen and Prucha (Czech Republic) 2000, p. 62; Stonis and Puce (Latvia) 2002). In the Latvian case, students have veto rights over a wide

range of issues. While granting this remarkable power to students may reflect several motivations such as the importance of democracy and equal rights since the fall of Communism or the importance of student activism in changing regimes, it is difficult to reconcile this degree of student academic political power with the university principles stated earlier: the academic interests of students are unlikely to conform overall with those of faculty who are more likely to have the long-run interests of the university at heart, especially as university participation rates grow (e.g., massification).

We have limited evidence on some other structural issues suggested by our list of "Soviet characteristics", most of which involve the educational process within the university which is particularly difficult to observe and characterize and yet are at the heart of the university experience. Limited evidence suggests that teaching and evaluation methods still rely primarily upon rote memorization (e.g., McMullen and Prucha (referring to the Czech Republic) 2000, p. 60). There is no evidence of widespread reform of curriculum beyond the "production-oriented" or vocational disciplines toward something resembling the "liberal arts" curriculum, conducive to the development of critical thinking skills, found to some extent in most Western and North American universities. Finally, since most faculty and administration were trained under the Soviet regime, one wonders about the extent to which course content is still coloured by ideology and administration is coloured by old loyalties.

Unlike the various reforms that have gone some distance in moving CEE universities beyond their Soviet past, one of the more invidious outcomes of the Communist era is the legacy of distrust of academic authority and cynicism about knowledge among students and scholars which are anathema to the academic enterprise; recall the earlier reference to the questionable position of senior academics in these countries. This is an unfortunate but predictable outcome when the university is driven so far from its defining principles for so long. This may dissipate over time, but its presence will prolong the re-emergence of a viable higher education sector.

While it is difficult to measure, we must not underestimate the impact upon the academic community of Soviet domination of its institutions for almost half a century. Since repression of dissent and control of both information and mobility were so central to the Soviet model, and freedom of expression and movement are so fundamental to the life of the university; we expect that this era had a profound and destructive effect upon the intellectual and even spiritual resources of the CEEC academic community that left it poor in relation to its western neighbours. One of the assets of an academic community is its academic standards, broadly defined, which include a variety of community norms ranging from adherence to scrupulous research techniques to a respect for inspired teaching and a consistent application of rigorous standards of performance evaluation (Marks, 2002). A crisis in the life of such a community may cause lapses in support for these standards; a "foreign occupation" over two generations may cause their extinction.

5. Integrating EU and CEEC Higher Education

The establishment of an effective European Higher Education Area depends upon the recognition of a shared vision between two communities. In this section we describe and discuss briefly a framework for evaluating the potential cohesion of the two communities and analyze the prospects in light of the preceding discussion.

We expect that a fully European system of higher education will require that the CEE universities move closer to the Western model rather than *vice versa* so we focus, first, upon how they have developed in recent years. Our discussion of the CEEC indicates that they have made some significant breaks with the past: the demise of the Communist political monopoly and its ideological requirements for access to resources (e.g., jobs and promotion; funding;

teaching, curriculum, and research content) and increased autonomy for the university. The division between research and teaching is less absolute. However, lingering elements of the Soviet legacy include relatively narrow curricular choices with continued emphasis upon science and technology, though now complemented with programs in management and information sciences (Scott 2002: 138), and the continuation of rudimentary teaching and learning processes. This, in turn, reinforces a focus upon certification rather than education and lifelong learning.

Anticipating the discussion to follow, we note several additional features of CEEC higher education starting with the limited resources available to CEEC universities relative to EU institutions. As suggested by the university ideal discussed earlier, we cannot expect universities to be profitable; in the absence of private benefactors, they must depend upon public funds, preferably untied to ideology. Poor governments cannot be generous so faculty leave or take second and third jobs, weakening their commitment to the enterprise (Scott 2002, p. 148). Academic careers look unattractive, and talent goes elsewhere, further weakening the enterprise.

We have also seen limited movement toward continental integration by faculty and students as evidenced by limited non-native language skills and curricula taught almost entirely in small-country languages; very little published research in non-native languages; limited student interest in studying outside the home country (Tesar, 1998); and correspondingly limited interest by students in working outside the home country. It may not be the case that faculty are comparably qualified in the CEEC. Universities may grant doctorates and assign faculty titles, but that need not mean that a professor of economics in one university is comparable one in another university.

Our discussion of the EU demonstrates, first, that its academic community looks different from the CEEC's and, second, that the EU model reflected in the Bologna objectives is a more natural next step for it than for the CEEC largely because, in its focus upon continental studies, it attempts to reduce educational barriers that have hindered EU students' educations but that have been largely irrelevant to the experiences of CEEC students. Nonetheless, continental education may become more appealing to CEEC students after they join the EU and benefit from the resulting economic stimulus.

What are the prospects for integration? The earlier sections have characterized the environments for higher education in these two communities. We now discuss their compatibility. The outlook depends upon a minimum level of cooperation, comparability, and complementarity along several structural dimensions which provide the framework for our examination:

1. the perceived definition of a university;
2. the place of the university in the national psyche;
3. budget support;
4. the relative importance of public and private institutions;
5. the perceived stakeholders, the perceived market;
6. disciplinary priorities;
7. evaluation standards (faculty, students);
8. methods of instruction and course content;
9. time horizon of the educational process;
10. openness to and funding for technological change;
11. interest in continent-wide mobility (faculty, students);
12. target labour markets; and
13. language of instruction and research (published).

Differences in objectives or visions or resources, or in commitment to the enterprise, all threaten the enterprise. In addition, enough members of every segment of the academic

community – primarily students, faculty, university administrators, and public policymakers – must see enough mutual benefit to justify the continental orientation.

Perceived definition of the university: Higher education has a long tradition in the EU; the three traditional models of higher education originated here. The size and resources of the community allow experimentation; one of the challenges to tradition has been massification which may threaten the important "unpopular" nature of many EU universities. The Soviet era diminished CEEC universities considerably so that they became, and continue to be, training academies more than universities. Some of the academies employ considerable talent, but they are at best scientific and technological research laboratories. The CEEC may aspire to have once again an exemplary academic community, but it currently has neither the resources nor, perhaps, the will to support it. One might characterize this as a search for institutional identity.

Place of the university in the national psyche: National universities have traditionally groomed leaders in a number of EU countries (e.g., UK, Portugal) and hold a favoured place. Many house important museums and libraries and employ world-famous faculty (e.g., Germany, Sweden). Some of the universities in the CEEC are among the oldest in the world and are still leading institutions in the region (e.g., Poland, Czech Republic), but their reputations do not extend beyond the region; and they have not consistently been training schools for national leaders. Their role during the Soviet era may have diminished their standing among the citizenry.

Budget support: The primary contrast here reflects the relative affluence of the home country: GDP per capita for the EU is more than twice that of the CEEC (1998), and EU universities are better funded in part because of their governments' greater resources. CEE university budgets have risen considerably over the last decade or so (e.g., Oleksy 2000; McMullen and Prucha 2000), and we expect that the higher education sector is of comparable importance in the two sectors: OECD (2001) data suggest that CEEC expenditure per student relative to GDP per capita in the tertiary sector, which hovers around 50 percent, compares favourably with the EU in both 1995 and 1998. However, in those same two years, CEEC public and private expenditure on tertiary education as a share of GDP was smaller than that of most EU members. Even the Czech Republic and Hungary spent only about one percent of GDP while EU budget shares fall more in the 1.0-1.5 percent range, perhaps reflecting the more urgent budget priorities of the CEEC.

Relative importance of public and private institutions: Unlike the United States, Europe has a relatively small private tertiary education sector: it rarely accounts for as much as 20 percent of the tertiary sector. Private education of unknown quality is perhaps a larger share of the higher education sector in some CEE countries (e.g., Czech Republic, Hungary) in part because of the limited resources of the public sector and the lack of an effective accrediting process. Scott (2002) attributes this popularity to the greater willingness of the CEEC to experiment as it emerges from the Soviet legacy. Recognizing that the Catholic church provides much of the private education in those EU countries where it is significant (except the UK), it is not apparent that either community has greater belief in the superiority or inferiority of private over public tertiary education. One concern is that the proliferation of poor-quality private institutions in the CEEC is actually diminishing the prospects of higher education there.

Perceived stakeholders, perceived market: One distinction here is the sources of students and their destinations after graduation. EU universities are more likely to see their service area as the continent rather than the nation or some part of it. CEEC universities are still inward oriented, servicing the national labour market. Another significant stakeholder is potential employers where, again, CEE universities are more oriented toward the needs of

local firms which, in many cases, are the heirs of the SOEs that were the targets of Communist manpower planning. The EU is more oriented toward multinational corporations.

Disciplinary priorities: The CEEC still concentrate upon science and technology and have expanded into management and information technology due primarily to labour market needs (Scott 2002). EU disciplinary priorities are more difficult to identify but have probably favoured technology in recent years in response to market conditions. However, because of their relative affluence and their intellectual traditions, their universities offer broader and deeper programs – some would say too broad at some universities, though this is related to massification and the need to find programs suitable for the larger share of the population matriculating.

Evaluation standards: Integration requires that quality standards for both faculty and students are comparable. Cooperation will be short-lived if students from one community are not prepared for work at the other community's universities, or if students shop for easy certification. Similarly, institutional academic reputation will have a significant influence upon the appeal of a given school and its ability to attract foreign students; this depends fundamentally upon the international reputation of the faculty. It is difficult to know which community has more inbreeding and absence of arms-length evaluation from universities training and hiring their own graduates. Multilingualism and the broader range of quality probably leads to more faculty mobility and meritocratic employment in the EU.

Methods of instruction and course content: We would assert that stimulating teaching and mentoring attract the best students who, in turn, will bring along other students. The energy in a classroom depends upon the quality of the students and the intellectual passion of the professor. CEE universities are currently staffed by faculty trained almost entirely in the Soviet tradition. The first wave of academics to emerge after the war began their careers in the early 50s and have now retired. However, their students now form the core of senior university faculty and administrators in the CEEC, and faculty members older than 35 received much of their university training before the change in regimes. Recalling the Soviet model of education, we expect that this history affects significantly the dominant mode of instruction, relying upon rote memory, and attitude toward innovation in course content. In contrast, EU faculty apprenticed in a more traditional system and would be more likely to incorporate new developments in their fields into their course content just as they have been willing to acknowledge new disciplines and open new programs.

Time horizon of the educational process: Somewhat in the spirit of the standard we introduced earlier, higher education in the EU has embraced the concept of lifelong learning and using universities, first, to instill in students an appreciation for continued learning and, second, to provide resources to facilitate that process. The certification mentality from the Soviet era still dominates CEE higher education, in part because of its disciplinary foci (e.g., engineering), its limited capacity to afford and develop new technology, and the occupational mix of the local labour market.

Openness to and funding for technological change: Because of their orientation, the CEE universities are certainly open to finding and using new technology in some fields. As mentioned earlier, they fell far enough behind in some fields that they have at least suspended the pursuit of new technology because of limited resources. However, their tradition is one that appreciates technological change. Both resource limits and lost competence play a role here. EU universities are subject to expanding and contracting budgets, but they continue a tradition of embracing new technology.

Interest in continent-wide mobility: The very existence of the EU reflects, among other things, an increasing sense of European community and a desire to reduce barriers, especially to expand markets. As mentioned earlier, the motivation for Bologna reflects both a recognition of increased mobility and a desire to facilitate it: as is often the case historically,

we are more likely to get along with trading partners. The CEEC has a new enthusiasm for mobility after decades of isolation, but this does not extend to studying and living in the west – for either students or faculty – in part because of the language barrier and, especially for faculty, because of concerns about competence.

Target labour markets: Western Europe is increasingly a continental labour market; and EU universities, recognizing this, design their programs to prepare students for this international market. CEE universities still focus upon the local labour market; they welcome foreign students who may wish to move to that country, but they are not oriented toward training domestic or foreign students for employment in other markets (e.g., the EU). EU faculty are less oriented toward a global faculty labour market than their North American colleagues, but EU universities recruit more widely, and their doctoral graduates search more widely, than their counterparts in the CEEC. Restriction on the language of instruction is a factor in this pattern.

Language of instruction and research (published): Issues of language have appeared throughout our discussion; this is not surprising when our focus is education and student and faculty mobility. Unlike athletes, students and professors must speak and write the same language; and the lack of a common language limits their mobility. CEE universities suffer from the minority status of their languages: in economic terms, their markets are thinner. They have fewer buyers of their services and fewer sources of supply. In addition they may feel profound resentment at having already invested so much in a language (Russian) whose value to them has depreciated so dramatically. The greater popularity of their languages, driven both by their greater size and by the prosperity of their private sectors, increases EU citizens' mobility. These same factors help explain the ascent of English as a near-global language. The language of instruction and research is an issue that can arouse strong feelings. Nonetheless, language choice has a profound effect upon the standing of the university in the academic community (e.g., Van Der Wende 2000, p. 309).

Given these observations, can these two communities performing different parts produce a result that is better than their individual performances? Unlike a merger of two similar firms in an industry, integration should provide a sum greater than the parts without forcing either side to become the other. The CEEC universities will benefit from greater cooperation and coordination as they continue to emerge from their difficult past. The EU universities will expand their pool of talent, broaden their academic network, and incorporate missing members of the academic community. If successful, the integration of the two communities will increase the efficiency of the continental market for higher education by allowing, among other things, better matches between institutional resources and student preferences and goals (Marks, 2004).

It is not surprising that the picture that emerges is murky. Working against integration are the wide gap in resources, the divergent views of the relevant stakeholders and markets, the disciplinary priorities, and a variety of conditions that yield different self-perceptions and ambitions. The academic community in the CEEC seems to suffer from its own realization that it has fallen behind and from the wider community's reduced opinion of it. It sets its sights low in focusing upon local needs and markets and a limited number of disciplines and by staying home professionally, even when members are visiting elsewhere; individual faculty can do little to improve matters because so much depends upon the community's norms. Many of the current norms are holdovers from the earlier regime (e.g., methods of instruction, evaluation standards, course content, time horizon, language of instruction and research). The questionable quality of private competitors permitted to operate in the CEEC and the lack of rigorous accreditation may reflect a kind of academic anomie.

Working in favor are the CEEC's traditional interest in higher education that its budgets reflect, its interest in technology, and probably some latent interest, especially among

academics less tied to the earlier regime (Scott, 2002, p. 147), in becoming more integrated with the European academic community. Ironically, it is fortunate that so many of the difficulties may be related to resource constraints – more on this below.

6. Results, Implications, and Conclusions

Despite their geographic proximity, these two academic communities are dramatically different. This reflects in part the extent and duration of ideological control that the CEEC faced during the Soviet era. It is not surprising that an institution that depends so much upon the intellect will develop differently under regimes with such different views of education and access to and accuracy of information. In many ways, it would be easier for CEEC farmers to catch up with their EU counterparts than for the universities to do so. However, the Soviet model is incompatible with the university as we have defined it, and the academic community in the CEEC – at least those not vested in the former regime[2] - seems to agree. In our framework, we have identified about a dozen dimensions which seem important to achieving a harmony between the two communities and found few where the two communities are currently compatible. However, they seem to have a mutual interest in the CEE universities belonging to the European Higher Education Area.

Much of the disparity in the two communities is reflected in different norms and different levels of resources: the two conditions are not independent. Many of the norms reflect the earlier regime and will weaken with enough shared experience. However, that requires resources which the CEEC does not have and has no prospect of having for some time; their economic growth rates are too low and unstable. For that reason alone, indigenous reform is unlikely in the CEEC. Increased resources could go far in addressing many of the barriers named earlier – in particular, language training, seed money for re-starting some of the missing disciplines (perhaps even exporting EU faculty to train apprentices in the CEEC), and support for extended visits to EU universities for both students and junior faculty and to CEE universities by EU students and faculty. Significantly higher academic salaries, with corresponding increases in professional responsibility, could have a significant effect upon the health of the industry: faculty would be more invested in their universities, foreign faculty would pay more attention, and students would find an academic career more appealing. The benefit of such support depends significantly upon the motivations of the participants, in particular their belief in the concept: funding alone will not address the problem. However, it is fortunate that simple resources could play a significant role here; at least the Soviet era is over. The results could go far in altering that self-perception that is currently hindering progress.

Sustained reform also depends significantly upon current students – the faculty, administrators, politicians, benefactors, and fathers and mothers of future students – so time is of the essence, especially because of the rapidly growing enrollments in CEEC universities—almost double since 1989 (e.g., Scott 2002, p. 142). Many CEEC students see university education as crucial to having a better life than their parents, but the prospects depend upon the content of that education and how "European" it is.

Many of the goals of the transition economy depend upon money, but this transition is particularly dependent upon public funds due to the nature of the university. Universities are

[2] Scott (2002, p. 146) cites an interesting case study of the effect of uniting two academic communities with backgrounds similar to the two we compare here. After reunification, "almost half of the higher education teaching staff members in the former German Democratic Republic lost their jobs, compared with fewer than 10 percent in the rest of Central and Eastern Europe". Realizing that we must avoid simple extrapolation, we can still see why many CEE academics, especially senior ones, are concerned about embracing new models of higher education such as the EU model and why developing closer ties with the EU may represent a threat.

inherently unprofitable. Also, significant funding must come from outside the region – probably from the EU primarily along with private funds – and this will mean timely and broad-based coordination between EU and CEEC ministries of education. Again, timing matters because higher education can play a central role in the speed and quality of the transition process through its effect upon labour market skills, migration, foreign investment, and the location of research and development.

References

Bloom, A. (1987). *The Closing of the American Mind.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Connelly, J. (2000). "The Sovietization of Higher Education in the Czech Lands, East Germany, and Poland during the Stalinist Period, 1948-1954". In *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers, and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe.* Eds: Michael David-Fox, Gyorgy Pe'teri. Westport, Ct: Bergin And Garvey, p. 141-177.

David-Fox, M. and Pe'teri, G. (2000). "On the Origins and Demise of the Communist Academic Regime". In *Academia in Upheaval*, p. 3-35.

Fallenbuchl, Z. (1996). "Poland: Higher Education and Science – A Survey". In *Science and Technology in Central and Eastern Europe: The Reform of Higher Education.* Eds: A. D. Tillett, Barry Lesser. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., p. 75-112.

Graham, L. (2000). "How Willing are Scientists to Reform their own Institutions?" In *Academia in Upheaval,* p. 255-274.

Kowalik, T. (1990). "Central Planning". In *Problems of The Planned Economy.* Eds: John Eatwell, Murray Milgate, and Peter Newman. From *The New Palgrave.* New York: W. W. Norton And Co., p. 42-50.

Malcolm, A. (2002). "European Higher Education and the Harmonization of Quality and Standards". *Industry And Higher Education* 16 (October), p. 283-288.

Mcmullen, M. And Prucha, J. (2000). "The Czech Republic: A Country in Transition … Again." In *The Emerging Markets and Higher Education*. Eds: Matthew S. Mcmullen, James E. Mauch, and Bob Donnorummo. New York: Routledgefalmer, p. 47-74.

Marks, D. (2002). "Academic Standards as Public Goods and Varieties of Free-Rider Behavior". *Education Economics* Vol. 10, No 2 (August), p. 145-163.

Marks, D. (2004). "Toward a Theory of the Market for Higher Education". Working Paper. Department of Economics, University Of Wisconsin-Whitewater.

Nove, A. (1990). "Planned Economy". In *Problems of the Planned Economy*, p. 186-197.

OECD (2001) *Education At A Glance – OECD Indicators 2001.* Paris: OECD.

Oleksy, W. (2000). "The Role of Higher Education in the Development of Poland's Democracy and Market Economy". In *The Emerging Markets*, p. 75-96.

Oleksy, W., Wasser, H. (1999). "Transformation of Higher Education in Poland after 1989: Case Study of the University of Lodz". In *Higher Education in the Post-Communist World: Case Studies of Eight Universities.* Ed: Paula L. W. Sabloff. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., p. 97-135.

Pe'teri, G. (2000). "On the Legacy of State Socialism in Academia". In *Academia in Upheaval*, p. 275-300.

Roth, A. (2003). "National Laws Hinder Scholar Mobility In Europe." *The Times Higher Education Supplement* No. 1585 (18 April): 40.

Sadlak, J. (1996). "Romania: Legacy and Change – Reform of Higher Education and Restoration of Academic Work". In *Science and Technology*, p. 113-142.

Scott, P. (2002). "Reflections on the Reform of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe." *Higher Education in Europe* 27 (April), p. 137-152.

Sebkova, H. (2002). "Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Europe." *Higher Education in Europe* 27 (January), p. 239-247.

Stonis, J., Puce, J. (2002). "Students with Veto Rights in the Senate – Reality". Paper Presented at the 24th Annual Forum of the European Association for Institutional Research, Prague, 8-11 September, 2002.

Tesar, G. (1998). "International Study Exchange Programs in the United States and Europe: Closing the Gap for Students from the Central and Eastern European Economies." In Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on *Business and Economic Development in Central and Eastern Europe.* Brno, Cr: Technical University of Brno, p. 631-644.

Van Der Wende, M. (2000). "The Bologna Declaration: Enhancing the Transparency and Competitiveness of European Higher Education." *Higher Education in Europe* 25 (October, p. 306-310.

Winston, G. C. (1999). "Subsidies, Hierarchies, and Peers: The Awkward Economics of Higher Education". *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 13 (1) (Winter), p. 13-36.

Winston, G. C. (2000). "The Positional Arms Race in Higher Education". Discussion Paper No. 54. Williams Project on the Economics of Higher Education. Williamstown, Ma (Usa): Williams College.

SKIRTINGI TIKSLAI, SKIRTINGI MODELIAI: EUROPOS SĄJUNGOS IR CENTRINĖS IR RYTŲ EUROPOS AUKŠTOJO MOKSLO INTEGRACIJOS IŠŠŪKIS

L. Denton Marks, George Tesar

SANTRAUKA

Ar gali Europos Sąjungos ir Centrinės bei Rytų Europos šalių akademinės bendruomenės dirbti kartu dėl bendros naudos, nežiūrint savo skirtingos patirties per praėjusį pusšimtį metų? Šiame straipsnyje siekiama atsakyti į šį iškeltą tyrimo tikslą, lyginant aukštojo mokslo politiką, pavyzdžiui Bolonijos deklaracijos pagrindu, su įvairiomis Europos šalių akademinėmis aplinkomis: palyginamos tradicinės bei geriau finansuojamos aukštojo mokslo bendruomenės ES-15 kontekste (2003 duomenimis) su CRE aukštojo mokslo bendruomene, kuri vis dar atspindi pokario metų komunistinės kontrolės palikimą.

Straipsnyje pateikiami metmenys, kurių pagalba galima nustatyti integracijos dimensijas (vz., biudžeto subsidijas, suvokiami tarpininkai (suinteresuotos grupės) ir suvokiamos rinkos, edukacinio proceso laikmatis, dėstomoji kalba ir mokslo tyrimai). Be to, palyginama dviejų nagrinėjamų aukštojo mokslo bendruomenių aplinka ir perspektyvos. Aptarus skirtybes ir tapatybes, paaiškėjo, jog (1) egzistuoja didelis atotrūkis tarp išteklių srityje bei (2) atotrūkis akademinėse normose ir jų sprendimo būduose.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: aukštasis mokslas, pereinamosios ekonomikos, rinka, Europos Sąjunga, Tarybų Sąjunga.