LI WANG

Higher Education Policies in the EU and in the People's Republic of China

A Comparative Approach

∎

Contents

Acknowledgments

I have been working on this dissertation at the Department of Education, Faculty of Education of University of Tampere (UTA) since 1999, a prestigious university with the most efficient and effective education system in the world, at which I feel honored to have been working, and an ideal academic environment with talented researchers, in which one can find the best cooperators one can ever expect.

First of all, I would like to express my warm gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Reijo Raivola, dean of Faculty of Education (emer.), who has provided me with the opportunity to study in Finland and given me invaluable guidance, encouragement, advice and help during my research, which have been of a great value to me as I find that his boundless interest, constant support and positive attitude are essential throughout this journey.

My special thanks go to Professor Jan-Ingvar Löfstedt and Research Director, Docent Timo Aarrevaara for their kind efforts in improving the whole manuscript and giving me very precious editorial advice.

I am sincerely grateful to Prof. Ruth Hayhoe (University of Toronto), Prof. Jurgen Henze (Humbolt-Universitat zu Berlin) and Prof. John Hawkins (University of California at Los Angeles) for their unselfishly providing me with relevant research materials.

Mr. Tuo Tianfu, an English professor and expert in North China University of Technology in Beijing, deserves my sincere thanks for his generous help in revising the English version of this dissertation. I am, of course, solely responsible for any errors or omissions.

There are several people who have helped me with this dissertation. Mrs. Sirpa Randell deserves my sincere thanks for her excellent work. I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Vesa Huotari and Aki Virtanen for their helpful advice. I am grateful to my classmates and good friends Anne Pylväinäinen and Aya Watanabe-Kuroda for their continuous support at all stages, with whom I have had conversations on different subjects have given me confidence and strength to finish this dissertation. In addition, I would like to thank my Finnish friends, Ms. Tuula Virvalo and Mr. Tapio Virvalo, for their kind support and encouragement to my family and me.

I would like to thank my parents and my brothers for their love, invaluable support and care throughout my life.

Abbreviations

ALFA	America Latin Formation Academic
CEC	Commission of the European Communities
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
CPC	Communist Party of China
EC	European Community
ECJ	European Court of Justice
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
ECTS	European Credit Transfer System
ECU	European Currency Unit
EEA	European Economic Area
EEC	European Economic Community
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
ENIC	European Network of Information Centres
ENQA	European Network of Quality Assurance
EP	European Parliament
EU	European Union
EUA	European University Association
Euratom	European Atomic Energy Community
GATS	General Agreement on Trade in Services
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HE	Higher Education
HEIs'	Higher Education Institutes
HEP	Higher Education Policy
ICPs	Inter-university Cooperation Programmes
ICTs	Information and Communication Technologies
IRDAC	Industrial Research and Development Advisory Committee
IT	Information technology

JSP	The Joint Study Programme
LDSS	Library and Documentation Support System
MEFSS	Modern Equipment and Facilities Sharing System
MOE	Ministry of Education
NARIC	National Academic Recognition Information Centres
NGAAs	National Grant Awarding Agencies
ODL	Open and Distance Learning
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OJ	Official Journal of the European Communities
OMC	Open Method of Coordination
PRC	People's Republic of China
R&E	Research and Education
R & D	Research and Development
RMB	Renminbi
SEA	Single European Act
SEC	State Education Commission
SMEs	Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
STE	Science, Technology, and Education
TEC	Treaty Establishing the European Community
TEMPUS	the Trans-European Mobility Programme for University Studies
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TRACE	Trans Regional Academic Mobility and Credential Evaluation
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
WEM	World Education Market
WTO	World Trade Organization

Abstract

The aims and objectives of the study are to explore and analyse the principles of higher education policies in the EU and China. The purpose is two-fold. The first is to identify the similarities and differences between the EU and China. The second is to explore if there are any lessons for China to learn from the EU in the field of higher education policy. To this end, this study reviews descriptive materials on higher education policies produced by Chinese and European Union authorities.

As a result of careful study, I have given a detailed picture of the status and development of the basic educational ideologies, strategies, contents, governance and decision-makings in both the EU and China systems. I have also explored the different backgrounds and considered the distinctive responses in Europe and China to future challenges in higher education. In addition, I have approached with much attention the role of higher education in promoting European integration, a topic that may have special relevance for China, given the huge size of the country and the diversity of different regions.

Regions and countries with different political and socioeconomic systems and dissimilar higher education traditions have similar patterns in reforms in higher education. On the basis of the study, it seems that the coherency of the Chinese system is deteriorating. It has become more flexible, the trend towards internationalization is obvious, and it is expanding and yet holding on to its competitiveness through increased effectiveness and commercialization. The Chinese higher education policies is also directing towards a more segmented and, regarding the needs of education, a more equipment oriented education supply. In the EU on the other hand, the system seems to be moving towards higher coherence, but the above described principles concerning China can also be applied to the EU. The common contextual factors, particularly the increasingly trend of globalization, seem to have considerably shaped higher education policy in the EU and China. The higher educational systems are, thus, at least at a normative level becoming more homogenized.

No nation has all the answers to the perplexing questions facing the new challenges of the 21st century, especially in the field of higher education system. National circumstances—in terms of specific economic, sociological, political and educational realities—are just too complicated for one to simply transfer institutions or even ideas from one country to another. Yet, perspectives from other countries can at least suggest ways of approaching problems that might lead to potential solutions. Comparative or joint higher education policies can il-

luminate and pose alternatives. This in itself is the right reason for this study to pay adequate attention.

The study will give readers some well-argumented information on how these two giants make use of higher education as a tool to face the challenges of knowledge-based economy and globalization.

Chapter 1

Background of the Research Problem, Aims and Objectives, Methods, Limitations and Significance of the Study

1.1   Background of the Research Problem

In the present computerized, globalized and knowledge-economy society, science and technology are developing rapidly. These external factors are profoundly influencing education, and market competition has become an element of the education policy in the European Union (EU). In People's Republic of China (PRC), higher education (HE) is undergoing reforms and developments similar to those taking place in other parts of the world. While higher education reform were formulated and adopted in response to each region's and country's unique problems, they also were driven by globalization forces that fostered an international perspective. Globalization theory envisages a new "borderless" world (Ohmae, 1990) where time and space are compressed (Harvey, 1990) and where national cultures are transformed by the forces of global communications and cultural commodification. International flows of goods, capital, labour, services and information will be accelerated. The potential effects of globalization on education would be no less revolutionary. Higher education policy (HEP) in many countries seems to have been shaped more and more by the growing international competition in the context of the globalization (Kearns & Doyle, 1991). Therefore, in a rapidly changing and increasingly globalized world, the success of nations, communities and individuals may be linked, now more than ever before, to how they adapt to change, learn and share knowledge. Global educational reform would benefit from examination from a comparative perspective.

Higher education policies will play a more important role in the country's and region's development at the age of knowledge-based economy than any other time in the history. In order to adapt themselves to this situation, many countries, including developed and developing countries, improved their higher education systems in the 1990's.

Education has traditionally been perceived as a marginal area of action for the European Union. The EU education policy is based on limited mechanisms of funding and regulation. However the 1990's have seen a considerable deepening and strengthening of Community action in various policy areas, which fall outside its traditional economic and technological interests. Treaty on European Union (ratified in November 1993) endowed with new sense to European community. The economic community is becoming an economic, political and monetary union. Education offers a promising vehicle for consolidating the political and social cohesion of the continent. The challenge of science and technology are central to European competitiveness and economic progress and requires that Europe should be in the forefront, not only in the generation of new knowledge, but also in its dissemination and application to economic life. Some of the EU policies of higher education are the invaluable treasure for human beings, especially for the developing countries. In 1999, Ministers from 29 European countries signed the *"Bologna Declaration"* which aims at the establishment of a European area of higher education by the end of this decade. This area should facilitate mobility of people, transparency and recognition of qualification, quality and European dimension in higher education, attractiveness of European institutions for third country students. *The Bologna Declaration* (1999) has moved recognition issues from the domain of 'technical specialists' to the core of the European higher education policy debate. A Europe of Knowledge is now widely recognized as an irreplaceable factor for social and human growth and as an indispensable component to consolidate and enrich the European citizenship, capable of giving its citizens the necessary competencies to face the challenges of the new millennium, together with an awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space.

The modernization of higher education is one of the most important parts that compose the social modernization, especially, higher education, which will play a more important role in the system of China's socialist market economy and national development. China all along has attached great importance to education and made manifold laws. Great progress has been made over the past 55 years. However, China's education level and pattern of cultivating individuals has turned to be incapable of fitting the needs of modernization. Therefore, how to prosper education is an important and objective necessity for China. *The Guidelines for the Education Reform and Development in China* (1993) brought forward the mark of higher education in the 1990's. Now, the Chinese government regards technology and education as the basic policy to develop the country and catch up with the developed countries.

Higher education has emerged as a central tool for social development in both China and the EU. In China, where its 21st century principles were to a great extent formed during the 1990s. Similarly, within the European Union higher education policies have become a significant factor in social development in the 1990s. The Bologna Declaration concluded in 1999 was the landmark for new European higher education policies whose principles had, however, already taken shape during the 1990s. If China could learn some ideas and experi-

ences from the EU in the field of HEP, then it will be helpful for the development of Chinese higher education.

Higher education policies of the EU and China is a field, to which much attention has been paid, but relatively little has been written, nor deep analytical thought has been given. This may, in my opinion, be due to two reasons. Firstly, research on international education in general is—while growing in scope and volume—still piecemeal and theoretically thin. Altbach (1991) has concluded that international education has remained a peripheral field of study and research on the area is still "theoretical and at a pre-paradigmatic stage". Secondly, the whole social-cultural dimension of European integration has so far been understudied, and the unwillingness of social scientists to participate in discussion of the European integration has astonished many observers. People interested in European Union are not interested in education, but in European integration.

According to Llobera (1993), social scientists lack the proper concepts and theories to even describe, let alone explain, the process of European integration. This results from the complexity of European politics and policies. EU's education programmes, too, are notably diverse and complex. EU's education policy is often referred to in papers addressing more generally international education and in some edited papers on different EU policy areas. As a traditional but at the same time fast-changing society, China opened her door to the outside world only after the late 1970s. With the development of the socialist market economy, China's higher education faced the problems of reform. In order to satisfy the high demand of Chinese people for higher education, China has to adopt new policies to solve the problems. Chinese education policies have been strongly influenced by a growing internationalization of various subsections of society and by gradually increasing counteractive forces inherent in the reform process. In my opinion, the Chinese government would more like to study the experiences of USA and Japan other than Europe's. Much has been written concerning the higher education reform of above countries. However, there are not an adequate number of papers on education policy of EU written in Chinese. The theme of this research is extremely necessary and demanding.

As we know, the basic ideology of education in general includes three elements: man, society and curriculum. It refers to who goes to school, what the schools are intended for and what is taught at school. These are the common facts for every country. However, it is well known that EU and China have basically different patterns of political social and economic organizations. The functions of higher education in any country are shaped by the nature of its particular society, by its cultural heritage and its political, economic and social institution. According to Nicholas Hans (1949)

> "The modern national systems of education are projected both into the past and into the future. As their national past was formed by factors often common to many nations and as their ideals of the future are the outcome of universal movements, the problems

of education in different countries are similar and the principles, which guide their solutions, may be compared and even identified. The analytical study of these factors from a historical perspective and the comparison of attempted solution of resultant problems are the main purpose of Comparative Education."

It is sufficient that the essential condition for comparison is fulfilled: a point of reference is established, so that all the units to be compared can be examined in the light of a common variable, the meaning of which is constant for all units under comparison. This basis of comparison forms a kind of third dimension on which the units to be compared can be unambiguously projected (Edwards, 1970). Through the comparison, policies of the EU's and Chinese higher education reforms will influence and complement each other.

1.2 Aims and Objectives of the Study

The aims and objectives of the study are to explore and analyse the principles of higher education policies in the EU and China. The purpose is two-fold. The first is to identify the similarities and differences between the EU and China. The second is to explore if there are any lessons for China to learn from the EU in the field of higher education policy. I will fulfill this research task around four questions:

1. What kind of background do the EU and China have for their higher education policy?
2. What is the role of higher education policies in promoting EU's integration and China's development?
3. How do the EU and China look at the new century's challenges to higher education policies?
4. What are the main differences and similarities in the EU's and Chinese higher education policies?

Based on the analysis of above four questions, I will indicate the underlying main reasons for similarities and differences in HEP and then discuss if there are any lessons for China to learn from the EU.

To this end, this study reviews descriptive materials on higher education policies produced by Chinese and European Union authorities. The research materials on the EU and China education policies consist of basic laws and treaties, published and unpublished reports, memoranda and other education documents by the State Council, the Ministry of Education and the advisory expert organizations operating in state educational administration. The common idea behind documents is related to build higher education space for the EU

and the development of China. Also relevant newspaper and journal articles are collected from different sources. These texts are regarded as discourses, and outcomes of argumentation practices. Discourses create social meanings and thus both shape and reflect the existing social reality. The study also pays special attention to the existing research of EU-China education policies at both international and national levels.

The aim and criteria in selecting the data was that a wide range of documents be chosen surrounding the research topic in order to provide a more holistic understanding of the meanings higher education policy in the EU and China. The most relevant documents were selected from official website of the EU and China. The process of data collection was itself influenced by the ongoing analysis that continually occurred through frequent contact with the literature and the incoming data. The major issue, which confronted me during the data collection process, was the large quantity of data. I know that the greater the amount of accurate documents I can gather, the more confident I can be that I am making the right conclusion.

The selected documents and materials (See Appendix) provide a valuable source of data. Data has been kept in a well-organized and easily accessible form for retrieval and re-analysis if required. Although this was very time and resource intensive, it did give me a familiarity, which was valuable during the data analysis process. I am responsible for showing that I did not "invent" the interpretations, but that they are the product of conscious analysis. This involves a constant justification of the interpretation and a relentless internal evaluation of my motives for interpreting in a particular way.

Among the most cited criticisms of qualitative research are the presumed lack of reliability and validity of its findings. In regard to field research, critics question the ability of qualitative research to replicate observations (reliability) or to obtain correct answers or correct impressions of the phenomenon under study (validity) (Kirk & Miller, 1986). Reliability addresses how accurate your research methods and techniques produce data. Within a conventional research background one speaks of the reliability of the "research instrument". Validity addresses whether your research explains or measures what you said you would be measuring or explaining. It therefore deals with the appropriateness of the method to the research question. According to Kirk and Miller (1986), there are three illustrations concerning validity question which including apparent validity (content), instrumental validity (criterion) and theoretical validity (construct).

On the broadest sense reliability and validity address issues about the quality of the data and appropriateness of the methods used in carrying a research project. Although reliability and validity issues apply mostly to research results and conclusions, one must consider those issues at the time of the design of the research, i.e. at the earliest stages of the research process, because if researcher consider them only at the end, it will be too late to gather data on a research question that is of any relevance and quality at all. Research is a careful, systematic

study that is undertaken to acquire or establish new facts and principles. The researcher must himself go through the sources that are connected with the phenomenon to be studied. The materials shall not be changed or damaged either. So, data and arguments are needed to clarify the problems of a research. Therefore, an effort is also made in this study, to get familiarized with the primary sources as deeply as possible. In this case primary sources mean mostly different China and the EU documents which are original and of primary importance to my topic. Such materials include treaties, acts, documents, memoranda and various kinds of official publications. Other primary sources include international journals and newspapers, published memoirs and documentary works.

It is often necessary to complement primary sources with secondary sources. This means that I must be happy with someone else's assessments of a solution in comparative study on higher education policy, because the original sources do not exist or are not available for some reason. Aware of this document limitation, I extended the education policy analyzing process by not only obtaining a more detailed and systematic official documents of the EU and China, but by reading and analyzing some articles published by the academics. The secondary sources also include existing publications such as *Comparative Education*, *Higher Education in Europe*, *International Review of Education*, *Journal of Social Policy* and Chinese publications that are relevant to the research theme in the fields of comparative higher education, education system, education policy, sociology, the science of history and the theories and methods of these sciences. They also include all other relevant historical or topical publications and works that are connected with the theme of the research. These educational publications were very helpful in directing me to further literature that could be relevant for the research. The task of the research is to make use of these varied source documents and to use groups of materials that are complementary to each other to construct validity.

It is important to think over the validity of the present study. I should try to examine the entire research process believing that reality is holistic and cannot be subdivided and attempt to produce a unique explanation about a given situation or individual strive for depth. I am responsible for the final articulation of the hermeneutic understandings, which flow from the data. As Usher and Bryant (1989), Walker (1980), as well as Kennedy (1979) have said, an important criteria for the validity and the reliability of a study are whether the readers of the research or the practitioners in the particular field find the findings of the study authentic, relevant and useful for their own situations. In this study, I will explore the differences and similarities of the HEP in the EU and China, analyze and consider the distinctive responses in the Europe and China to future challenges in higher education. I will approach with much attention the role of higher education in promoting European integration, a topic that may have special relevance for China, given the huge size of the country and the diversity of different regions. I believe that the dissertation will give readers some well-argumented information on

how these two giants use higher education as a tool to face the challenges of knowledge-based economy and globalization.

1.3 Research Methods

There is not really any uniform and comprehensive theory of education policy that has been proved to be valid. We can say that researchers can use different theoretical approaches in their work.

Research methods can be classified in various ways, one of the most common distinctions, however, being between qualitative and quantitative research methods. The motivation for doing qualitative research as opposed to quantitative research comes from the observation that, if there is one thing that distinguishes humans from the natural world, it is our ability to talk! Qualitative research methods are designed to help researchers understand people and the social and cultural contexts within which they live. Kaplan and Maxwell (1994) argue that the goal of understanding a phenomenon from the point of view of the participants and its particular social and institutional context is largely lost when textual data are quantified. Qualitative research involves the use of qualitative data, such as interviews, documents, and participant observation, to understand and explain social phenomena. Qualitative researchers can be found in many disciplines and fields, using a variety of approaches, methods and techniques.

Just as there are various philosophical perspectives, which can form qualitative research, so there are various qualitative research methods. A research method is a strategy of inquiry which moves from the underlying philosophical assumptions to research design and data collection. The choice of research methods influences the way in which the researcher collects data. Specific research methods also imply different skills, assumptions and research practices.

The argumentation and task presented above may serve as a frame of categorization and analysis of the materials. As the nature of the materials does not permit much quantitative analysis, conventional qualitative research methods of document and content analysis will be used. The approach used in this research is basically historic-genetic with the aim of examining the process of the forming of higher education policy in a problem-centered way. The materials of the EU's and Chinese higher educational policies will be dissected from the policy texts and then arranged by classifying according to the subjects. After this, through close reading and elaborate analysis of the content, answers to the research questions will be sought. In the course of qualitative study, specific attention will be given to the exploratory and descriptive of the EU's and Chinese higher education policies in nature.

In the qualitative area, theory is data driven and emerges as part of the research process, evolving from the data as they are collected. Concerning my research, the analysis process is one in which I examine the assumptions that surround the research topic in my mind and seek out 'matches' in the data. I should try to apply the valid and reliable criteria to the research data, method and conclusions from the beginning to the end. By making use of the most relevant official documents, I should give a detailed comparative picture of the status and development of the basic educational ideologies, strategies, contents, governance, operations and decision-makings in both the EU and China. As a result of careful study, the conclusions were drawn from the main documents analysis.

Not all comparative research seeks general explanations, but all research that seeks to offer general explanations must be comparative. Researchers and practitioners have relied on comparative and international perspectives to illuminate the field of higher education. Today more than ever before, in an era of information technology and an inter-connected global economy of skills and ideas, scholars need to understand how the processes of schooling and learning vary across societies, and what implications these variations have for higher education in the world today. Another important tool in the analysis is the comparative method. The very essence of comparison in this dissertation will be three steps: identification of differences and similarities; explanations of possible reasons or causes for these differences and similarities and then analysis, assessment, and conclusions—including lessons to be drawn. The manner of collecting data and explaining European and Chinese systems of higher education will be used. Comparison will be involved in inductive reasoning process. The concepts developed in one cultural backgrounds cannot be transferred without any problems to the situation in another. Care should be taken to keep concept equivalents in the study.

1.4   Limitations and Delimitation of the Study

The study falls within the scope of international and comparative education and it has contact points with higher education research, comparative administrative science as well as sociology and history. The objects of comparison are the status and development of factors indicating higher education policies. Founded on the frame of reference, the indicators in this study are educational ideologies, strategies, contents, governance, operations in terms of implementation and decision-making.

The main focal point is on the role of higher education policy in promoting the EU's integration and Chinese development and on the analysis of the differences and similarities, but different backgrounds in the past and future responses to the 21st century challenges between the two entities will also be explored. It is a macro study of the growth of the importance of higher education as a phenomenon on two systems to some extent.

The selection of the two entities is done on the basis that different types of higher education might provide a broader overview of strategies to promote higher education reform. It might be possible for China to know and learn much more from the EU. This is a motive for the preliminary choice of these two entities.

As a macro level research, the operations of institutions or fields of science are delimited outside the study. As this study examined only the higher education policies at the EU level, the HEP of member states would not be referred to in the dissertation.

1.5   Significance of the Study

A description of the functioning of education policies can allow countries to see themselves in the light of other countries' performances. Through international comparisons, countries may recognize strengths and weaknesses in their own education systems and to assess to what extent variations in educational experiences are unique or mirror differences observed elsewhere. In searching for effective education policies that aim to enhance individuals' social and economic prospects, provide incentives for greater efficiency in schooling and help to mobilize resources in order to meet rising demands for education, governments are paying increasing attention to international comparative policy analysis. The European Union and China are the two important forces in the arena of international politics and economy. They have some common or similar positions and viewpoints towards many international issues. How to utilize and organize the important vehicle by the EU and China will be an interesting content. Therefore I think this topic is very significant and worth studying in an international and comparative view.

No nation has all the answers to the perplexing questions facing the new challenges of the 21st century, especially in the field of higher education system. National circumstances—in terms of specific economic, sociological, political and educational realities—are just too complicated for one to simply transfer institutions or even ideas from one country to another. Yet, perspectives from other countries can at least suggest ways of approaching problems that might lead to potential solutions. Comparative or joint higher education policies can illuminate and pose alternatives. This in itself is the right reason for this study to pay adequate attention.

1.6   The Organization of the Dissertation

The study is historic-genetic in nature and will be organized on the basis of chapter 8.

The first part (Chapters 1 & 2) presents preliminary aims, purposes, methods, significance and limitations and the main concepts and theoretical framework used in the study.

The second section (Chapters 3 & 4 & 5) concentrates on the first three main research questions including historical background, the role of higher education policy and distinct response to the future challenges. The description and analysis of the chapters will provide a good basis for comparing and drawing conclusion.

The third section (Chapters 6 & 7) concentrates on the main differences and similarities of higher education policies in the EU and China. The analysis of the main reasons for those differences and similarities will be addressed.

The final section (Chapters 8) presents conclusion and discussions on the main findings of the study.

Chapter 2

Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

2.1 The Main Theoretical Framework

A framework is a system of ideas or conceptual structures that help us "see" the social world, understand it, explain it, and change it. A framework guides our thinking, research, and action. It provides us with a systematic way of examining social issues and providing recommendations for change. In general, educational theoretical frameworks have influenced thinking and policy. An historical context is important to understand development and to explain when and why these frameworks emerge, how they influence one another, and how they change. In this chapter, we shall examine HEP of the EU and China in the theoretical framework of comparative and international education. In order to ensure that theoretical frameworks reflect our interests and concerns, education system and education policy, human capital theory and globalization theory will be regarded as the important points for this research.

2.1.1 Education System and Education Policy

The Politics of Educational Policy

Countless definitions of politics are offered in the literature. Many represent variants of those offered by Lasswell (1958) and Easton (1965) more than a quarter century ago. Both define politics in the context of the authoritative allocation of values, benefits, and costs. Politics is that set of human activities that surrounds such allocative decisions and is reflected in the varied efforts of mobilized interests to realize partisan values in decision outcomes. The specific activities that characterize these efforts are typically conflict-ridden. As Schattschneider (1960) has observed, politics is the socialization of conflict. Individuals and groups contest, debate, mobilize, coalesce, pressure, persuade, and negotiate quid pro quo—all in an attempt

to influence decision outcomes at various stages of the policy life cycle (Kingdon, 1995; Lindblom, 1980).

Although the level of political intensity surrounding the decision process may vary across issues and settings, policy participants mobilize in an attempt to influence this outcome. Their goal is to see that their values are realized (ideally, maximized) in the final policy decision. However, policy outcomes rarely reflect the full agendas of all competing interests. Compromise is the typical order of the day. Regardless of the character of this compromise, an important defining feature of the policy-making process and arena is its agenda-driven nature (Chelimsky, 1995). Multiple actors driven by diverse agendas interact in numerous ways to produce policy outcomes.

Policy, as we see it, is a course, program or set of principles of action adopted or proposed by governments and political parties to guide implementation. It could be understood as a transformation of intentions—purposes and goals meant to shape the behavior of actors in the future and at other sites—motivate actors to act in the policy arena, to use policy as a vehicle for realizing their purposes. The transformation of intentions in a conventional sense occurs when actors aim specific actions at a problem for announced purposes.

The educational system can be perceived as a configuration that can only be explained in terms of the unique historical and cultural traditions in which it is imbedded. Education policy is one of the many branches of social policy, which, at least in the proper sense of the word, only started, with the development of educational systems. However, no other sector of policy but education is equally tightly intertwined with the entire growth and development of human beings nor has such an immediate influence on his life. Education is one of the means by which social policy is implemented. At the same time, though, expansion of education and continuous growth of the school supply of the population have made schooling a powerful factor that exerts an increasing influence on society. Therefore, not only educational policy but schooling as well must be examined as social phenomena. Lehtisalo and Raivola (1986, 38) remark to the point that: "too many educational scientists study the school system as an autonomous factor. Education is always an essential part of the political, economic, social and cultural reality, whichever social ideology we are concerned with". Many features of the theories of education policy can be traced back to the theories of social sciences. Education policy in general and the education policy of each era in particular must be seen as efforts to provide a partial solution to the economic and social problems of society. In this part, the basic principle is to examine the interaction between society and education. The educational interest groups, their roles and power in the educational play and the interaction between these groups thus constitute education policy. (Lehtisalo & Raivola, 1986, 34.)

Education System and Policy-Makers

Education systems everywhere had become arenas of political and social conflicts, and it is therefore hardly surprising that governments gave the increased priority to the funding of educational research. A perspective used all too infrequently in both functionalist and conflict analyses of education and social structure is the comparative approach. Turner (1960) and Hopper (1971) developed a systematic typology of educational systems. Their purpose was to provide a conceptual framework to encourage theoretically informed empirical research, and they suggested various ways in which the analysis of structural differences between educational systems might illuminate existing knowledge. The keystone of their framework was a typology of the various dimensions of the educational selection process, and a crucial element in it was the comparative analysis of educational ideology.

> *"As societies industrialize they develop specialized and differentiated systems of education. Such systems have three primary manifest functions: the selection of children with different types and levels of ability; the provision of the appropriate type of instruction for the various categories of children created by the selection process; and the eventual allocation of trained personal either directly to occupational roles or to agencies which specialize in occupation recruitment. Because the last two functions are closely linked to the first, the structure of educational systems, especially those within industrial societies, can be understood primarily in terms of the structure of their selection process."* (p. 154)

Since educational systems in stratified industrial societies are mechanisms of selection and allocation, such societies are likely to have explicit ideologies of legitimization concerning educational selection. These ideologies translate questions concerning the distribution of educational suitability. They defined who should be selected for higher training and explained why some people should be rejected when others are selected.

One way, in which educational systems maybe classified, therefore, is according to their ideologies of legitimization concerning educational selection. Two properties of these ideologies warrant special attention. In answer to the question "Who should be selected?" one can conceptualize a continuum ranging between two polar properties: the first representing a quality of complete universalism; and the second, its opposite—representing a quality of complete particularism. In answer to the question "why should they be selected?" one can also conceptualize a continuum ranging between two polar types: the first representing a quality of complete collectivism; and the second—its opposite—representing a quality of complete individualism. Educational systems may be classified on each continuum. The two continua can be combined to produce four ideal types of ideologies of legitimization concerning educational selection: "aristocratic," "paternalistic", "meritocratic," and "communistic." Each ideal type may be defined as follows:

Particularistic

To the extent that pupils should be selected primarily on the basis of their diffuse skills and only secondarily on the basis of their technical skills, such that those with the most of the former need have least of the latter, the ideology has a "particularistic" quality. This assumes that the society has a system of ascribed statuses on the basis of which certain diffuse skills and ascribe characteristics are likely to become unequally distributed. It also assumes that the opportunity for learning such skills is strictly limited to particular groups and that substitute for ascribed characteristics are unacceptable.

Aristocratic Ideology: An Individualistic Form of Particularism. When particularistic selections are justified to the population in terms of the right of those selected to privilege on the basis of their diffuse skills and ascribed characteristics one may refer to the "aristocratic" quality of the ideology.

Paternalistic Ideology: A Collectivistic Form of Particularism. When particularistic selections are justified to the population in terms of the society's "need" for people with diffuse skills and certain ascribed characteristics in order that the society may be led by the most "suitable" people, one may refer to the "paternalistic" quality of the ideology.

Universalistic

To the extent that pupils should be selected primarily on the basis of their technical skills and only secondarily on the basis of their diffuse skills, such that those with the most of the former need to have least of the latter, the ideology has a "universalistic" quality. This assumes that the society does not have a system of ascribed statuses on the basis of which certain diffuse skills and ascribed characteristics are likely to become unequally distributed. It also assumes that maximum opportunity is available for such skills to be learned.

Meritocratic ideology: An Individualistic Form of Universalism. When universalistic selections are justified to the population in terms of the right of the selected to privilege as a reward for their talents, ambition, and technical skills, one may refer to the "meritocratic" quality of the ideology.

Communistic Ideology: A Collectivist Form of Universalism. When universalistic selections are justified to the population in terms of the society's need for the most talented, ambitious, and technically qualified men to be guided to positions of leadership and responsibility, and for those less qualified in these respects to be guided to appropriately subordinate positions, one may refer to the "communistic" quality of the ideology.

It may be possible to demonstrate that by classifying educational systems in the four dimensional typology one thereby acquires greater analytical power with respect to the understanding of how these systems work and of how they relate to their host societies.

The comparative study of education has consisted, for the most part, of making detailed descriptions of educational systems in society after society. Although it is now clear that considerable variation exists in the structure of educational systems, even among societies at similar levels of industrial development, it is quite easy to become overwhelmed by this glut of "facts". This is especially so when a researcher begins to study a system for which there is abundant documentation. By highlighting some of the more important structural dimensions along which educational systems may vary, and thereby, drawing attention to their more important similarities and differences, a typology for the classification of educational systems is useful aid for the organization and interpretation of the wealth of available data.

In addition, the dimensions of the typology might be taken as guidelines for the study of the ways in which an educational system changes. Further, the dimensions can be treated as patterns which systems are likely to cover as a result of an industrialization process. Their typology is helpful for me to research the EU's and Chinese higher education. In my opinion, the EU's education may have the characteristic of meritocratic ideology, while China's education may have the characteristics of communistic ideology, paternalistic ideology and meritocratic ideology.

Sir Michael Sadler (1902) claimed that the practical value of studying other systems of education should be that a great deal could be learned about one's own system of education. He stressed that what goes on outside the classrooms may be perhaps even more important than what is observed inside them. External conditions, aspirations, and resources are to be viewed as both determinating and justifying internal school arrangements. Comparative studies have "to explain educational principles and tendencies in terms of social, economic, and political antecedents of each country under considerations" (Sandiford, 1918). Studying nations' educational thought and practice, can be seen as a way to understand social dynamics and general patterns of development of institutions and ideas in education (see e.g. Hans, 1949; Kandel, 1933; Ulich, 1961).

To find these principles the educational problems mentioned were analyzed from a democratic point of view and the modern legislation of many countries supplied typical solutions. Hans attempted in his work to connect in detail the national systems of education with historical backgrounds. Hans commented that I. L. Kandel did this in 1933. In his *Studies of Comparative Education*, Kandel points out, "The comparison of the educational systems of several countries lends itself to a variety of methods of treatment, depending somewhat on its purpose. The task which has been undertaken is to discuss the meaning of general education, elementary and secondary, in the light of the forces—political, social and cultural—which determine the character of national systems of education. The problems and purposes of educa-

tion have in general become somewhat similar in most countries; the solutions are influenced by differences of tradition and culture of each" (Kandel, 1933). Kandel paid special attention to nationalism and national character as a historical background to actual conditions and formulated the necessity of a historical approach and the study of determining factors. "The chief value of a comparative approach to educational problems lies in an analysis of the causes which have produced them, in a comparison of the differences between the various systems and the reasons underlying them, and finally, in a study of the solutions attempted. In other words, the comparative approach demands first an appreciation of the intangible, impalpable spiritual and cultural forces which underlie an educational system; the factors and forces outside the school matter even more than what goes inside it" (Kandel, 1933). As Kandel said, the purpose of comparative education is to discover the differences in the forces and causes that produce differences in educational systems. Hans (1949) added that "to discover the underlying principles which govern the development of all national systems of education," Hans emphasized still more the historical approach and dealt with education in each country as the result of cultural and national background.

Europe is once again going through a great historical transformation for which one of the key elements has been the European Union. This change, which started as a purely economical form of co-operation and integration, is now involving political and even cultural integration and unification as well. As the most populous country, Chinese higher education is still in the "elite" stage, while mass education is an international phenomenon that has occurred in many industrialized countries in the period following the Second World War. Pressures for growth in higher education in the post-war period have been driven in particular by the "baby boom", the pipeline effect of more students in the system and higher education access and participation, and the demand for qualified manpower by industry. The higher education systems of today are complex, multifaceted, and constantly changing. As such, they represent major challenges to national policy makers, institutional leaders and administrators, as well as to the academic work force everywhere.

2.1.2 Human Capital, Social Capital and Higher Education

Human Capital and Higher Education

In most developed countries a high proportion of the population (up to 50%) now enter higher education at some time in their lives. Higher education is therefore very important to national economies, both as a significant industry in its own right, and as a source of trained and educated personnel for the rest of the economy; it is often argued that in a modern economy

the quantity and quality of such human capital is the most important factor underlying economic growth. There are a lot of discussions on human capital in the EU and China during the 1990s. The role of human capital has been emphasized more and more in the official documents.

Although the concept of human capital has a long history, it was in the 1960s that Schultz (1961) and Becker (1964) developed the notion of human capital, taking Adam Smith's original notion that investment in education and skill formation was as significant a factor in economic growth as investment in physical plant and equipment. Human capital theory has been immensely influential at all sorts of levels, including that of political imagery. The thrust of Schultz's argument is that education, in addition to being a form of consumption, is also an individually and socially productive investment. Human capital has come to refer to the knowledge, skills, competencies and attributes embodied in individuals, which facilitate the creation of personal, social and economic well-being. Tacit knowledge has been defined as "...knowledge that has not been documented and made explicit by the one who uses and controls it" (OECD, 2000). Human capital includes motivation, moral behaviour and attitudes and also includes tacit knowledge and skill.

As Schultz said, investment in human capital not only increases individual productivity, but, in so doing, also lays the technical base of the type of labour force necessary for rapid economic growth. The measure of capital formation based on fixed capital alone was deficient because it failed to take into account education, health, and nonprofits research. These, they claimed, contributed to economic growth by increasing the level of efficiency and therefore productivity of the entire economic system. Any form of acquired skills or knowledge that could be used to improve the individual's ability to perform productive work must be considered capital investments. Economists thus attempted to incorporate educational and other human capital investments into the mainstream of economic analysis.

As Gary Becker viewed, human capital was similar to "physical means of production", e.g., factories and machines: one can invest in human capital (via education, training, medical treatment) and one's income depends partly on the rate of return on the human capital one owns. Thus, human capital is a stock of assets one owns, which allows one to receive a flow of income, which is like interest earned. The theory of human capital has created a uniform and generally applicable analytical framework for studying on education. It is hardly an overstatement to say that the human-capital approach is one of the most empirically applied theories in economics today.

Higher education, it was argued, not only improved individual choices available to all people but that an educated population provided the type of labour force required for industrial development and economic growth. It increased the productivity of a country's labour force, indirectly increasing the productivity of its physical capital. The net result was a higher living standard for all members of the society involved. Furthermore, the liberal view asserted

that higher education was the great economic equalizer capable of bridging the income gap between the rich and the poor because it provided each individual with the necessary knowledge and skills to earn a livelihood in the society.

Human capital is a notion that captures the valuation of the attributes in which people invest. However, the inherited culture and traditions of a given society heavily influence the acquisition and use of these skills and knowledge. The human capital theory should take into account the initial circumstances of peoples at different levels of development, the attitudes of different communities to performance motivation, and the kind of income structure and policy practiced, including its historical development. This seems to be an important factor in explaining why human capital formation and accumulation is quite different across jurisdictions or national boundaries. It shows that the generality of a theory maybe tested by elaborating relationships postulated by means of cultural variables.

Social Capital and Higher Education

While human capital is embodied in individuals, social capital is embodied in relationships. There is, potentially, a strong complementarity between human capital and social capital. J. Coleman (1988) in his development of social capital analysis stressed the role of strong communities and ties among parents, educators and pupils in fostering learning. On the other hand, education and learning can foster habits, skills and values conducive to social co-operation and participation.

Social capital is increasingly seen as a useful concept tool for understanding the role of relations and networks in social and economic development. Although the notions associated with "social capital" are not new, the popularisation and growing mainstreaming of this concept have called attention to the importance of social and civic traditions and to the ways in which public policy can complement and strengthen these traditions.

A multitude of definitions and understandings of social capital is possible ranging from those that emphasize the value to individuals of resources in the form of social relations in families and communities, to others that emphasize the role of networks and norms in civil society. For the most part, social capital has been defined in terms of networks, norms and values, and the way these allow agents and institutions to be more effective in achieving common objectives. Trust is considered an outcome.

The heuristic value of the social capital concept in recent debate has lain in its calling attention to crucial aspects of social relations that impinge on economic and political life and that are neither easily nor convincingly incorporated into an explanatory model based on the rational pursuit of individual self-interest. The growing popularity throughout contemporary social science of the rational actor model and its relative neglect of norms, values, social net-

works, organization, and other context-dependent resources explains social capital's heuristic leverage for a growing number of analysts. Thus, social capital can be seen as the most recent in a string of efforts—including human capital and cultural capital—to amend or overcome the failure of the predominant economic model to incorporate non-market factors into its accounts of the political and economic behaviour of individuals and groups.

James Coleman's articulation of the notion of social capital was explicitly conceived as the latest in a series of theoretical amendments—including human and cultural capital—to the predominant economic model (with which, however, it is not necessarily incompatible. See Becker, 1993; Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1990). The key empirical difference between human and social capital, in Coleman's rendering, is that social capital inheres in relations between individuals and groups, not in individuals per se. By contrast, human capital does inhere in individuals so that when people move in and out of various social contexts, their human capital—whether formal education or organizational skills—goes with them rather than remaining embedded in the context (Coleman, 1988).

Human capital is understood in terms of the stock of individual skills, competences and qualifications (Woodhall, 1995). What I was interested in is how these are encouraged or inhibited by the relationships, which exist between the stakeholder institutions. These relationships embody the social capital, which enables human capital to be realized. The argument here is not that social capital is superior as a fundamental theoretical concept, but that it can bring a much-needed extra dimension to both analytical discussion and political debate of the future of a learning society.

The concept's applications are proliferating wildly, and it remains to be seen how deep it can send its roots into the soil of social analysis. One positive implication is that the existence of social capital enables the potential of human capital to be realized. The more information and values are shared, the more effective the system will be in encouraging adults to learn. Importantly, social capital allows individuals, groups and communities to resolve collective problems more easily. Collective action involves use of norms and networks in situations where individuals might otherwise be reluctant to be co-operative or socially engaged. Thus, social capital is not marketable, is nobody's property. It is social capital that made human capital possible**,** takes advantage of it.

When we look at higher education, the university contributes instrumentally to society by preparing human service professionals in a broad range of disciplines for the betterment of individuals and families. Today, however, the multiple needs of families are becoming less amenable to technical or clinical solutions and appear to require a greater collaboration among human service providers. Experiential learning is one way for university programs to help students develop collaborative skills.

The European Union has been speaking up recently in favour of a learning society and learning economy. Yet most policy thinking about the "learning society" is relatively superfi-

cial and even conservative, amounting to little more than the hope that more individuals will realize that education is good for them. Given the scale of the changes and challenges facing our world, a more radical and ambitious conception is required. We need to take a hard look at our society, and ask which social arrangements best promote lifelong learning.

Social capital therefore treats learning not as a matter of individual acquisition of skills and knowledge, but as a function of identifiable social relationships. It also draws attention to the role of norms and values in the motivation to learn, in the acquisition of skills, and the deployment of new know-how. A society, which is strong in social capital, then, is likely to be one, which is able to promote lifelong learning, and make the most of its benefits.

One way of exploring it in more concrete terms is to ask how far people in different institutions share information, how far they share values, and how far they are able to trust others to pursue common goals. This gives us a basic framework to think about, and research institutional relationships and their effect on lifelong learning.

2.1.3 Higher Education in the Context of Globalization

The Roles of Higher Education

The definitions of the most important functions of the universities have varied greatly in time. Manuel Castells (1991, 206—208) defines the universities firstly acting as ideological apparatuses either recreating or opposing the dominant ideology of the state. The second function Castells finds for universities has been acting as mechanisms for selection of dominant elites and the third function for universities is to act as generators of new knowledge. Purpose of the higher education has also been defined as education being a human right (United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, UN Covenant on Social, Cultural and Economic Rights 1966), means of personal growth for the individual, means of constructing culture, sharing traditions and providing well being for the society as a whole and as a means of accumulating personal and societal wealth and competitiveness (see e.g. Bowen 1980, 55—59; Scott 1998, 111).

The importance of education (including higher education) depends on the perception of its functionality: education as a system, as a societal process, as a cluster of organizations, or as a cluster of persons with different roles. Education has, generally speaking, functions for the economy, politics, health sector, social cultural sphere, or other internal segments of the educational sector (Droogleever Fortuijin, 1988). The primary purpose of HE is, of course, to raise the education and skills levels of its students, thereby increasing their productive capacity and potential, and driving the knowledge economy. As such, spending on higher education is an investment rather than consumption activity, yielding future returns.

Having "a central role in economic regeneration" (Barclays, 2002, p. 36), higher education has an economic significance to future prosperity that is widely recognized as crucial, and which has, with government encouragement, led universities to embrace these "third mission" activities (to enhance impact on the local and national economy), alongside the more traditional ones of quality teaching and research.

Recent work has shown that higher education is a net contributor to the prosperity of a modern economy (Barclays, 2002; Charles & Bennworth, 2002; Florax, 1992a, 1992b; Hill, 2004). It achieves this through a number of mechanisms, including providing employment, attracting revenue and expenditure from students and visitors, but above all through its crucial role in the development of the "knowledge economy". This is widely seen as increasingly important in determining prosperity in the future. If the knowledge economy is defined as one in which value is added through the application of ideas and information, then the role of higher education in contemporary economic development is self-evident. This role is manifested through the creation, refinement and application of knowledge, especially through research and development, in the expanding output of people with higher level knowledge and skills, and in the dissemination of knowledge through innovation networks (Hill & Webb, 2001).

Impact of Globalization

According to the OECD, the term "globalization" was first used in 1985 by Theodore Levitt. At that time, Levitt referred to vast changes in economy and finance affecting production, consumption, and global investment as a result of economic and financial liberalization, structural adjustment programs, and the diminished role of the state in the economy (Malhotra, 1997). This definition captured very well the economic side of the changes but did not sufficiently grasp the many social transformations incurred as a result of technological developments in communications and transportation.

Economic definitions of globalization abound. Although they differ in scope, content and emphasis, all refer to the increased internationalization and integration of the world economy. One skeptic, Wiseman (1998) cautioned "– – globalization is the most slippery, dangerous and important buzzword of the late twentieth century" (p.149). Weisbrot (2001) acknowledges that 'globalization' means different things to different people but offers a succinct description of the globalization process: the dominant view among people who write and speak about the issue is that globalization is an inevitable, technologically-driven process that is increasing commercial and political relations between people of different countries. For them, it is not only a natural phenomenon, but primarily good for the world, although it is recognized that the process produces both "winners and losers." (p. 1) This description implies that there

is nothing intrinsically new about globalization. It is an intensification and acceleration of international trade and investment flows, facilitated by the information technology revolution, that leads to more rapid technology transfer and increased interdependency between countries. Ryan (2001), observing that 'globalization has been packaged to make it appear intrinsically good and desirable…' introduces a cautionary note stating it is basically about economic openness and increased international competitiveness. It is a race into the future where those nations that cannot maintain the necessary pace of change will slide backwards in relative economic terms—a sort of economic Darwinism" (p. 207).

The playing field is most definitely uneven, favoring the advanced nations and the monolithic, multi-national corporations, who, when acting in unison, are more powerful than most governments, but are themselves without nationality. Aninat (2001) tenders a very broad definition of globalization—so broad in fact that it lacks clarity and focus. "Globalization can be defined as the increasing interaction among and integration of diverse human societies in all important dimensions of their activities—economic, social, political, cultural and religious. It is not new; it has been occurring for centuries" (p. 1). He elaborates: "The driving forces have been threefold: First, improvements in technology, especially in transportation and communication. Second, a desire by people to take advantage of the opportunities provided by interaction with other societies—whether through trade, migration, investment, and acquisition of knowledge; and third, in recent decades, the lowering of barriers to international trade and capital flows resulting from the liberation of policies" (p. 102). In addition, Aninat (2001) observes: "But what is different about the current epoch is the enormous impact that the new information technologies are having on market integration, efficiency, industrial organizati…along with its implications for the development of human capital" (p. 2). What Aninat (2001) identifies as driving forces could be more correctly referred to as catalysts or facilitating mechanisms. The real driving forces relate to profits and economic power, both of which provide the means of exercising political power, including power brokering in the transnational sense. The information revolution has accelerated the globalization evolutionary process.

Globalization is a process that is partially uncontrollable and partially can be directed. Passively, globalization can be seen as a social process whereby, from a geographical point of view, social and cultural borders are fading, and people are becoming more and more conscious of this. The consequence is that people are becoming increasingly involved in world-wide dependency networks. In active terms, globalization can be seen as the process of forging multiple linkages and interconnections between states and societies that together form the modern global system. The consequence of this is that happenings, decisions, and activities on one part of the globe have significant influence on individuals and communities on another part of the globe. Globalization has several dimensions, each of which plays a part in the process defined above, but which also influence one another. The most important are

the economic-commercial, political, institutional, communicative, cultural, social, environmental, and normative-ethical dimensions. In other words, globalization must be addressed in an interdisciplinary manner.

Both the active and passive views of globalization clearly signify the importance for all countries in the world of striving for participation on the international political, economic, and social platforms. Participation requires highly educated people. In this context we could talk about the globalization of higher education. The effect of globalization on education can be measured by the degree to which education is shaped by the globalization, and also by the type of educational reform that is required to address the consequences of globalization (Carnoy, 1999; Hallak, 1998; Riddel, 1996).

One result of globalization is a more dispersed global division of labour. Since industrial development is no longer the prerogative of the industrialized world, the content and structure of education in both developing and industrialized countries have to be adjusted. Education has to react on the expertise, know-how, and skills that required by the new types of employment. The comparative advantage of developing countries, which was once mainly based on cheap manual labour, is now based on highly educated, though still relatively cheap, labour. We can say that in the process of globalization economies are moving towards knowledge-based industries (Alic, 1997).

2.2   Conceptual Framework

Education has traditionally been considered as belonging to the sphere of the "social" and "cultural" good and being primarily regulated in the sphere of the "national" and of the "institutional". The roles of education have been closely linked to the social development and democratic empowerment of societies. On the other hand, knowledge and education as its carrier have possessed a certain intrinsic value. The traditional paradigm of education is, however, shifting towards new instrumental values. Consequently, education is moving towards the sphere of the "economic" decision making, which in its turn is becoming more and more influenced by the "regional", the "international" and the "global".

Higher education has moved from the sphere of the "national" to the spheres of the "regional", the "international" and the "global". An example of the regional approach in higher education is the Bologna-process aspiring to create a European Higher Education Area, an example of an international process is the mutual recognition process of recognition of qualifications (the Lisbon Convention of 1997) and the global trade in educational services can be considered as happening in the global sphere partly irrespective of the nation state boundaries.

Few of the main concepts explored in my research are the concepts of globalization and internationalization of higher education as well as IT revolution and knowledge society.

Globalization and Internationalization

A conceptual understanding of globalization and internationalization is needed to make sense of the varied and complex ways they are affecting higher education in the worldwide.

According to Held et al. (1999, 27), globalization is a process affecting a wide variety of sectors from the cultural to the economic, the political, the legal etc. It is however, not a uniform process but operates on different dynamics and leads to different consequences in all the key domains of social activity. Thus also education is widely affected by the process of globalization, which takes on different forms in the fields of education provision, decision-making, financing etc.

Internationalization, like globalization is a concept with different interpretations. Internationalization of higher education can be viewed either from national policy perspective or institutional perspective. According to Hayward (2000, 41), internationalization can be viewed as "an intentional national response to globalization" used to facilitate understanding of global environment and ways of interaction in it and Elliott (1998, 32) understands internationalization of higher education "as a systematic, sustained effort by government to make higher education (HE) institutions more responsive to the challenges of 'globalization' of the economy and society".

Altbach (2002) argues that, in broad terms, globalization refers to trends in higher education that have cross-national implications. These include mass higher education; a global marketplace for students, faculty, and highly educated personnel; and the global reach of the new Internet-based technologies, among others. Internationalization refers to the specific policies and initiatives of countries and individual academic institutions or systems to deal with global trends. Examples of internationalization include policies relating to recruitment of foreign students, collaboration with academic institutions or systems in other countries, and the establishment of branch campuses abroad (Altbach, 2002).

Globalization of higher education will lead to series of debates among higher education actors as well as other interested parties. Globalization of higher education is detected in expanding global trade in higher education, the growing influence of international actors in the regulation of higher education such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the World Bank as well as many multinational corporations, and related phenomena such as the inclusion of higher education into the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). However, there are still a huge variety of questions addressed in the context of globalization of higher education must be noted.

As regards education, there is very little evidence across the globe that nation states are loosing control over their education systems or ceasing to press them into service for national economic and social ends, whatever the recent accretions of internationalization. In fact the opposite may be true. As governments lose control over various levers on their national economies and cede absolute sovereignty in foreign affairs and defence, they frequently turn to education and training as two areas where they do still maintain control (Avis et al., 1996). Whilst education systems remain essentially national they may nevertheless be experiencing a degree of convergence under the impact of international forces.

Information Technology (IT) Revolution and Knowledge Society

The world is passing through a major revolution called the information revolution, in which information and knowledge is becoming available to people in unprecedented amounts wherever and whenever they need it. Those societies that fail to take advantage of the new technology will be left behind, just like in the industrial revolution.

The information society is that society which undergone, or is evidently undergoing, thorough transformation as the result of the widespread application of new IT. This is not to say simplistically that the new technology is causing social and economic change. Rather, it is the application of this technology on the part of some (and increasing numbers of) actors, and the responses of others to these applications and their consequences, that constitutes this change. Advances in IT are affecting most segments of business, society, and government in many if not most regions of the world. The changes that IT is bringing about in various aspects of life are often collectively called the "information technology revolution." Many of these changes could over time prove to be profound; some may have already done so. A wide range of national and international political, economic, and societal issues arise from these changes, both now and in the future.

Understanding the various impacts that advances in IT will have and the likely nature of future changes that IT will bring about, in different societies all around the world, and the issues (i.e., problems and opportunities) that will arise from these impacts and changes is very important—and also quite difficult. It is important because IT is likely to change the 21st-century world just as much as the steam engine, railroad, and telegraph changed the 19th-century world, and just as much as electricity, the internal combustion engine, automobile and airplane, and the telephone, radio, and television changed the 20th-century world. It is difficult because, while the technology developments that enable and drive the information revolution are more or less the same throughout the world, a large number of factors—social and cultural, political and governmental, business and financial—shape each society's approach to those technology developments. These factors interact in a variety of ways, both

straightforward and subtle, and are subject to numerous variations in nations throughout the world, leading to many different national or regional manifestations of the information revolution.

The traditional view of higher education sees it as primarily a public good benefiting the whole society and as something defined by the higher education institutions themselves, funded mainly by the public authorities and with an emphasis on internal (institutional or academic) and political decision making. The new view of higher education sees it as primarily a private good benefiting the person acquiring it and also as a means of generating profit, funded by the internal/direct beneficiaries (i.e. student) and external/indirect beneficiaries (e.g. employers, state) both looking for particular gains to be achieved through acquiring higher education. It lays emphasis on market mechanisms and means of facilitating those mechanisms (e.g. trade agreements). This view is manifested in the rhetoric of education: according to Ball (1998), such firmly established concepts as the 'learning society' or the 'knowledge-based economy' are potent policy condensates, which "serve and symbolize the increasing colonization of education policy by economic policy imperatives".

China has to make use of new IT revolution to transform the industrial economy into a knowledge economy quickly. The knowledge economy can be defined as an economy that makes knowledge portable, collective and accredited, or one in which the generation and exploitation of knowledge plays the predominant part in the creation of wealth. Western Europe probably have left the industrial society. Knowledge society can be a very suitable designation for most societies in Western Europe. It is naturally a matter of definition when a society has become a knowledge society where people know more and more and where knowledge hence has gained its own power of influence. The common threads are higher education plays a central role in the development, dissemination and application of knowledge. Therefore, the aim of higher education is to enable society to make progress through an understanding of itself and its world: in short, to sustain a knowledge society.

Chapter 3

Backgrounds of the EU and China in the Field of Higher Education Policy

The main purpose of this chapter is to explore the different backgrounds of the EU and China in the field of higher education policy. In this part I will first briefly introduce the situation and process of policy-making in the EU and China. Then emphasis will be put on the background of higher education policies separately. Faced with the challenges and opportunities, how to make their higher education policy is an emergent task for both the EU and China. On the above basis, I will compare the differences of background and analyze the reasons of differences.

3.1 Background of the EU Higher Education Policy

3.1.1 Historical Overview

Though most of us look at the European Union as a '90s phenomenon, the roots of this collaboration date back as far as the 1950s to the Coal and Steel Authority. The European Union was founded in 1957 on the basis of three agreements to develop joint policies and action for the progress of the economies, the development of atomic energy for civil use and the production of steel and coal of the countries involved. Only in the course of the 1970s, education together with social policy became a target for European policy. Higher education at that time was defined as being part of vocational education and training and an important element for maintaining or improving competitiveness on increasingly global markets. In the course of time, the European Commission was able to expand its competence in the field of education and in particular higher education due to its initiatives. Since its inception in 1989, the ERASMUS Program supporting mobility of academic staff and students, recognition of study abroad and joint curriculum development has been one of the most popular and successful programs designed by the EU. In the field of structural development and reforms of higher education the European Commission has always tended to be a rather strong force of conver-

gence in the face of government actors jealously guarding their national systems' specificities. A number of diverging elements in the structural patterns of European higher education systems are currently being more and more homogenized. With the Treaty on European Union (TEU, "Maastricht Treaty", 1992), ratified in November 1993, the Community was incorporated into the European Union as one of its pillars. It gave European integration a whole new dimension. The development and continued progress of integration in Europe has been one of the major success stories of the second half of the 20th century. The European Union is viewed as a supranational actor, which seeks to influence its Member States and their societal sub-systems (economy, politics, agriculture, social and education policy) in various ways. Now that there has been substantial economic and political integration in Europe, the issues of a common European educational policy and creation of a common European identity are gaining greater importance.

Through its various policy instruments, the European Union participates in the reproduction and dissemination of the existing world educational culture. However, it is also bound to transform it. The European Union is already significantly more than an intergovernmental organization in the traditional sense. In certain fields, it wields supranational powers, which results in a transfer of sovereignty away from the nation states - or voluntary "pooling of sovereignties". Thus, it gradually changes the prevailing global norm according to which the nation state is the appropriate form of political organization (Olsen, 1994, 2). This is why it cannot fully support an educational ideology based on an underlying assumption of absolute national sovereignty and citizenship. Rather, it will seek to create a new normative belief, according to which contemporary citizens must possess knowledge, skills and attitudes that facilitate their adaptation to the new economic, political, social and cultural space being formed on the European level. The nation-state itself is transformed as a result of European integration and this will also call for changes in education.

The late 1980s and the 1990s have seen a considerable deepening and strengthening of Community action in various policy areas, which fall outside its traditional economic and technological interests. The economic community is becoming an economic, political and monetary union. Education offers a promising vehicle for consolidating the political and social cohesion of the continent. Applied to the process of European integration in the field of education, the institutional perspective suggests that regulations, policy advice and funding opportunities from the European Union are filtered through national administrative apparatus and policies and impact on educational institutions in a modified form. These impacts include firstly formal and easily verifiable decisions to participate in EU programmes, target funding to European cooperation, set up infrastructures for cooperation, and possibly enact changes in legislation due to EU education policy. Secondly, Europeanization refers to the process, in which the European integration and EU education policy is incorporated in education policy argumentation. Here, education policy discourses are regarded as cognitive

formations, which both determine and reflect the development of a key system of national reproduction—the education system.

The structure and decision-making of the European Union

The highest political organ of the EU is the Summit of Heads of States and Government, the European Council, as it has been called since 1974. The Council of Ministers (the Council) is the highest decision-making authority of the EU. The Council must approve all legislation. It represents the interests of Member States' governments and is composed of ministers of national governments. The institution responsible for legislative proposals in the EU is the Commission. It is often regarded as the most powerful institution of the EU. An important organ of the EU is the European Court of Justice (ECJ), which oversees the implementation of EU legislation. It also monitors the legislative relationships between the European Union and its Member States, and between the EU and its citizens. Its decisions are binding on both the Member States and their judicial instances. The administration concerning education, vocational training and youth has resided in different directorates general during the past years. In the late 1980s, a special unit, A Task Force for Human Resources, Education, Training and Youth was set up. In the beginning of 1995, it was transformed into Directorate General XXII. This Directorate General carries political responsibility for preparation and execution of EU education policy. The Council of Education Ministers discusses educational issues, issues concerning vocational training by Ministers of Labor and/or Social Affairs (Raivola, 1995). The European Parliament (EP) was for over two decades composed of delegates from national parliaments and its legislative powers were very meagre. Since 1979, however, it has been elected by a direct universal suffrage. The Single European Act (1987) and the Treaty on European Union (1992) increased its powers, and now it has an absolute right of veto on certain issues. The one responsible for educational matters is currently called the Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport.

With the growing economic and political integration of Europe, decision-making processes at both the national and supranational level are becoming increasingly intertwined. While the European Union is neither a state nor a federation, but rather an organization of its own kind, it is not easy to transfer national prerogatives to the supranational level. An important difference between decision-making at the communal level in comparison with decision-making at the national level is that, at the communal level, the institutions have no general authority to take decisions. At the communal level, there is a system of specific allocation of powers. Moreover, there is no unequivocal decision-making method. This varies depending on the subject of the decision to be taken. In the separate treaty provisions, it is stipulated

how a decision in a certain policy field must be made. In these cases, however, reference is often made to general rules and procedures for decision-making.

The "constitution" of the European Union consists of the Treaties of Paris (ECSC) and Rome (EEC and Euratom), and their subsequent amendments. The importance of these amendments are the Single European Act (1987), the Treaty on European Union (1992) and the Amsterdam Treaty (signed in 1997, in force since May 1999). All other Community legislation is based on this constitution and must not contradict it. The forms of legislation comprise regulations, directives, decisions, recommendations and opinions. Regulations are transnational "laws" which are generally binding on each Member State and directly applicable. Directives differ from regulations in the sense that they must separately be introduced into national legislation within a given time limit. The manner of imposing these directives can be nationally determined. The directives on education concern recognition of diplomas and certificates for professional purposes, education of migrant children and the right of residence of students. Council decisions usually concern a specific subject or programme, and are binding only as concerns this specific matter. Most EU education programmes are established by decisions. Recommendations and opinions are not binding. In addition to this, the Council of Ministers may produce different statements, subject to initiative from the Member State holding the presidency. These can be, for instance, resolutions, which denote the general guidelines of Community, or national action, to which all participants are committed, or conclusions, which simply point out the view of the ministers. Resolutions and conclusions are often regarded as intergovernmental "soft law" in the sense that it is agreed on consensually and the issues addressed may fall outside immediate Community competence.

The EU organs also publish various kinds of other written material, which is not legislative in nature, but nevertheless, influence discussions on education in the Member States. These include studies and surveys, memoranda, working papers, and green and white papers. Green papers are discussion documents and usually concern limited areas on which the EU has weak legislative powers. White papers, on the other hand, often include analyses and provide guidelines for future Community action.

The subsidiary principle and its significance in the EU

The principle of subsidiarity, which is set out in Article 3b of the Treaty establishing the European Community (1957), is designed to ensure that action to achieve an objective is taken at the most appropriate level, whether by the Member States or by the Community. The principle of "subsidiarity" in EU law requires that action to accomplish a legitimate government objective should in principle be taken at the lowest level of government, which is capable of effectively addressing the problem. In effect, subsidiarity is a guideline for contemporary

power sharing between the relatively new institutions of the EU and the constituent Member States that formed the Union.

Rather than creating a division among respective powers of the EU and the individual Member States, subsidiarity creates a presumption of deference to state or local government decision-making in those areas of concurrent jurisdiction. In its application, the subsidiarity principle urges the European Council of Ministers (Council), the European Parliament (Parliament), and the European Commission (Commission) to take actions pursuant to their constitutional powers only when constituent Member States cannot adequately achieve the desired results by acting alone or in conjunction with other Member States. The subsidiarity principle thus expresses the aspiration that the decision-making integrity of Member States over local affairs will be preserved, and the institutions of the EC will be prevented from encroaching on areas more appropriately reserved for Member States.

The EU does not have any school. Formally, the EU cannot practise an actual education policy. Its legislative competence in this field is very limited: education as such was not mentioned in the founding Treaty of the EEC (the Treaty of Rome, 1957). Article 126 and 127 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU; the Maastricht Treaty, 1992)—concerning education and vocational training, respectively—seriously limit the powers of the Union in this area. The EU must fully respect the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organization of education systems, and their cultural and linguistic diversity. Article 126 also unequivocally rules out any measures to harmonize national policies, systems or curricula. The EU may merely support and supplement the measures of the Member States to develop quality education. These incentive measures include international education programmes, the participation in which is based on specific calls for applications and in principle voluntary.

The activities of the European Union in the field of education have expanded considerably over the past twenty years. EU measures do not explicitly aim at regulation of national systems and policies, but rather supplement them. Especially over the 1990s, educational cooperation enjoyed an exceptionally consensual support. The main tool for putting this ambition into practice is the SOCRATES programme, which contains an action specifically focused on Higher Education: SOCRATES/Erasmus. Erasmus has become a world wide acknowledged success-story, which adds considerably to the EU's reputation as a trend-setting actor in international higher education. It supports and encourages exchanges of students and teachers, the launching of joint study programmes or intensive courses, pan-European thematic networks and other measures aiming at the development of a European dimension in higher education. Universities are very much involved in all the actions of the SOCRATES programme. Mobility of students and teachers remains the cornerstone of academic co-operation. The need to ensure mobility of students and teachers/researchers is crucial to future co-operation in European higher education. Moreover, Ministers from 29 European countries signed the

"Bologna Declaration" in 1999, aims at the establishment of a European area of higher education by the end of this decade.

3.1.2 Macro Backgrounds of the EU Higher Education Policy

The EU's inhabitants are 450 million since May 1st 2004. Europe, the small continent, once again is playing a major part on the world's political and economic stage. The forms of action employed by the EU in the field of higher education can be roughly categorized as higher education programmes and other action programmes involving higher education as the main activity and educational institutions as an important target group; coordination and exchange of information concerning higher education and legislation concerning higher education. In many EU higher education policy documents "the European dimension of education" has been understood broadly to encompass student mobility, cooperation between institutions, Europe in the curriculum, the importance of language on education, the training of teachers, recognition of qualifications and periods of study, the international role of higher education, exchange of information and policy analysis (COM (91) 349). EU cooperation in youth issues, which dates back some ten years, consists above all in supporting the development of youth exchange between member states. This objective is inscribed in the Union's "constitution", the Treaty establishing the European Community (the EC Treaty). Through youth exchange, the EU also aims to enhance understanding between young people from different countries and cultures. Therefore, it is necessary to have an illustrative picture of the aims and objectives that are central to the educational policy in the European Union.

Reinforcing European competitiveness through education and training

The goals of European Union educational policy are set in particular within the scope of growing international economic competition and according to the contemporary situation and future requirements of the labor market in the different countries and regions of Europe. Hence, it is argued that the general role of education and training systems in the Member States of the European Union should be organized and strengthened in order to meet the various challenges that are involved in the advancement of globalization and in preserving or rather improving employment in Europe. Europe's education and training systems need to adapt both to the demands of the knowledge society and to the need for an improved level and quality of employment. In more concrete terms, this means to make use of education primarily as an instrument to produce people that possess and constantly acquire the skills and

competence, which are needed to work in certain occupations and to survive in a competitive world economy.

Europe has close economic ties with many regions of the world. Conflicts and crises whether within or beyond will threaten all European states and citizens alike. Only through cooperation, solidarity and unity can Europe effectively help to solve world problems. The main motivation behind moves to promote or create a common European identity appears to be the view that differences in culture and identity result in reduced support for further European integration, and hence there is a need to try and reduce or remove them. Because of its position in world trade and its economic weight, the Union is already a respected partner in the great international forums such as the World Trade Organization or the UN. Step by step, the Union is using its economic power as a means of developing its political influence and speaking with a single voice.

Maintaining social cohesion through education and training

The building of a united Europe is undoubtedly one of the greatest historical undertakings of the 20th century. "Schuman declaration" (1950) is considered to be the beginning of the creation of what is now the European Union. The future course of European co-operation was answered in 1992 in Maastricht, when the Member States resolved to cooperate in foreign and security policy as well. The objective was to create a stable Europe. The 21st century sees Europe assert itself as a force for peace, provided the Union fosters stability and development within the major regional groupings, which surround it.

The idea of a peacefully united Europe and internationalism as processes in technology, labor market and politics put up challenges to current education systems. Education taken in one European country should be valid throughout Europe, making the systems compatible. In spite of a perspective where education is simply viewed as a means to equip individuals with the knowledge that is required to achieve and secure economic performance and growth, education must lay the foundations for a coherent social basis on which to build a more just and sustainable the European Union.

The quest for the European identity

During the 1990s the world model of two superpowers has crumbled and Russia no longer suffices for an ideological and military threat to Europe. Instead, *"Facing up to America, Japan and soon China, Europe must have the economic, demographic and political mass capable of securing its independence"* (CEC, 1995). The European Commission's enthusiasm

with the European identity has been based on a perceived need to make individuals more favorably disposed to the integration project. The European identity must be regarded as a key dimension of the European citizenship. It is the cultural component of a predominantly political status of persons. As Karlsen (1994, 89—92) has pointed out, it has also been closely linked to efforts to create an education policy for the EU. The European identity presupposes learning to be a European.

The EU views education as a key instrument in influencing the knowledge base and attitudes of the Europeans in order to make them more positively disposed towards the European integration. The increased interest of the European Commission in education reflects a will to make the European citizens associate themselves mentally with Europe.

Committing the great public to the European construction in the new situation has been perceived vital. To ease off the social tensions inevitably arising from the integration process, the European Commission has entered into a conscious process of "identity creation" to make people more able and willing to relate themselves to the Union and to accept the integration project. This constructed social reality, the new "imagined community" as Anderson (1983) would put it, serves as a basis for the unity of the European peoples as nationalized imagery did for national unity. Indeed, the European integration is now seen as strongest 'card' in ensuring continued success in responding to the economic and social challenges of globalization.

Constructing European citizenship through education and training

The European identity is abstract and the argument is if someone can really give a specific definition to an identity that has to be derived from many cultural diversities. Jean Monnet, at the end of his life, said that if he had to begin again he would start with culture. Monnet became increasingly convinced that the problems blocking the path to political and economic union couldn't be solved simply by compromise between national reservations. Most of the issues like economy, taxation, trades are overshadowed by political considerations shaped by values largely spring from distinct cultural attitudes and identities (Wistrich, 1994 p. 80).

While present in EU discourses from early 1970s onwards, the European citizenship was given a constitutional position in the Maastricht Treaty (1992). The statement "a citizens' Europe" has a broader dimension; it means that the European integration is being carried through for the citizens and with them. It embraces the idea of bringing the European institutions closer to the public and greater participation by ordinary people in Union affairs. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, the Treaty stipulates explicitly "citizenship of the Union shall complement and not replace national citizenship", thus expanding on Article 8, which reads: *"Citizenship of the Union is hereby established. Every person holding the nation-*

ality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union." Even more importantly, the Treaty states *"the Union is founded on the principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law, principles which are common to the Member States."* The Treaty is particularly specific on creating a genuine European area of freedom, security and justice. It stipulates that the Community must respect and promote the diversity of its cultures.

The new importance granted for "the European citizenship" in EU rhetoric reflects the growing political nature of the EU. It implies a political recognition that individuals are no longer perceived as workers, service providers and in general beneficiaries of integration but rather as key actors in the European construction. The importance of the TEU citizenship provisions lies not in their content but rather in the promise they hold for the future. The concept is a dynamic one, capable of being added to or strengthened, but not diminished. Thus, the real content of the European citizenship is actually constantly shaped through new EU legislation and policies.

The European citizenship is quite a complex notion. It is especially the task of education to promote a sense of identity among the people of the European Union that should go far beyond the rather narrow and old-fashioned idea of citizenship of the nation state. In consequence, education that claims to be up to date and which strives towards the European citizenship must call for several principles that have to be lived in practice. Among others, these are for example values such as free access to certain rights and responsibilities to partake in the formation of political opinions and decision making, rejection of discrimination and prejudice based on gender and ethnicity, acceptance of the value of cultural diversity and openness for a plural world, readiness for an ethic of tolerance and solidarity, preservation of the natural environment and so forth.

3.1.3 Internationalization of EU Higher Education: an Answer to Global Challenges?

Internationalization means *"the process of integrating an international dimension into the research, teaching and services function of a higher education institution"* and was established by Jane Knight in 1993 (Knight, 1993). A process then, rather than a product, and a process encompassing a wide range of functions. This definition seems to focus primarily on choices and implementation at institutional level but it is important to place these in a national context. Wende (1999c) formulates internationalization as any *"systematic sustained effort aimed at making higher education more responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labor markets".*

Internationalization of higher education seems to be strongly related to the aim to improve the quality of higher education. The idea that internationalization should not be seen

as an end in itself but as a means for quality enhancement has been the basis of much policy documents. In the 1980s publications of the OECD presented the quality perspective in particular in relation to the expected qualitative impact of the presence of foreign students on the teaching and learning process and on the institution's curriculum and services (Ebuchi, 1989). In the Maastricht Treaty (1992) the articles which provide the basis for Community action in higher education reflect the aim of improving the quality of education through co-operation between the member states of the European Union.

Higher education institutions are challenged, coerced or forced to become entrepreneurial which is the new concept for being innovative. Internationalization of higher education, in terms of the outcome of intended (governmental) policies aimed at making the nationally based system of higher education more international by integrating international elements into the teaching, research and service functions, introduces new elements into higher education such as co-operation, exchange and internationalized curricula. Besides bilateral cooperation and mobility schemes, multi-lateral initiatives, such as the programmes of the European Union (e.g. SOCRATES and LEONARDO, but also the EC-US, EC-Canada, EC-Japan programmes, etc.) also provide an important basis for the development of this type of international activities. It is important to note that these initiatives are based on agreements between countries, while fully respecting the national basis of the system and the sovereignty of the nation state in the governance of the higher education system.

In order to find answers and solutions to pressing problems, the European Commission has strongly promoted trans-national cooperation. Although extracting fragments or elements from a different system to improve one's own usually does not work because of existing differences in higher education cultures and traditions, such elements can serve as models to experiment with or they can be adapted to another culture.

According to its statements on education, the European Commission believes that internationalising education leads to a fuller exploitation of the continent's human resources. This is deemed important in times of ever hardening global and economic competition, where new rivals emerge next to the traditional competitors of the EU, USA and Japan. The effective operation of a European labour market demands highly trained European labour force. In addition to this, the EU education programmes aim at increasing the social, economic and political cohesion among the Member States. The educational programmes include an ideology of opening for young people a window of opportunity to seek quality education outside the borders of their own country.

3.1.4 The Single Market for Education Policy

There seems to be a certain shift from regarding education as a purely national matter to something, which is partly governed by the new operating environment shaped at the European level. An interesting stage in this discussion was reached in May 1998, when the Ministers of Education of four large EU countries—the UK, France, Germany and Italy—adopted the Sorbonne declaration on harmonization of the architecture of the European higher education system. According to the declaration, higher education systems should be reformed to offer two kinds of degrees, a bachelor's level first degree, and a postgraduate degree which would be either a professionally oriented master's or a doctorate encompassing mainly scientific research. This would increase the transparency and compatibility of higher education systems and facilitate international mobility. In addition to this, the joint declaration called for more student exchange, better exploitation of EU programmes, and praised the contribution made to recognition of foreign studies by the ECTS system.

The Sorbonne declaration was followed by a second declaration, signed by the Ministers of Education of nearly all EU Member States, EEA states and the associated countries in Bologna in June 1999. Furthermore, as the Bologna Declaration sets out, building the European Higher education Area is a condition for enhancing the attractiveness and competitiveness of higher education institutions in Europe. Higher education should be considered as a public good and is and will remain a public responsibility. They also expressed a commitment to coordinate national education policies so as to adopt a system of comparable degrees, employ a system of credit units, and promote mobility, cooperation in quality assurance and a European dimension in higher education. The Bologna declaration opens with a statement on the European integration and its significance from the point of view of higher education, but does not describe EU education policy in more detail. However, many of the expressed objectives are in line with those of the EU education programmes. The concept of a European higher education area itself has been consistently promoted by the EU: European educational cooperation, which obviously played a part in inspiring the declaration. Two years after signing the Bologna Declaration and three years after the Sorbonne Declaration, European Ministers in charge of higher education, representing 32 signatories, met in Prague in order to review the progress achieved and to set directions and priorities for the coming years of the process. Ministers reaffirmed their commitment to the objective of establishing the European Higher Education Area by 2010.

Not surprisingly, the Bologna/Sorbonne process and Prague meeting have evoked a lot of discussion, rich in both critical and supportive comments. It will continue to develop an education policy based on a range of incentive measures, and in this way contribute to the creation of a single market for education.

3.2   Background of Chinese Higher Education Policy

The People's Republic of China (PRC) has a land area of about 9.6 million square km. China is the most populous country in the world, with 1.3 billion people by July, 2004 (The World Factbook, 2004), about 22 percent of the world's total. The Constitution stipulates, "The People's Republic of China is a socialist state under the people's democratic dictatorship led by the working class and based on the alliance of workers and peasants" (Constitution of the People's Republic of China, adopted on December 4, 1982). In China, the leading position of the working class in state affairs is realized through the Communist Party of China (CPC). And the guiding Marxism, Leninism and Mao Zedong thought and Deng Xiaoping theory is the main thought of the CPC. Now China is at the primary stage of socialism with the socialism system as the fundamental system.

The main policy-making procedure is like this: Party makes propositions, which are turned into state will through legal procedures, and through Party organizations' activities and model roles of Party members, Party leads the masses implementing the Party's principles and policies. In addition to the Communist Party of China (CPC), China has eight other political parties, called democratic parties. These parties are political alliances of laborers and compatriots. They are all dedicated to and participate in the socialist cause as friendly parties. They are neither out-of-power parties nor opposition ones. Since China is a nation with many ethnic groups and multiple parties, when the state adopts a key decision on the national economy and people's livelihood, the CPC will consult in advance with all nationalities, sectors, parties and non-party democratic personages to achieve consensus. The multi-party co-operation and political consultative system are under the leadership of the CPC, and form a basic political system of China. The multi-party cooperation and political consultation adopt mainly two forms: One is the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, and the other is represented by consultative meetings and symposiums attended by democratic parties and non-party democratic personages invited by the CPC. It is because of repeated exchanges of opinions and democratic discussions that policies and rules and regulations formulated by the state can be more substantial and perfect and reflects the demands and the will of the majority of the people.

3.2.1 Three Major Milestones in the Recent History of Reforms

The Party and government attach great importance to national education. It is not easy for a poor country to develop education; it is even harder for a big country with a population accounting for one-fifth of the world's total to run school. The main task of higher education in China is to train specialists for all the sectors of the country's development.

It is necessary to briefly overview the background and development of Chinese higher education in historical perspective. Immediately upon the foundation of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the institutions of higher education, 60% of which were run by the state and 40% of which were run privately or by foreign missionary organizations, were taken over by the new government and run either by the central government or by local governmental authorities. The management of higher education was entirely in the hands of the central government, and its purpose was seen to be the development of the national economy.

Although it was not obvious at that time, China established an economic policy that resembled very much the policy of the Soviet Union (Spence, 1991, p. 541—557). Once the new China was established, the Communist Party of China wanted to develop a socialist economy. At that time, there was a fierce international opposition between socialism and capitalism. Since the Soviet Union was the first country where the socialist revolution had succeeded and a socialist economy had been established, it was a ready example for China to follow. The policy of the Soviet Union inspired not only China's economic policy but also its higher-education policy. With the support of large numbers of Soviet experts both as consultants to the ministries and as teachers and researchers in a number of institutions, China, instead of learning from the experience of the Soviet Union, copied the total political, economic, and cultural patterns and practices of the Soviet Union. Higher education came increasingly to resemble the Soviet system[1] (Zhong Guo Jiao Yu Bai Nian Da Shi, 1952). The first large-scale reform of higher education was launched by the Chinese government in the early 1950s under the guidance of the Soviet Union. This reform changed and reorganized the colleges, schools and departments of the institutions of higher education. This complete restructuring of the entire higher educational system was to place it at the immediate service of the economic and political objectives of the First Five-Year Plan. The new institutions were run by their affiliated professional ministries.[2] The operational mechanism in the old model of highly centrally planned economy greatly influenced the higher education as almost the same management model was adopted. For the period between the 1950s and 1966, the centralized Chinese higher educational system came in for a great deal of criticism. For example, the colleges and universities, which were affiliated either with the central professional ministries or with the

---

[1]   November 1952, the Ministry of Education (MOE) prescribed and asked the institutions of higher education to make a plan for editing and translating textbooks form the Soviet Union. Between 1952 and 1956, 1393 Soviet Union's textbooks were translated and published in Chinese.

[2]   By "professional ministries", we mean the central ministries before 1990, such as the Ministry of the Electronic Industry, the Ministry of the Metallurgical Industry, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of the Chemical Industry, the Ministry of Railways, and the Ministry of Construction. At that time, these professional ministries owned and administered their specialized higher institutions (*bumen banxue*). The ministries decided about teaching and learning programs, funding programs, enrollment programs, and so on for these institutions on the basis of their needs. They also recruited students from their own institutions (Chen, 2002).

local governments, had divided functions and responsibilities. All of the programs[3] were set in function of the needs of the professional ministries or the local governments. The government reorganized the colleges, schools and departments in 1952 and 1953 and replaced the comprehensive universities by new specialist universities and colleges (Chen, 2002; Jian, 1998; Min, 2002). As a result, the scope of knowledge on the part of the graduates was relatively narrow especially narrow specialization on technology and the natural sciences and the neglect of the humanities and the social sciences. There were also the emphases on central manpower planning and job assignment. The ensuing reaction to this heritage was the 10 years of Cultural Revolution. During the "Cultural Revolution" from 1966—1976, the Chinese higher education witnessed unprecedented chaos in its leadership system, in education and in instruction management. It brought Chinese higher education system to a halt. The university entrance exams were cancelled during this period, only restored by Deng Xiaoping in 1977. Many intellectuals were purged or "sent down" to rural labor camps. It seems that everyone with skills over that of the average person was the target of political struggle in some way. According to most Western observers and followers of Deng Xiaoping, this led to almost a generation of *know nothings*; nearly a generation of China's scientists and other useful intellectuals were missing.

In the late 1970s, after practices were corrected and appropriate measures taken, economic, scientific, technological, and cultural and educational matters have gradually begun to take a new developmental track. After 1978, the American model of higher education was the one copied in China. Still in a stage of immature development, the higher education system in China is now more likely to be hyperpoliticized and ideologized even in the reform era.

As a study by Yin and White (1994) described, the recent history of reforms in Chinese higher education had been shaped by three major events. The first milestone was the Third Plenum of the Eleventh Central Committee of CPC, held in December 1978, which adopted a resolution to switch the strategic focus of national policies from "class struggle" to economic construction. It was after this plenum session that the "Four Modernizations", originally proclaimed by the late Premier Zhou Enlai in 1975, gained momentum and that education began to be seen as a crucial basis for a drive towards economic and technological modernization. On October 1, 1983, Comrade Deng Xiaoping autographed for Jingshan School as follows: "Education should be oriented to modernization, to the world and to the future." Under the guidance of the "three orientation" principle, China's education sector has been going on deepening reform and accumulated valuable experiences. Deng Xiaoping repeatedly emphasized this on different occasions. The construction of the education legal system has played an increasingly important role in educational reform and personnel training. Since

---

3   Programs here mean the enrolment plan, the curriculum and instruction plan, the graduate job assignment plan, and the like.

the launch of the reform and opening drive, education has become the realm with the most legislation just behind the economic field.

The second milestone was two decisions by the CPC Central Committee in 1985 on reforming the educational and scientific-technological systems. The guiding principle of the "Decision on Reform of the Scientific-technological System" in March 1985 was defined as "the commercialization of scientific and technological achievements" (cited by Yin & White, 1994). The "Decision on the Educational System" in May 1985 defined one of the strategic goals of Chinese Higher Education as "contributing considerably to China's independent scientific and technological development, and … solving major theoretical and practical problems that crop up in the course of socialist modernization" (cited by Yin & White, 1994). The May 1985 Decision clearly stated that higher education institutions should enjoy greater operational autonomy and should have the right to enroll commissioned and self-paying students, to readjust the services provided by their specialized departments, to accept commissioned projects and to expand their co-operation with other sectors of the society and economy. All this implies a stronger role for market forces. The post-1985 period was characterized by continuous and rapid increases in enrolments and with a growing effort to participate in the market economy, to rationalize specialization and to restructure curriculum and instruction.

The third milestone was Deng Xiaoping's inspection tour of south China in early 1992, during which he made a series of speeches and called for the accelerated introduction of a "socialist market economy" in China. Although several interpretations of the term "socialist market economy" have emerged, the prevailing view describes it as "placing the market mechanism in a key position to distribute all social resources" (cited by Yin & White, 1994). The 14th Congress (1992) made three policy decisions of far-reaching significance. One, seize opportunities to speed up development; two, define the establishment of a socialist market economy as the goal of economic restructuring in China; and three, establish the guiding position of Deng Xiaoping's theory of building socialism with Chinese characteristics in the whole Party. The basic principle of CPC is "seizing the current opportunity to deepen the reform and open China wider to the outside world, promoting development and maintaining stability" (14th Congress, 1992). In December 1992, the State Education Commission issued a document entitled "Points Regarding How to Expedite Reforms and Vigorously Develop Ordinary Higher Education", which stated that one of the key guidelines for Chinese higher education was "to adapt it to the socialist market economy". This document makes it clear that a greater proportion of higher education institutions "operating funding will derive from tuition fees and financial support from various sectors of society. It also encourages the development of private enterprise-run educational institutions. Moreover, this document laid down that "*higher education institutions should become real autonomous corporate bodies*" (cited by Yin & White, 1994).

3.2.2 Socialist Market Economy: New Demands for Higher Education

The recent decades have been a crucial period of time for China as it works to set up a socialist market economy, to reach the second-phase strategic goals of modernization, and to advance to the third-phase goals. Socioeconomic development will increase the demands on education in every aspect. Nonetheless, China is a developing country whose economic foundation is rather weak. Therefore, the conflict between the increasingly high demand for and low input in higher education still existed. The following urgent issues still faced China, such as how to depart from the Chinese realities to increase the input in education by both the government and the whole society, how to streamline the educational structure to promote a balance between the development of higher education and socioeconomic development, how to increase the effective utilizing of educational resources, and how best to meet the higher education needs of people.

China is currently undergoing a transition from a planned economy to a socialist market economy, involving reforms in many aspects of economic and social life and posing new challenges for education reform and development.

- The old education system was oriented toward a planned economy and was characterized by a high degree of state centralization and direct governmental management.
- The government was not only responsible for running all higher education institutions, but also for covering student costs of tuition and fees, medical care, and partial living expenses.
- Education and economic activities belong to different realms of social functions, each having its own patterns and characteristics.

There was a considerable amount of overlap in institutions' missions and their academic programs, thus keeping the already limited resources from being rationally allocated and utilized, and creating a large amount of waste. The problems of the higher education system had negative effects on moves to improve curriculum and teaching. Therefore, the reform of the higher education system is an important approach to developing higher education in China. Although much work has been done in this regard and some lessons and experience gained, the current higher education system as a whole is still unable to meet the demands of social and economic progress. A comment made by Hayhoe (1996) is that in the whole century of development, from the 1890s to the 1990s, China's universities have been elite institutions, assessable only to a tiny minority of the population. Even after a decade of rapid expansion over the reform decade of the 1980s, when enrolments in the whole system tripled, age cohort participation was estimated at about 2% in 1990 (Hayhoe, 1996). How to accelerate the pace of higher education system reform has become a pressing challenge for Chinese educators.

3.2.3 Knowledge Revolution Calls for a Faster and Deeper Educational Reform

There is a current knowledge revolution in the time we are living in, which is information-communication and technology based (Castells, 1996). The expansion and differentiation of higher education is emerging at the same time as the pace of knowledge creation is dramatically accelerating. The categories into which new knowledge falls are becoming increasingly specialized, and an information technology revolution has occurred in people's ability to access knowledge quickly and from increasingly distant locations. These changes are fundamentally altering what economies produce, as well as where and how they produce it. Organizations are changing; as are the skills needed to run them and the way they utilize human capital. "A key to success in the knowledge-based economy is a trained labor force. It is not surprising that so many countries have focused on improving their educational system." (Stiglitz, 1999.) Stiglitz also argues that success in the knowledge-based economy requires creativity, higher order cognitive skills in addition to basic skills. Those countries that find ways of fostering this kind of creativity will, in the long run, have a competitive advantage in the knowledge-based economy. Success in the knowledge-based economy is based on training in science and technology, and the level of government subsidies to science education. It could be said that the reforms and rapid expansion of Chinese higher education in the late 1990s are due to the pressure of the new global knowledge-based economy.

The current trend calls for a fundamental reform in curriculum and teaching methodology in Chinese universities and colleges. New requirements regarding the quality of higher education are raised in the context of a fast-developing economy, expanding international cooperation, and social progress. The constraints of traditional methods have become evident, such as concentration on instruction in specialized knowledge rather than a student's all-around ability. Such practice does not cater to the diversified needs of students, fails to let them take initiative in seeking, analyzing, and applying knowledge, and limits their creativeness.

Problems such as narrowly defined specialities and irrational disciplinary structure exist. Institutions of different types and levels overlap in their missions and do not play up their own strengths. Instructional content, course structure as well as the organization of knowledge needs updating and improvement. There is a gap between what is taught and what is actually happening in social and productive life. In addition, some teaching methods and pedagogies are out of date. It is, therefore, a fundamental requirement for the socioeconomic development of the country that higher education should renew educational philosophy and concepts to suit the needs of economic, scientific, and social development.

3.3   Analysis on the Different Backgrounds

Both the EU and China policy makers recognized that higher education plays a central role in the development of both human beings and modern societies as it enhances social, cultural and economic development, active citizenship and ethical values. However, due to the internal different situation and different tasks at different periods, the roles and competences of the EU and China in the HEP are different.

The Roles of the EU and China in the field of HEP

The field of higher education has been central in the nation-building processes of most European nation-states. The EU has weak legal and financial instruments and also the EU governance of education rests on the principle of *subsidiarity*. Moreover, based on new legal capacities, the post Maastricht area has witnessed new EU initiatives within this policy field (e.g. European Commission, 2000a). According to Art. 149 of the Treaty of Amsterdam, the Community has a complementary role to play: to add a European dimension to education, to help to develop quality education and to encourage life-long learning. The European Union (EU) is a forum for the exchange of ideas and good practice. It does not have a common education policy; on the contrary, its role is to create a system of genuine cooperation between the Member States by preserving the rights of each Member State in terms of the content and organization of its education and training systems. In addition to the goal of strengthening EU's economic and technological competitiveness worldwide, an important goal of current EU programmes is to construct a "People's Europe" and an "ever-closer Union". Hence, notions of European citizenship and the construction of a common European identity supplement the instrumental, economic and market rationales of EU's educational policies.

While there is different characterization of the nature of the State in different countries, even after five decades of transformation, the Chinese State remains a one-party State with power monopolized by the Communist Party of China (CPC). The CPC has been the ruling party of China since 1949, with monopolistic control of the Chinese State. Being a part of the super-structure of society, education has a key role to play in political and ideological development of the Chinese people and society. The State has a major role in shaping policies and practices in many different areas, including education. Education is not an autonomous social institution; it is part of the CPC-dominated State and is an important arena over which different factions within the CPC compete for control and through which to realize their vision for national development. In short, policy shifts in education has to be linked to conflicts among factions within the CPC.

The Changes of the EU and China in the HEP

The general outlines of European Union education policies are found in the New *Amsterdam Treaty* and in *Agenda 2000.* The Commission's Communication to the Council of November 1997, *Towards a Europe of Knowledge* (COM (97) 563), is based on these two important documents. EU integration has traditionally been stronger economically and legally than politically, culturally and socially (Olsen, 2001). Higher education is a fairly recent field of close and deep co-operation at the EU level (De Wit & Verhoeven, 2001, 178).

EU policies generally include common policies (e.g. competition, agriculture, internal market), shared policies governed in tandem by the EU and domestic authorities (e.g. research, structural funds), and policies primarily governed by domestic governments (e.g. culture, education). The policies of education could be considered a shared portfolio of the EU and the member-states, however with a strong component of national sovereignty (European Commission, 2002, 20; Neave, 2001; Nòvoa, 2001). There is a supranational policies shift.

Efforts towards EU co-operation in the field of higher education are more recent than in the field of research. Yet, an independent supranational EU policy of R&E (Research & Education) has gradually emerged in the 1980s and 1990s. Whereas EU initiatives in R&E were mainly supportive to nation-state policies prior to the 1980s, 1983 witnessed the emergence of a 'supranational turn' in R&E policy. This turn has gained increased momentum thereafter (Beukel, 2001; De Wit & Verhoeven, 2001, 187; Field, 1997; Ruberti, 2001). The Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties have later confirmed this supranational shift, however, counterbalanced against the principle of *subsidiarity* (Beukel, 2001). Reflecting this supranational turn, European ideas and visions increasingly dominate the Commission's arguments for closer EU co-operation in R&E (e.g. European Commission, 2000a). Less emphasis is put on arguments of supplementing, strengthening and co-coordinating national policies of R&E (Beukel, 2001).

The move from intergovernmental co-operation towards supranational governance in R&E, however, has not been a swift and abrupt process (Karlsen, 1994). The advent of increased supranational governance in R&E has not come about through careful planning and grand visions alone. It reflects very much the accumulated effects of Commission initiatives and decisions by the European Court of Justice during the 1980s and 1990s (Field, 1997). Hence, despite the lack of Treaty provisions, the EU has achieved significant results in R&E (European Commission, 2002, 21).

At the end of the 1990s the supranational turn in EU's R&E policies also reflect the strengthened supranational competencies of the Union more generally (European Commission, 2002). However, this supranational turn in R&E policies also parallels the so-called "Bologna process" aimed at constructing "European Higher Education Area" (De Wit & Verhoeven, 2001, 186; Laffan, O'Donnell & Smith, 2000). The Bologna declaration (1999) has

called for a new architecture of European higher education. Its ambition is to create an open European area for higher education, create systems for international recognition of degrees, and strengthen intra-European mobility, and the competitiveness of European higher education internationally.

China's educational leaders have long debated the pluses and minuses of decentralization of control and recourses of China's vast educational enterprise. Since 1949 and the establishment of the People's Republic of China, China's leaders have sought to find a "Chinese way to higher education" including such radical efforts as the virtual elimination of conventional higher education during the Cultural Revolution. However, in general one can say that since 1949 two principal goals have been pursued with respect to higher education: ideological training and establishing a narrowly focused technical training program to build socialism (or in earlier ideological jargon, universities were exhorted to be both "red" and "expert"). Under the socialist system of a planned economy, education was necessarily an integral part of manpower planning. Under the ideology of those days, there should be no personal interests beyond the state's interests, and there was indeed no room for personal mobility beyond the state plans. Only after the early 1980s, when Deng Xiaoping declared China would open its doors to modernization, the world and the future, could the rich experience of modern university building in the pre-1949 period be recovered, and reforms undertaken that have allowed diverse influences from the outside to interact with new developments in Chinese higher education. The task of higher education in China should be to foster higher specialization people, which have creative spirit and practical capability, develop technology and culture, and promote socialism modernization building. In order to develop a modern education system, higher education in China has been experiencing tremendous changes and reforms.

As party leaders fought over alternative goals and approaches to national development, and as the education system served as a reactive vehicle for realizing the party's development objectives rather than an autonomous institution for social change, educators, parents, and students have been unwillingly caught in cycles of heart-wrenching dislocations and adjustments. Major educational policies and reversals have been undertaken to resolve enduring dilemmas regarding the political/ideological versus economic functions of education, education for economic efficiency versus education for social equality and equity, and the proper role of intellectuals in the Chinese state and society which supposedly represent the interests of the proletariat class. Policy shifts in education reflect shifts in power and development perspective among party factions.

As the CPC (1992) continues to push for "a socialist market economy with Chinese characteristics", it has to confront the challenge of responding to the demand from civil society for change and exercising control over the direction and pace of such change. The power relationship between the CPC, the State, and civil society is an important determinant of China's policy for national development and for education. Education may have the potential

of indirectly affecting those institutions and organizations that normally shape policy and development of the education system.

Chinese higher education reforms have been dominated by the government, but with little attention paid to the university's role. As an administrative concept in higher education, university autonomy was an inevitable result of political reform and opening to the world in the late 1970s. From then on, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, the Central People's Government (state council) and the State Educational Committee issued a series of resolutions that set out workable measures for university autonomy. Of course, university autonomy has to be implemented gradually.

Summary for this Chapter

Higher education policy has traditionally been perceived as a key area of national sovereignty and autonomy. It is very sensitive from the standpoint of supranational decision-making, which results from the complexity and multiplicity of the stakes involved. It has also been regarded as an important vehicle for fostering economic growth, for ensuring a high level of employment and for reproducing the national education cultural identity (Neave, 1984, 197). In addition to this, national education systems have historically been shaped through such societal processes as nation building and industrialization. This is why the EU and China differ strongly in the field of higher education policy from each other.

What the Chinese leaders wanted was to try to combine "centralism" with "people's democracy" (Spence, 1991, p. 654—659). The time was ripe for change, also in higher education policy. While higher education in China is under increasing pressure to follow international trends, the lingering influence of the country's longstanding centrally planned system and the complex domestic situation combine to create difficulties in easing China's ongoing social transformation. The role of the state, while still strong, is undergoing change. Considering China's social, cultural, and historical realities, the state remains necessary as a regulator, facilitator, and negotiator. Currently, the state performs all these roles, although arguably such diverse roles often do not play out in a consistently beneficial way. In the new era, with the deepening of the reform of the political and economic system, university funds arise from various channels instead of the government only. Moreover, the indirect control and macro-administration of government and self-regulation and self-administration will be improved. All of these factors will benefit Chinese university autonomy, which will become practicable and at the same time government will control universities in a more effective way.

EU's resource base is limited but its regulatory activities have increased substantially in the 1990s. With its formally very limited powers and resources in the sphere of education, the EU is still a potentially efficient normative actor in the field. Maybe this result from the

special nature of EU and unforeseen powers it holds on other policy sectors, notably the economic, monetary, and competition policies. The EU cannot claim the experience and expertise of education departments of the OECD, UNESCO and World Bank. Rather, it has a status based on its sheer economic and political power. Secondly, it is and has always been an organisation in transition. Through its gradual enlargement, it has participated in shaping the political landscape of the whole continent. Thirdly, the education policy measures adopted by the EU differ from those of other intergovernmental organisations. In addition to producing normative prescriptions, its policies are based on funding programmes, which are dependent on initiative from the "grass-roots level" (individual students, teachers, academics and educational institutions). We can see advent of creeping supranational education policies at the EU level (Ruberti, 2001).

Chapter 4

The Role of Higher Education Policy in Promoting the EU's Integration and China's Developments

The purpose of this chapter is to analyse the similar relationship between the higher education and regional/national development in the EU and China. I will first go through into the important documents of the EU and China and then analyze how the EU and China policy-makers go about tackling often similar issues though in different ways and use higher education policy as the important weapon to promote economic, political and social development.

4.1 The Significant Role of Higher Education Policy in Promoting the EU's Integration

When we want to know more about European level initiatives regarding the relationship between higher education and the economy, we cannot ignore the more general policy that is developed towards education. Therefore, this part has a double aim: to provide an overview of the general lines of policy of the EC/EU in this area, and to give some analysis on specific initiatives that are of special importance for higher education.

4.1.1 Overview on the General Lines of Policy of the EU in Education

This more or less chronological account distinguishes three periods. The first runs from the establishment of the European Communities to the point where the Court of Justice cleared the way for more elaborate programmes. The second begins when the EC expands its competence in the field of education. The third period starts with the Treaty of Maastricht (1993) that includes a chapter on "education, vocational training and youth". Here we will go through into the important documents of EU and analyze how the EU policy-makers use higher education policy as the important weapon to promote economic, political and social integration.

Moving slowly towards European cooperation in the field of education (1971—1982)

The first step towards the European Union was the decision of six European countries (Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands) to establish three European Communities: the European Coal and Steel Community (1951), the European Economic Community (1957) and the European atomic Energy Committee (1957). In the founding treaties of those Communities education as such isn't mentioned. Education was considered to be an exclusive competence of the Member States. Nevertheless, article 128 of the EEC-Treaty on vocational training did become the basis for later actions in this field. This treaty, apart from the general principles on vocational training laid down in article 128, is related to education on three more occasions. Article 118 is about vocational training of employees, article 41 about vocational training of farmers and article 57 about mutual recognition of academic qualifications. The ECSC-Treaty mentioned retraining of employees in article 56.

The necessity of cooperation in the field of education, particularly higher education, was born[1]. But the Ministers of Education of the EC only met for the first time on 16 November 1971, at the 174th session of the council, which at the same time was a diplomatic conference of those ministers. This formula of "the Council and the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council" was constructed to cope with the problem of the small legal basis of community action in this field. It indicated that cooperation in the field of education was only partially community-level and for the main part was inter-governmental.

During the period 1971—1982, the European Community policy towards higher education and education in general, was limited to a fragmented collection of (often low-budget) measures being taken. Most (financial) support was given to a series of research programmes which were mainly aimed at the research and development of new technologies[2] and which had a clear economic goal: to enhance the competitiveness of European industry.

Community-level cooperation in the field of education (1983—1992)

From 1983 onwards, the characteristics of the cooperation in the field of education within the European Community change. Whereas in the previous period this cooperation was limited to inter-governmental actions most of the time, the "second movement" of execution of the Action Programme increasingly gave rise to community-level cooperation.

---

[1]   Bull, EC 7/8—1961/40—42

[2]   FAST (OJ 1978 L 225/38—40) —Forecasting and Assessment in the field of Science and Technology

The European Court of Justice has played an important role in this evolution. In a series of judgments it broadened the legal basis of the cooperation in the field of education by interpreting the notion of "vocational training" in the sense of article 128 of the EEC-Treaty in a broad way.

Other factors also account for this evolution. The European Council of 21 and 22 March 1983 in Brussels declared to be in favour of the promotion of mobility by the academic recognition of diplomas and study results[3]. On the next meeting of the European Council (Frankfurt, 1983, June 19) the *Solemn Declaration on European Union*[4] was adopted. One of the many agreements between the heads of state and government was to promote closer cooperation between higher education institutions, including the exchange of teachers and students. A series of Resolutions of the Council and the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council adopted on 2 June[5] changed one of the main objectives of the education Action Programme, namely "cooperation in the field of higher education", to "promotion of the free movement and mobility of teachers, students and researchers".

So in line with the Action programme of 1976 three major goals regarding higher education emerge in the mid-80's: (1) the promotion of cooperation between higher education institutions and between these institutions and business as far as technological training is concerned; (2) the promotion of the mobility of students, teachers and researchers; and (3) the promotion of the academic recognition of diploma's and study periods. The community-level action programme COMETT and ERASMUS were developed to achieve these goals.

COMETT (OJ 1986 L 222/17—21, and OJ 1989 L 13/57—63) was aimed at cooperation between higher education institutions and industry with respect to a high-level training in new technologies. The programme contained the development of university-enterprise training partnerships, of joint projects on ongoing training, and of multimedia training systems; and (grants for) transnational exchanges.

The main objectives of the ERASMUS[6] programme were to enhance the mobility of students and teachers, to establish closer relations between the citizens of the different Member States, and to increase the number of graduates with direct experience in the area of study, cooperation and the daily life within the EC. It wanted to establish a European university network and a student grants scheme, and wanted to improve the academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study.

Both programmes must also be seen in relation with the *Single European Act,* which was signed in February 1987 and took effect on 1 July 1987[7]. The Act was the first comprehensive

---

[3]   Bull. EC 3—1983, no.1.5.3

[4]   Bull. EC 6—1983, no. 1.6.1

[5]   Bull. EC 6—1983, no. 2.1.84

[6]   OJ 1987 L 166/20—24, and OJ 1989 L 395/23—27

[7]   Bull. EC suppl. 2—1986

revision of the founding treaties, especially the EEC-Treaty. It comprised institutional reforms (among other things, the introduction of the cooperation procedure), the completion of the internal market, the introduction of new policy areas (such as social policy, economic and social coherence, research and technological development) and closer cooperation in foreign-policy matters. The Act recognized that the completion of the internal market depended, among other things, on the improvement of the human resources of the Community.

In the light of the *Single European Act* and then ongoing reform of the Structural Funds (which were aimed at elimination structural and regional disparities), the Commission placed education and training in a new context[8]. The new point of view was that education and training should support the economic and social coherence (the free movement of persons, the development of economic less favoured regions, the preparation of young people for their entrance in the labour market, the reduction of long-lasting unemployment, and the enhancement of technological cooperation). This shows that the Commission attached greater significance to vocational training than to education. Nevertheless, by preparing the future labour force for working life, the development of human resources through education could also contribute to these goals.

Later the Commission introduced the principles of diversity and subsidiarity[9]. The former is an expression of the reserve that the EC has always had against harmonisation. This means that, although a certain functional coherence between the different education systems of the Member States is unavoidable, a greater degree of convergence must be achieved with respect for the diversity of the national education systems. The principle of subsidiarity states that decisions need to be made as closely to the citizens as possible; power has to be allocated to that level that is best suited to achieve a certain objective. In the field of education these principles are an explicit confirmation of the competence of the Member States regarding the structure of the national systems and the content of education.

The Council and the Ministers of Education, meeting within the Council discussed these proposals of the Commission. Consequently the Council agreed (1989, October 6) on the main lines of policy to be followed by the Member States, and on a Community policy, and the means for this policy[10]. The Community policy was based on five objectives. Europe should be plural-cultural and open to the world, it should guarantee training for all, and should create more opportunities for mobility and the acquisition of skills. The Education Committee was charged to evaluate proposals of the Commission in the light of these objectives and means, to promote the exchange of information, and to seek other possibilities to enlarge cooperation, thereby taking into account the need for efficient management and the limitation of available financial means. This last point was dealt with on 1 June 1992[11]. The

---

[8]   COM (88) 280 final of 18 May 1988; Bull. EC 5—1988, no. 1.2.3.—1.2.9

[9]   COM (89) 236 final of 2 June 1989; Bull. EC 6—1989, no. 2.1.106

[10]   OJ 1989 C 277/5—6

[11]   OJ 1992 C 151/3—4

Council decided that all new community-level programmes have to be evaluated by explicit criteria regarding the objectives, means and results of these programmes and the financial means dedicated to these programmes.

In the meantime the second half of the eighties was becoming a very important period for the development of a Community policy towards higher education. Apart from the major action programmes COMETT and ERASMUS new programmes were developed: JEAN MONNET, LINGUA, and Trans-European Mobility Programme for University Studies (TEMPUS).

The action JEAN MONNET[12] supported initiatives of higher education institutions regarding education and research about the European integration. First established in 1989 for a period of three years, it was continued until 1997. The programme envisaged providing financial aid for research, and the creation of Jean Monnet Chairs devoted to European integration studies, especially in the areas of law, economics, political and social sciences, and history.

The main aim of LINGUA[13] programme was to improve both in a quantitative and a qualitative manner the knowledge of foreign languages. Action II of LINGUA focused on higher education. It provided grants for inter-university cooperation programmes, individual students and teachers, in order to promote the mobility and exchange of foreign language students and, particularly, the initial training of future foreign language teachers.

TEMPUS[14] can be roughly described as having the same goals as ERASMUS, but focused on mobility between Eastern and Western Europe. It supported the development of joint European projects between universities and/or enterprises. And it provided direct financial support for students (and teachers and administrators) of Eastern Europe to study in an eligible state (Hungary and Poland at first, but nowadays other Central and Eastern European countries and the former of the Soviet Union are eligible as well).

Next to TEMPUS, two other initiatives were taken in the field of cooperation with third countries.

The EC, the USA, and Canada reached agreement on a Joint Statement (1990, November 22) on common goals and principles, cooperation, and consultation. One of the areas of cooperation was education, including the exchange of academics and young people. As far as higher education was concerned, a study group was established to seek for the possibilities of cooperation. A further proposition was to support model or demonstration projects. A fundamental agreement on the enhancement of the cooperation and exchange between American and European universities was signed on 20 May 1993 in Washington.

---

[12]   OJ 1989 C 308/13—14

[13]   OJ 1989 L 239/24—32

[14]   OJ 1990 L 131/21—26; OJ 1993 L 112/34—39; OJ 1996 L 306/36—39

Since 1989 the European policy on cooperation with Mediterranean third countries has been to enlarge this cooperation in commercial, financial and technological fields. 12 October 1992 was the official starting date of the programme MED-CAMPUS for the first year. The programme intends to improve the exchange of information and experience between higher education institutions, and particularly to establish networks of higher education institutions in the EC and in the Mediterranean countries, the enhancement of higher education structures, the strengthening of the ties between higher education institutions and local firms, and a deepening and widening of cultural bonds. Therefore the programme grants financial support to cooperation actions between at least two EC higher education institutions and one partner from a Mediterranean country. These actions are aimed at the initial and advanced training of university teachers, administrators and technical personnel, and at intensive short-term practical training. Themes are concentrated around management and development.

The general lines of policy were further developed in a series of memoranda, published by the Commission at the end of 1991.

With the *"Memorandum on higher education in the European Community"*[15], the Commission wanted to open a debate on the preparation of the national education systems for the future changes, and to stimulate the discussion between higher education and industry. These changes were the forthcoming economic, monetary and political unification. The memorandum was inspired also by the result of the IRDAC-report (Industrial Research and Development Advisory Committee) on "Skills Shortages in Europe".

The following analysis was made. The population in the EC is aging, and industry is demanding (flexible) individuals with increased knowledge and advanced skills. This challenges education, particularly higher education. It must provide the industry with skilled laborers. It has to develop continued education and training. Research must play an important role, as well as international contacts, in the transfer of knowledge and skills.

Therefore, higher education institutions have to take into account a number of structural factors: the balance between general, technical and vocational training; the financing of the management of education; the use of new technologies; and possibilities for a permanent interest in quality. Other crucial factors are: the need for an increased participation in higher education; taking into account the new needs and wishes of industry; the demand for permanent education and flexible laborers; the need for reinforcement of open and distance learning provisions.

These factors necessitate a dialogue with the higher education institutions about the following issues:

---

[15] COM (91) 349 final of 5 November 1991; Bull. EC 11—1991, no. 1.2.82

- A broader policy on the mobility of students than the successful action programmes COMETT, ERASMUS and LINGUA.

- Cooperation between higher education institutions at the European level.

- The enhancement of language proficiency by other actions than LINGUA, like offering language education in all courses, and taking the knowledge of foreign languages as an entrance criterion.

- Offer teachers a European experience (i.e. training in another Member State).

- Develop a mechanism for recognition of diplomas and study periods, with the ECTS and inter-university agreements as a basis.

- Prepare themselves (e.g. through contacts) for their international role, as the international role of the EC increases.

- Analysis of information and policy at Community level especially European dimension in curriculum.

The problem of the mutual academic recognition of diplomas did not come to a definitive solution in this period, but several measures were taken. The COMETT-programme included transborder work placements in firms in other Member States, bringing about academic recognition. The ERASMUS-programme took up the further development of the NARIC and established the ECTS. The NARIC (Network for Academic Recognition Information Centres) consisted of national centres responsible for providing institutions and citizens with information on higher education systems and qualifications, in order to facilitate the recognition of qualifications. The ECTS (European Community Course Credit Transfer System) was a pilot project for testing a mechanism of transfer of study credits between higher education institutions.

Furthermore a general system of recognition was introduced for the first time in 1989[16]. The system regulated the recognition of higher education diplomas gained in a Member State, in the host country were the professional activity is executed. It applied to all professions requiring a higher education training of at least three years, and which were not covered by specific directives governing recognition. Although recognition was the basic principle, the system provided the possible exception of recognition after compensation in the form of an adaptation period, an aptitude test or professional experience. In 1992 this system was elaborated to higher education of less than three years (post-secondary and secondary courses)[17].

To create an Open European Area for cooperation in higher education, the Council and the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council saw a necessity for measures in three areas[18]. The Commission was invited to draw a report on the obstructions to the access to

---

[16]   OJ 1989 L 19/16—23

[17]   OJ 1992 L 209/25—45

[18]   OJ 1993 C 186/1—2

studies. Secondly, to enhance the equality of the studies the Commission was asked to support the development of networks of higher education institutions, and to promote the mobility of teachers and information; and to draw reports on the quality of higher education and on the possibilities of transfer of study points between Member States. Thirdly, with regard to the relevance of studies to personal development and preparation for society and work, the Member States, the national institutions and the Commission were requested to develop diversity by exchange of know-how and experience.

The European Training Foundation was established within the framework of PHARE. A regulation was adopted in 1990[19], but this could only take effect when the decision about the place of residence of the Foundation was taken. The foundation has three goals: (1) to improve higher education; (2) to promote cooperation between the EC and the favoured countries in the field of vocational training; and (3) to contribute to the coordination of the support of the EC, the Member States and third countries.

The Treaty on European Union and onwards (1993—1997)

The *Treaty on European Union*[20] among other things extends the former EEC-Treaty with the notion "citizenship of the Union", the principle of subsidiarity, and some new policy areas. Under the heading "Education, vocational training and youth" two new articles are introduced: article 126 on education and article 127 on vocational training. At the same time the competence of the European Union in these fields is restricted by a strict definition of the procedures to be followed (respectively the co-decision procedure and the cooperation procedure), and the fields of competence of the EU.

At the end of 1994 the phase of "first generation" community level action programmes was coming to an end. Therefore, proposals of the Commission for new programmes had to be approved by the Council in 1994. The Commission presented the Ruberti-report[21] in May 1993. This document contained guidelines for the forthcoming actions in the field of education. The general objective was still defined as the development of human capital. More specific goals were, among other things, the promotion of cooperation between education and training systems, and the improvement of the quality of education and training (e.g. in the field of new technologies and open and distance education). Means to achieve these aims were the establishment of networks of inter-university cooperation programmes, the promotion of the mobility and exchange of students, teachers and researchers within these networks, and the development of joint study or research programmes.

---

[19] OJ 1990 L 131/1—5

[20] OJ 1992 C 191/1—112

[21] COM (93) 183 final of 9 May 1993; Bull. 5—1993, no. 1.2.62 (4)

These guidelines were stressed in the "*White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment*" of the Commission, and the action plan based on this White Paper of the European Council of 10 and 11 December 1993 in Brussels[22]. Both documents assigned an important role to education and training in answering to the new socio-economic developments.

In a society, which increasingly is knowledge-oriented, education and training are of crucial importance. By improving the competitiveness of industry and business growth can be reactivated. And this growth will be labor-intensive when skills are better adapted to the developments and the demands of the market and society.

The White Paper comes across several negative aspects of the education and training systems in the EU: high dropout rates; shortage of skilled labor in spite of a high level of unemployment; insufficient mutual recognition of diplomas; and the non-existence of a real European area for open and distance learning. But also positive evolutions were taking place. The increase of the general level of education and the educational attainment, and the increasing investments in education are the more general improvements. Positive changes in higher education are the growing participation of the private sector, the decentralization of the management, a change in mentality bringing education and industry closer together. The last means the recognition by education institutions of the need to adapt training better to working life, and the recognition by industry of the importance of general education next to professional knowledge.

Nevertheless, a further reform of the education and training systems was required. In general school education and working life must be firmly coupled. For higher education systems the challenge was to improve cooperation between the universities and industry; to reorganize available funds towards a greater intervention of the private sector; and to make universities promote continuous training. On the national level the White Paper proposes more specifically the development of a system of training vouchers; training through new technologies; and decentralization of the management of education. On community level it primarily favors the development of the European dimension in education through existing and future programmes, concerning mobility, the recognition of diplomas, information supply and so on.

Since the competence of the EU in the field of education and training was recognized, and bearing in mind the reforms proposed by the White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment, the character of the Community policy changed. No longer fragmented measures, but programmes including all levels of education and forming a comprehensive unity were established. New Community action programmes wanted to increase the impact and interactivity of previous measures by bringing them within the framework of a single programme.

---

[22] Bull. EC suppl. 6—1993

The Community policy was conceived around three major lines of action: education (SOCRATES), training (LEONARDO) and youth (YOUTH FOR EUROPE). SOCRATES[23] is the first comprehensive action programmed in the field of education: it covers all sectors of education. As far as higher education is concerned, SOCRATES continues and extends ERASMUS and LINGUA, and it effects new actions in the field of open and distance learning and adult education. In this way SOCRATES clearly forms a part of the strategy to promote lifelong learning. The LEONARDO programme and YOUTH FOR EUROPE III are established with the same goal.

Next to the encompassing framework of these three major programmes, action was taken to further develop the cooperation with third countries: Latin America, the US, and Canada.

Bearing in mind the experiences with programmes as ERASMUS, TEMPUS, and MED-CAMPUS, the Commission approved a programme for cooperation between Europe and Latin America in the field of higher education on 10 March 1994. The ALFA (America Latin Formation Academic) programme fell under the responsibility of DG I b (Directorate for Latin America). ALFA's main objectives were to overcome the unbalances between Europe and Latin America by improving the scientific, academic and technological potential of the latter, and to contribute to the regional integration of Latin America. Its activities were gathered in two sub-programmes: (a) cooperation for institutional management; and (b) cooperation for scientific and technological training.

The European Parliament stressed in March 1994 the significance of the joint statement of the EU and the United States (22 November 1990) and insisted on the transformation of this statement in a treaty, and also on the further development of the relation with the US and the extension of the Fulbright programme[24]. The Commission, given a mandate by the Council, proposed to the Council a draft cooperation agreement on 1 June 1995 between the EU and the US regarding higher education and vocational training for the period 1995—2000. A similar draft proposal with Canada was presented on 31 July 1995. The decision procedure experienced no problems and the treaties were approved on respectively 23 October and 27 November 1995. Briefly summarized, the main objectives of the treaty with the US are improving quality and learning to know each other, by developing joint project of EU/US partnership between higher education institutions of at least two Member States of the EU and two States of the US. These projects have to cover, among other things, the exchange of students and staff of higher education institutions and companies with full academic recognition, development of study programmes, and short intensive courses. A mixed committee of independent representatives of the EU and the US does the selection of cooperation activities and the drafting of a yearly report.

---

[23]   OJ 1995 L 87/10—24

[24]   OJ 1994 C 114/18—20

Also in 1995, the Commission presented its White paper *"Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society"*[25]. It focused on "three factors of upheaval" appearing into European society: the impact of the information society, the impact of internationalization, and the impact of the scientific and technological world. Education and training can respond to this by enhancing the broad knowledge base (as step towards the acquisition of new technical skills) and fostering the ability for employment (by encouraging mobility, developing all types of dual structures of work and training, validating skills, and offering a second chance). Moving towards the learning society is a twofold challenge, says the White Paper. Economically, the competitiveness of European industry must be consolidated and improved. Social exclusion must be combated. Therefore, it proposes guidelines for action linked to five general objectives:

(1) Encourage the acquisition of new knowledge (personal skills cards);

(2) Bring schools and business sector closer together (apprenticeship/traineeship);

(3) Combat exclusion (second chance through school);

(4) Proficiency in three Community languages;

(5) Treat capital investment and investment on training on an equal basis.

A field not mentioned in this White Paper was the academic recognition of diplomas. Until the Treaty on European Union the competence of the Community was restricted to the recognition of diplomas for the practice of a certain profession in another Member-State. But with this Treaty the situation changed. The EU is now competent to take measures concerning academic recognition. From this moment on the general introduction of the ECTS was promoted. And a communication of the Commission[26] proposed new lines of action to be followed in this field. The Commission made an inventory of the realizations on community level regarding the academic and professional recognition of diplomas. Two forms of recognition were encountered:

(1) Voluntary recognition on the basis of accumulation (further studies in another Member States after recognition of the already achieved diploma) and through substitution (recognition by the own institution of a study period in another Member State; developed e.g. in COMETT and ERASMUS agreements);

(2) Professional recognition de jure (Directives based on the EC-Treaty) and de facto (the system of comparability of certificates of professional skills).

---

[25] COM (95) 590 final

[26] OJ 1995 C 166/108—109

The Commission concluded that these forms of recognition were not mutually replaceable. Thus it saw no other way to improve the recognition of diplomas than to improve the mutual knowledge and trust and voluntary cooperation. It admitted that a real community-level solution was not available. The approach proposed focused primarily on the exchange of information and the establishment of networks of teachers and professionals, and in second order on the promotion of initiatives regarding mutual adjustment of (both contents and construction of) training programmes.

4.1.2 The Major Community Action Programmes and Initiatives

Higher education has always been at the heart of the programmes in the field of education and vocational training. The very first actions (e. g. Joint Study Programme Scheme) and the first major action programmes (e.g. COMETT, ERASMUS) all concerned higher education. This can be explained for a large part by the strong degree of autonomy in implementing measures that higher education institutions have. Moreover, many aspects of scientific exchange traditionally are of an international nature. With the Treaty on the European Union other levels of education have become more prominent, but an important part of the present-day initiatives still concerns higher education.

The Joint Study Programme (JSP) Scheme was a designed to promote study abroad programmes. It provided Community aid for the development and the implementation of arrangements negotiated between two or more individual higher education institutions in different Member States regarding: (1) student exchange for integrated periods of study; (2) integrated teaching assignments in another Community country for staff members; and (3) joint development of curricular elements for insertion into teaching courses at the participating institutions. Imbalances in the distribution between Member States, subject area types of institute, and the mode of cooperation imposed, were redressed by increasing the dissemination about the Scheme to the sectors concerned. Given the comparatively modest resources available (around 2 MECU in the academic year 1984/85 to cover programmes in the then ten Member States), the JSP Scheme has taken the form of a pilot project for the further development of higher education cooperation in the Community, especially ERASMUS.

The COMETT I programme was the first major Community action programme in the field of education. The goals set out for the programme were: to give a European dimension to the cooperation between universities and enterprises; to foster the joint development of training programmes and the optimum use of training resources; to improve the supply of training; and to develop the level of training in response to technological and social changes. The COMETT programme comprised a range of transnational projects to strengthen and encourage cooperation between universities and enterprises within the European framework

in regard to both initial and ongoing training. COMETT II established a second phase of university-enterprise cooperation in the field of advanced technology, envisaged training in advanced technologies and development of highly qualified human resources, in order to strengthen the competitiveness of European industry. The content of COMETT II differed from COMETT I as to the length (5 years instead of 4), the budget (250 instead of 45 MECU), and the attention paid to initial training (instead of advanced training). Moreover, it was centered more around transnational networks for projects regarding training, particularly in the field of advanced technology, and respond more to the specific needs of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs). Throughout the programme, the spread of participation among the European countries, and the representation of technology-related sectors became more balanced. In spite of the strong increase in the budget, demand wasn't satisfied (only 10% to 15%). Together with the impressive growth in numbers of the projects approved, this clearly marks the success of the COMETT programme.

ERASMUS I ran from 1 July 1987 to 30 June 1990. During this period an amount of 85 MECU was available. This budget was used to reach for the following objectives:

(1) To achieve a significant increase in the number of university students spending an integrated period of study in another Member State, in order to create an adequate pool of manpower with first-hand experience of economic and social aspects of other Member States;

(2) To promote cooperation between universities;

(3) To increase mobility of staff and thereby improving the quality of education and training with a view to securing the competitiveness of the Community;

(4) To strengthen the interaction between citizens with a view to consolidating the concept of a People's Europe;

(5) To ensure the development of a pool of graduates with direct experience of intra-Community cooperation.

In order to meet these objectives, ERASMUS was centered around such four actions as European university network, student grants scheme, the academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study and complementary measures. Surprisingly, the ERASMUS-decision contained a call on the Member States to support activities that help establish the goals of ERASMUS. This was unusual, because as a rule community-level action was complementary to national actions, and not the other way round.

ERASMUS II provided 192 MECU for the first three years of the five-year programme, which would begin on 1 January 1991 (1 July for the Student Grants Scheme). The programme was now open for students up to doctorate level. Compared to the first phase, marked changes concerning the European university network were the attention paid to the study of language, and the establishment of a grant of 20,000 ECU for universities organizing short intensive

courses for students of different Member States (formerly, this was a complementary measure). Each Member State would receive a budget for student grants of 200,000 ECU minimum (approximately 100 grants). The budget for complementary measures was restricted to 5% of the total budget.

> *"This year we can claim confidently that eight years of ERASMUS have established an extensive and innovative system of higher education cooperation which has transformed the relationship between European higher education institutions and given access to study abroad to over 490,000 European students"* (CEC, 1995).

The main goal of the LINGUA programme was the qualitative and quantitative improvement of the knowledge of foreign languages, i.e. the languages of EC-countries taught as a foreign language, with view on improved communication proficiency within the Community. Action II provided support for measures promoting the learning of foreign languages in universities and other institutions of higher education, and, in particular, supporting the initial training of future foreign language teachers. This action supplemented two ERASMUS actions: (1) the European university network of ICPs (Inter-university Cooperation Programmes), which it wanted to develop further; and (2) the grant system for the mobility and exchange of students and teachers.

TEMPUS was established for a trial period of three years, beginning 1 July 1990 within a perspective of five years. The objectives of TEMPUS are comparable to those of ERASMUS, but focused on the mobility between Western and Eastern Europe. The most tangible result of the TEMPUS programme has been the introduction of innovations in the university curricula, including the preparation of new courses, new teaching material and new teaching methods. Being closely linked to the PHARE and TACIS programmes TEMPUS has been able to become more structural and strategic in its objectives, to increase the involvement of the partner countries, and to determine projects according to national priorities. The commission therefore stated in its interim report[27] that "the projects supported by TEMPUS can be considered by and large as successful and important for the development of higher education in the Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) partner countries."

General goals of Community action programme used to be general objectives for the founding Treaties. When the Treaty on European Union took effect, which included a chapter on education and training, this changed. SOCRATES is the first comprehensive programme. The goals of the SOCRATES programme regarded education as defined in articles 3, sub p and 126 of the EU-Treaty. Hence, SOCRATES aimed at the improvement of the quality of education and at the development of an Open European Area for cooperation in education. It has been legally based on articles 126 and 127 of the EU-Treaty.

Two actions related to higher education *(ERASMUS)* should be taken:

---

[27]   COM (96) 197 final

Action I: The promotion of the European Dimension in universities

Within Action I, a distinction can be made between activities for which an institutional contract can be concluded, and projects on subjects of mutual interest.

On the one hand, universities may conclude an institutional contract to receive assistance for a maximum period of three years. Their application has to comprise a policy statement on European cooperation and proposals as to the specific cooperation activities envisaged. These may include activities established under ICPs:

- Organization of student mobility;
- Introduction of the ECTS;
- Curriculum development activities;
- Teaching staff mobility (short, fully integrated teaching assignments at a university in another participating country) and selective teaching fellowships;
- Intensive programmes (bringing together students and staff from several countries to obtain new perspectives on a specific theme, and to compare and test teaching approaches in an international classroom environment).

Outside an ICP framework preparatory study visits can be supported. The same goes for the incorporation into curricula of material contributing to the understanding of characteristics of other Member states and the learning of languages as an integral part of studies. Wherever appropriate, universities are encouraged to apply open and distance learning techniques and materials to the above activities.

The Community will lend its support to "university cooperation projects on subjects of mutual interest", generally known as "Thematic Networks". The purpose of these networks is to define and develop a European dimension within a range of academic disciplines through cooperation between existing academic associations and university faculties or departments. This cooperation should enable them to exchange experiences, discuss and foster the development of joint programmes and specialized courses, especially for subject-areas underrepresented in ICPs.

Action 2: Encouragement of student mobility and financing of ERASMUS grants

This action provides direct financial aid to students carrying out a period of study in another participating country. The grants of maximum 5,000 ECU per student cover the mobility costs, i.e. travel, language preparation and differences in the cost of living. They are awarded only when certain conditions are fulfilled: full-time, between three months and a full aca-

demic year, full academic recognition, the host universities' waiving of tuition fees. Priority is given to students following courses in activities supported under Action I. Special attention is paid to the principle of equality between men and women and to the specific needs of disabled students. Each Member State receives at least 200,000 ECU. The grants are administered through a network of National Agencies (NGAAs).

Several actions in the other chapters can also qualify for ERASMUS support when they involve universities, their students or their staff.

The Commission adopted a report on the results of the SOCRATES programme on 14 March 1997[28]. The report covered the years 1995 and 1996. The great success of the programme brought the Commission to adopt a proposal on the same day to increase the programme's budget to 99 MECU. The following figures indicate the success of the Community action programmes:

- 316,000 students pursued a recognized period of study in one of the participating countries;
- 2,673 inter-university cooperation programmes were set up, involving 1,800 higher education institutions;
- 28 major thematic networks in the higher education sector were set up, each one with over 70 participating establishments;
- 600 transnational projects, involving 2,700 establishments, were implemented in the fields of ODL, adult education, intercultural education, language teaching, and initial and continuing training for teachers.

The European Union ECTS and Databases

The ERASMUS programme gave rise to intensive recognition arrangements, e.g., double degree and joint degree programmes. Within the Inter-university Co-operation Programmes (ICP), the rules for sending students abroad for study periods of three to twelve months required that the studies undertaken be fully recognized by the home institution after their successful completion. In the first years of the programme, however, this recognition was not always put into effect in the way intended, something that had been anticipated due to the general lack of tradition in the area of recognition of periods of studies- in spite of the conventions mentioned above.

In order to speed up the process of recognition of periods of study, a special pilot project for the recognition of studies within the ERASMUS programme was launched, the ECTS, the European Community Course Credit Transfer System (now shortened to European Credit

---

[28]   COM (97) 99 final

Transfer System). ECTS is a credit system whereby credits are allocated on the basis of sixty credits per full-time year workload of study, or thirty credits per semester, or twenty credits per trimester. All ECTS courses are part of the mainstream courses of participating institutions, as followed by home students under normal circumstances. All participating ECTS departments agree to break down the descriptions of their own courses into small units to facilitate the allocation of credits and to publicize them in information packages. Students in the scheme must receive full credit for all negotiated and approved work successfully completed.

ECTS has the potential to provide the basic regulatory framework and accounting system for credit transfer across Europe. It can act as an educational *euro currency* providing a common and linking different national educational systems. The user's guide that can also be viewed as a code of good practice gives broad guidelines that may develop into rules that institutions must follow if they wish to use the ECTS logo and to be listed as *approved institutions.* An ECTS Directory linked to the ORTELIUS database will provide information on all institutions and programmes using ECTS principles (Adam, 1996).

The recognition (or non-recognition) and under-evaluation of academic and professional qualifications is a very topical issue in Europe. The creation of a true single market based on freedom of movement rests partly on progress in recognition and the creation of "a single European educational area" (Adam, 1996). Although ECTS is designed primarily to facilitate academic recognition, it can also be useful for the professional area. There is a link to the Diploma Supplement mentioned above, but in the case of ECTS, the use of the transcript of record has spread very rapidly. The institutions concerned generally accept the transcript.

DATABASES

The European Union Database, ORTELIUS

For many years, the NARIC expressed a wish to have a European database on higher education in the member countries. In order to meet all the needs for this kind of information, the European Commission invited an Italian consortium to set up a database that was named ORTELIUS. Financial support from the Commission was given to this consortium for three years in order for it to complete the task. The database went into operation as of the end of 1996.

The criteria for information to be introduced into the database are that they must

- Permit the greatest level of mutual knowledge in order to facilitate mobility and co-operation;
- Respect the diversities but at the same time strive to find the lowest common denominators on which mutual communication can be based.

Six sets of information have been defined, taking into account the specific types of higher education offered in each country as well as the basic legal framework of the European Union:

- The European Union: laws, regulations, actions;
- The country and its higher education system;
- The town, the location of given higher education institutions;
- The higher education institutions in each town;
- The qualifications that are awarded and the relevant curricula;
- Course descriptions.

The database is founded on an integrated network system approach. Data are collected by national agencies, partners in the system in the member states. The collected information is then transmitted to the central database in Florence, Italy. The information is available on Internet on the basis of subscription or on CD-ROM.

Initially, each country uses the data transmission language it prefers while the guided menus for searches are in English. The objective is that the entire database should be available in the eleven European Union languages. ORTELIUS will be linked to other national and international databases in Europe, like TRACE, in order to avoid overlapping and to give users the added possibility of navigating among different but complimentary databases.

TRACE

The Higher Education Information System, TRACE (Trans Regional Academic Mobility and Credential Evaluation), affiliated with UNESCO, was formally established in 1989. It is an international network for collecting, processing, and standardizing information on higher education and professional training by means of the latest information technology.

As of October 1996, TRACE information is available on a CD-ROM, entitled World Academic Database along with data from the latest edition of the International handbook of Universities (14th edition, 1996) and the World List of Universities (20th edition, 1995). Institutions and national education ministries/authorities in 175 countries provide the information.

TRACE gives information on

- *Educational systems*: including the structures of education systems, admission requirements, requirements for the recognition of foreign credentials, international co-operation, student life and finances;

- *Institutions*: including general information, admissions, student life and finances, international co-operation, statistics, list of academic divisions;

- *Credentials*: including main field of study, credential name, level of study, type of institution.

The academic recognition of degrees is closely linked to the matter of recognition of universities as reputable partners for inter-university co-operation. Academic recognition is also linked to questions concerning the domestic recognition of private universities, to accreditation, and to quality assessment programmes, and it is therefore necessary for the NARIC/ENIC in all countries in the European Region to follow the development of higher education.

4.2 The Role of Higher Education Policy in Promoting China's Development

4.2.1 The Restructuring of Chinese Higher Education in the 1990's

China is still a developing country. "A poor country runs a big education" is a phrase frequently used to defend proposed education reform, but this phrase also indicates that the reform and development of Chinese higher education is destined to face dual squeezing and challenges. On the one hand, it must meet the needs of national development; on the other hand, it must face the challenges of world development, and it is expected to help the nation take a better position in world competition. Under such a situation, it is particularly important to develop a new and effective administrative and management system. To be specific, how to define the activities of educational governance and the coordinating institutions, and how to articulate the relations between them will be the most important and urgent issue for the further development of the restructuring of Chinese higher education.

The restructuring of Chinese higher education in the 1990s was arguably initiated by the official document: *Decision on the Reform of China's Educational Structure* (CPC, 1985), promoted by another document: *Guideline of China's Education Reform and Development* (CPC & State Council, 1993), and further advanced by *Action Scheme for Invigorating Education Towards the 21st Century* (Ministry of Education, 1998). The former document acknowledged

the problems of the higher education system and initiated a change from the tight controls and all-embracing responsibility of government on higher education based on planned economy. It decided to increase the autonomy of universities, so that universities could play a more active role in the development of economy and society. For that purpose, it took the initiative to introduce market forces into the higher education sector, such as the proposition to reform enrollment, planning, and employment of graduates, the recruitment of a certain number of privately financed and commissioned training (enterprise-sponsored) students. In addition, the ministry has played an active and decisive role in educational reform. One major change in governance has been the introduction of the "two-level education provision system", in which the central government (Minister of Education) shares responsibility for educational governance with local governments (provincial bureaus of education). The provincial bureaus of education have been assigned greater responsibilities and now directly administer most common universities and colleges.

The establishment of market economy and policy approaches

The political and economic reform was subsequently furthered. In 1992, the 14th national congress of the Chinese Communist Party (CPC) made it clear that the establishment of a socialist market economy was the objective of economic reforms. This is an ideological as well as theoretical breakthrough in China's political and economic life.

The establishment of China's socialist market economy requires further reform of the policies and systems based on planned economy; it also requires a breakthrough of the reforms of Chinese higher education system initiated by the *Decision*. Under this situation, the government in 1993 promulgated the *Guideline of China's Education Reform and Development*. This programme, as an endorsement of many reform issues enacted and experimentally carried out in the 1980s, further related education directly to China's economic modernization within the context of a very competitive world economy. This document highlighted China's strategies on development, which include the belief that education and science are of great importance to its catching up with the most developed countries in the world. To achieve this goal, it determined to accelerate the restructuring of the education system in higher education, with the reform of the administrative system as the focus of content. The reform of the administrative system was on the government agenda early in 1992. After that, four special meetings on the reform of the administrative system were held, in 1994 in Shanghai, in 1995 in Nanchang, in 1996 in Beidaihe, and in 1998 in Yanzhou. The guiding principles of restructuring (joint provision, adjustment, cooperation and amalgamation) were summarized and proposed by Vice-Premier Minister Li Lanqing at the Yanzhou meeting, and scaffold the schemes, principles and measures of the restructuring as follows:

- Decentralization. The change of the state full provision of higher education, the encouragement of local government and social community provision; the emphasis on the macro-coordination and macro-control of the government's administrative power over higher education;

- Devolution. The establishment of a two-level administering system, with the local (provincial) government as the main body of the administering of higher education; the empowerment of the local government in educational decision making and planning; the increasing of the autonomy of universities;

- Injection of market forces and incentives. The initiation of user pays in higher education; changes in enrollment and job assignment for graduates; the reform of the funding allocation mechanism; renewed selection of elite institutions (the implementation of "211" Project).

The emergence of knowledge-based economy and policy approaches

The *Guideline of China's Education Reform and Development* (1993) has set the blueprint for the reform and development of China's education system with its main concern relating to higher education. Its objective is mainly to establish a new higher education system that is adaptive to and helps to promote the establishment of a socialist market economy. *The Action Scheme for Invigorating Education Towards the 21st Century*, formulated by the Ministry of Education on 24 December 1998 (transferred by the State Council on 13 January 1999), however, has further worked out the acting, planning and set-up of the main objectives of the reform and development of China's education, particularly higher education, as a response to the proposal for building China's own innovation system to face the era of knowledge-based economy, and as a way of implementing the national development strategy of "making China prosperous through science and education" in the education sector.

In May 1995, at the National Conference of Science and Technology, President Jiang Zemin first put forward "making China prosperous through science and education" as a national strategy of development. From then on, promoting economic development and social progress by mainly relying on science, technology and education has become the focus of national policies and strategies of development. In March 1998, when Zhu Rongji took the position of Premier Minister, he announced that "prosper China through science and education" is the most important task of his government. On 4 May 1998, at the ceremony of the 100 years anniversary of Beijing University, President Jiang Zemin briefly summarized the cross-century epochal characteristics in his speech, that "at the present world, science and technology is making remarkable progress, knowledge-based economy is starting to emerge, the competition of national power is becoming more and more fierce". With this understanding, he calls the whole party (CPC) and whole society to pay great attention to the great role of knowledge innovation and the tapping of intellectual resources in the promotion of economic develop-

ment and social progress, so that prospering China through science and education really becomes the widely shared consensus and the real practice of the nation.

Inspired by the Chinese leaders' aspirations, the notion of "knowledge-based economy" and "innovation" became the hot topic of discussion and caught the attention of the whole of society. As part of the national innovation system, the *Action Scheme for Invigorating Education Towards the 21st Century* (Ministry of Education, 1998) formulated 12 main tasks as the means to implement the national strategy of development in the education sector. In this *Action Scheme*, the importance of higher education is well acknowledged. Among the 12 main tasks, more than half of them are directly aimed at higher education, such as:

- The implementation of the "high level innovative talents project". Advertising for excellent talent from both home and abroad by offering high salaries and providing special financial support and working conditions;
- Continuing and facilitating the implementation of "211 project" and its related plans. Announced in 1993, its purpose is to identify for the 21st century 100 institutions and a number of disciplines of "world standard" by preferential treatment;
- The establishment of a number of world-class universities (about 10) and disciplines;
- The implementation of the project for the industrialization of new high technology in higher education institutions. The purpose is to enhance the relationship between teaching, research and production (economy), and to encourage the cooperation between higher education institutions and industries as well as research institutes;
- Actively and steadily developing higher education by carrying out the *Higher Education Law;*
- Enhancing the political and spiritual works in higher education institutions.

It is important to note here that the main points of the *Guideline of China's Education Reform* (1993) and the *Action Scheme for Invigorating Education Towards the 21st Century* (1998) are legislated in the *Higher Education Law* (passed on 29 August 1998, in effect from 1 September 1999). The *Higher Education Law* is the first law in relation to higher education in China and it marks the beginning of the institutionalization of the administration and management of Chinese higher education.

The guiding ideology and principles of restructuring in 1990s

Traditionally, Chinese higher education system was established in accordance with the then highly centralized planning economy with the features that state maintained the control of higher education, and took full responsibility for the provision of higher education and the employment of graduates. In terms of governance, the central government departments and

local authorities, with little coordination, following the "vertical" and "horizontal" patterns of general public administration, directly administered higher education. This kind of system has caused many problems, such as the departmentalization of higher education institutions, the unreasonable distribution and resources allocation, the duplication of the provision and the dominance of mono-disciplinary institutes, etc. The restructuring of the higher education system in the 1990s is directly aimed at this kind of out-of-date system and is carried out mainly with regard to two aspects: the innovation of regulation and the diversity of provision.

The overall guiding principle of regulation innovation is to rationalize the relationship between government, civil society, market and schools, to clarify the responsibilities of the central government, and to optimize the allocation of educational resources so as to promote the sustainable, healthy and stable development of higher education.

Chinese government has deliberately speeded up the development of higher education, it is expected that the enrollment rate will reach 15% by 2010 (Ministry of Education, 1999). In that case, depending only on the State and public higher education is obviously not enough, so non-state sectors including non-government enterprises, private individuals and local communities shall be encouraged and supported to run schools. A favorable social environment shall be formed for the rising of private education institutions, which in turn will help to promote the development of mass and universal higher education. The *Guideline of China's Education Reform and Development* in 1993 proposed the guiding principle for privately run (or *minban*) higher education as "encouraging, support, right guiding and enhanced administering". Inspired by this principle, private higher education has been undergoing rapid development, particularly in China's big cities (Mok & Chan, 1998). But in general, private higher education is still strictly controlled by the State. For instance, the *Regulations on Social Forces running Schools* promulgated by the SEdC in 1997 clearly states that the State shall strictly control the higher education organization run by social forces (item 5). For a long time, on the other hand, there has been a directed thinking and behaving pattern among Chinese officials and common people that the public is high valued, the private is lowly valued, the officials are high valued, common people lowly valued. Such a tradition and reality indicate that private higher education, on the one hand, has indeed become more popular in the PRC, but on the other hand, its development is likely to play only a very limited peripheral role. The mainstream still lies with schools run by the public sector (Hayhoe, 1996, pp. 225—226). The strength and the supplementary role of private higher education is unbearable in competition with public institutions, and private higher education in the short term cannot have much of a prospect of development. However, one thing is certain that the newly emerging private higher education has posed a challenge to the traditional system, and as the state progressively rolls back from the frontier of social provision, private higher education will become

more of an initiative and occupy a certain place in higher education. Without the diversity of provision, mass higher education is impossible.

The current restructuring is being conducted under the guiding principle of "joint provision, adjustment, cooperation and amalgamation" and as well as the strategy of "making China prosperous and powerful through education and science". It is being carried out in two phases: the first phase focuses on the universities, particularly the key universities, affiliated to the departments or ministries of the government, to make them jointly provided for, and managed by central and local government. This phase is being realized by the implementation of the "211 Project". Announced in 1993, the purpose of the "211 Project" is to identify for the 21st century 100 institutions of "world standard". To facilitate this move, the state has adopted preferential treatment and put aside a sum of incentive money, for instance, starting in 1995, the identified "211 Schools" each received 35 million Yuan for development. The renewed selection of elite institutions caused competition among institutions as well as local communities. Effects include the merger of prestigious institutions to increase their competition capacity, and increased local investment. The second phase will transfer all the universities to the Ministry of Education or local government, except those few particularly approved by the government, so that the provision of higher education is appropriately distributed in regional and local communities, to be of service to regional economic development. The purpose here is to rationalize the management system of higher education, and meanwhile, to build about 10 world-class universities in China, by intensive state and private investment, as a way of increasing the comprehensive competition of the state in the sciences and world economy.

In terms of the number of higher education institutions, it is expected that after the restructuring it will be reduced from the present over 2100 to about 1600 (including regular, adult higher education institutions and advanced professional training institutes). Among them, the number of regular higher education institutions will be reduced from over 1000 to about 600. The university that will be directly administered by the education administrative department, the Ministry of Education, and financially supported by the State will be increased from 36 to about 110.

4.2.2 The Main Reforms of Higher Education in China

Changes on the ideas of education

In the past, college education was supposed to teach students professional knowledge, to prepare them for certain occupations. It was quite common that science students knew very little

about the humanities; likewise, humanity students were almost technologically illiterate. In other words, the range of their knowledge was rather narrow, which inevitably limited students' thinking and restricted their future development. Now most Chinese educators have reached a consensus that development-oriented education should replace knowledge-and-technology-based education in higher education. Influenced by this educational idea, college curriculum is designed quite differently, aiming at improving students' overall competence. Optional courses occupy a larger proportion in school courses. Students of science departments can take courses on the humanities and *vice versa*. In some schools, optional courses are considered so important that students cannot graduate if they have failed to earn enough credits from non-compulsory courses. What is worth mentioning is that the Chinese traditional culture, its history and geography, are emphasized in cultural competence-oriented education. It is believed that the knowledge in these areas may help students form good character and foster their patriotism. To some extent, cultural competence-oriented education has readjusted the students' knowledge structure, training them into talents with multiple skills and with higher competence.

The implementation of cultural competence-oriented education is just a trial in higher education in China. Like other new things, it will inevitably meet some pros and cons, experience ups and downs. Yet it is certain that competence education and cultural competence-oriented education will bring education in China up to a new stage.

Reform on financing of higher education

Higher education in China has grown vigorously over the last two decades (Min, 1991; World Bank, 1997). As in other developing countries, one of the main themes of Chinese higher education reforms has been the finance of universites. Sheehan (1987) states that the financing of higher education can be seen in the context of public policy goals for higher education, and the changing structure of society and the economy. During the rapid expansion from 1978 until 1988 the total number of higher education institutions rose from 598 in 1978 to 1075 in 1988. Along with the fast growth and development, the Chinese higher education system has also faced increasing financial constraints (Min, 1991). Inconsistency of system expansion with the cost-effectiveness of the system has not only caused low internal efficiency, but also led to low external efficiency. Students prepared by such a system often find themselves lacking adaptability to the constantly changing social, economic and technological enviroment.

Unlike higher education systems in other countries, colleges and universities in China did not charge their students tuition fees and they were responsible for assigning jobs to students upon their graduation. As students did not pay for their education, some of them did not cherish the learning opportunity. There was no competition among students, since everyone

was guaranteed a job no matter how he or she did in his or her studies. Furthermore, this system resulted in a severe deficiency in the education budget, which surely hindered the further development of higher education. According to the new system, those who benefit from higher education should pay for it; in other words, students have to pay for their tuition. Those who cannot afford the tuition fees can get a loan from the banks. In terms of students' future employment, schools no longer promise to find jobs for them; instead, students are introduced to the labor market.

After 1992, system expansion was replaced by system adjustment and improvement. Given the financing constraints on higher education in China, the central government and the State Education Commission, the major policymaking and planning organization for the Chinese higher education system, have launched several reforms to improve the administrative system and reconfigure the structure of Chinese higher education (MOE, 1985). These reform strategies and policies started with system change rather than piecemeal solutions.

Ever since the implementation of the new system, many universities and colleges have taken a new look: students, now with greater pressure, study more diligently, schools are equipped with better teaching facilities, and teachers work harder.

With the expansion of enrollments, declining funding from central government, increasing demand for greater quality and efficiency, and ascendance of market orientations and solutions, a new mechanism of administration and financing has emerged to adapt Chinese colleges and universities to change.

Reform of diversification of school ownership

One of the most noticeable changes in China's education is the existence of diversified school ownership, with public schools co-existing with private schools. With the encouragement and support of the government, non-public schools are mushrooming rapidly throughout China (Yang, 2002).

There are several reasons behind the growth of private schools. First of all, the existing public higher institutions cannot meet people's needs. Though, in the last two years, the number of students admitted to colleges and universities has increased, many secondary graduates with fairly good academic abilities are still rejected by the colleges. The second reason is the increasing demand and severe competition of the labor market. Nowadays, without higher education certificates it is very difficult for people to find white-collar jobs. Higher educational background has become one of the most important passports to the job market. These circumstances have stimulated the development of civilian-run higher institutions. Besides, there is also an economic reason. It is believed that the expansion of education can stimulate civilian expenditure and attract more civilian investment in this sector.

The establishment and success of private schools has produced positive effects in the following aspects: First, it alleviates both the central and local governments' efforts to invest more money in education, especially in higher education, yet it still can hardly satisfy people's increasing needs. The fact that China is a developing country with a big population makes it almost impossible for the government to increase its education budget. With the participation of civilians in education, the government's financial pressure has been lessened. Second, private schools offer more educational opportunities for secondary school graduates. It can be said, to a certain degree, that the existence of private higher educational institutions has shortened the gap between supply and demand for education. Third, the development of private schools can also bring about positive effects for China's economy since the development of education can stimulate civilian expenditure.

4.3   Comparison and Analysis

Different emphasis and solutions

Diversity is an abiding characteristic of the European Union and one that it aims to preserve and promote. More than 100000 EU citizens benefit each year from educational exchange programmes that foster an understanding of different cultures. First-hand experience of other cultures and work environments motivates young people to take an active interest in the meaning of citizenship. Educational and training qualifications recognized across the EU facilitate mobility. The need to ensure mobility of students and teachers/researchers is crucial to future cooperation in European higher education. Therefore, the EU initiative is not aimed at standardizing national education policies or imposing a "European timetable" on the member states. By its activities, the Community would like to give the various education policies of the member countries a community dimension. There are no aspirations toward a centralized policy; "Unity in Diversity" is the objective.

The emphasis of the EU is trying to use higher education programmes, which could promote the integration and provide greater mobility of the member states. Starting with education, doors have been thrown open following the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty. The European Union has reformed its education policy, reorganized the programs, and expanded the opportunities of promotion geographically. Mobility of students and teachers will remain the cornerstone of European academic co-operation. The programmes of the European Commission such as ERASMUS, SOCRATES, LEONARDO, TEMPUS and other have shaped the way in which internationalization was defined in most European universities. Of a number of sub-programmes under the Socrates umbrella, Erasmus is the oldest and probably

the best known. It has more than 100 million Euros annually available for grants for students and teachers to spend time at universities in other countries. Two thousand universities participate in the programme. By the end of 2002, more than one million students had studied at another university thanks to Erasmus. By 2007, that figure should be two million and by 2010 three million. The efforts of Lingua are complemented by language-oriented projects within other programmes. The European Commission would like to see language learning accorded an even higher priority through a Language Action Programme. Through the EU's own funding and the efforts of the member states, the Commission hopes to see 'mother tongue + two languages' become the norm for all EU citizens (EU Education, Training and Youth, Website).

Mobility of people is as important as mobility of goods, capital, and services, and students and university teachers represent the "goods, capital, and services" of higher education. Over the years, the EU educational and training programmes in its various forms have no doubt had a strong impact on the European activities of the universities. The students have, with interest and enthusiasm, involved themselves in the various activities and cooperation across the EU borders. The programmes have offered both structure and contents to European co-operation and, in return, positively paved the way for international cooperation outside Europe—particularly in terms of student mobility. However, it should be born in mind that mobility of students, trainees and young researchers will only be successful if sufficient recognition and accreditation measures are taken. Academic co-operation on programme structures, modules and credit point systems is also needed to ensure that non-mobile students can benefit from academic networking.

What was common to all of these programmes was their voluntaristic nature, which necessitated a big deal of enthusiasm, devotion and pioneering work. This energy born out of good will and conviction characterized internationalization in many European universities in the past two decades. It disregarded however that these European mobility and cooperation projects in fact were a kind of substitute and even an 'excuse' for the absence of real competencies in educational policy at European level. European nation states always have opposed the transfer of significant competencies in the field of educational policy towards supra-national levels. The European Union does not have important competencies in higher education policy—limited to two articles in the Amsterdam Treaty—and has been forced to develop a 'European dimension' in higher education by means of mobility and co-operation programmes. These programmes are very important instruments in shaping a common European approach to higher education, but thus far did only have a marginal impact on higher education structures, diploma systems, curricula, etc.

The emphasis of China is trying to reform higher education to adapt to the market economy. As a developing country of great importance, China is expected to modernize agriculture and industry, make advances in high technology that help to promote the national economy,

and secure the development of society. Universities are needed not only to train creative high quality personnel and bring scientific achievements to a high level, but also to create new technology, to translate knowledge into productivity and finally, to enable the development of both the economy and society.

It is evident that the number of students recruited by China's institutions of higher learning has repeatedly increased in recent years, but in 1995 the enrollment rate of eighteen to twenty year olds was a mere 6.5 percent (China Education Statistical Yearbook, 1996). Moreover, the development of higher education is a gradual process; even when the social economy experiences great development, higher education should develop at an appropriate pace and must not forge blindly ahead. After all, the development of institutions of higher learning must be consistent with social and economic development, on the one hand, and, on the other, must have a corresponding contingent of qualified college and university teachers. It is true that China's economy is making considerable advances today, but the construction of a corresponding contingent of college and university teachers have yet to reach the requisite level. Moreover, China has a weak economic foundation and a large population, and its economic development is unbalanced. As with the entire education system, higher education also faces the problem of a serious lack of funds. This situation, to a large extent, restricts its development and indirectly influences the potential development power of the national economy, especially for China. In consideration of the country's need for all-round development, China cannot throw all its energies into education. Thus the development of higher education will require time, whereas opportunities for young people to acquire a higher education will gradually increase in a corresponding manner.

It is well known that the EU and China have basically different patterns of political, social and economic organization. The functions of higher education in any country are shaped by the natures of its particular society, by its cultural heritage and its political, economic and social institution. With their differing political systems, economic situations and cultural traditions, EU and China will be faced with a variety of problems and challenges accordingly. Therefore, the emphasis and solutions to basically similar problems had been sought in widely different institutional models.

Similar relationship between HEP and development of the EU and China

However, we could discover similar relationship between higher education policy and development of the EU and China from this study. The underlying reasons of this similar relationship lie on the emphasis of the importance of higher education and human capital for political, economic and social development.

Universities educate future leaders and develop the high-level technical capacities that underpin economic growth. Institutions of higher education have the main responsibility for equipping individuals with the advanced knowledge and skills required for positions of responsibility in government, business, and the professions. These institutions produce new knowledge through research, serve as conduits for the transfer, adaptation, and dissemination of knowledge generated elsewhere in the world, and support government and business with advice and consultancy services. In both the EU member states and China, higher education institutions also play important social roles by forging the national identity of the country and offering a forum for pluralistic debate. The development of higher education is correlated with economic development: enrollment ratios in higher education average 51 percent in the countries that belong to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), compared with 21 percent in middle-income countries and 6 percent in low-income countries. Estimated social rates of return of 10 percent or more in many developing countries also indicate that investments in higher education contribute to increases in labor productivity and to higher long-term economic growth, which are essential for poverty alleviation (The World Bank "Higher Education", 1994). Higher education, which originally has an important task to combine teaching and research and disseminate knowledge and information, now will play a more important role at the age of knowledge-based economy than any other time in the history.

It is well known that the human factor in the progress of industrial production, science and technology has a more mental than physical aspect, especially in skilled applications of scientific knowledge. A wide-ranging public application of scientific knowledge is made possible only by education, which in turn is made possible by the support of the public and the government. This is particularly true of higher education. In the modern world, it is the cross-fertilization or integration of science and technology, economy, and education that have determined the level of an organization and a nation's development. In a nutshell, the integration of science and technology, economy, and education has been the dominating trend on a global scale. Meanwhile, this trend has led to fundamental reforms in education systems, curriculum structures, content of courses, and methods of teaching. The continual cycle of restructuring and reform and its results has been enhancing organizational and national economic efficiency and social benefits.

Today, society has already entered what is known as a "knowledge-based economy". Higher education must have direct links with the development level of the productive forces. With the rapid development of science and technology, economic growth will depend more and more upon the application and new innovations of science and highly trained personnel. The development of higher education will directly relate to the development of the national economy and social construction. Because of the important role (function) of higher education to the growth of the economy—to guarantee the objectives of development of the na-

tional economy—the higher education system must develop comparatively quickly. Both the EU and China have made use of higher education policy as a helpful tool to develop European integration and Chinese socialist market economy.

Increasingly recognizing looking on the important relationship between the human capital and higher education in the EU policy objectives, the EU has made use of higher education as a tool to promote its integration. Although there were different EU action programmes in the field of higher education, we could find various programmes and actions have certain characteristics in common. They are transnational, in most cases multilateral (involving at least three participating countries). We could also find that the grants for mobility and exchange of the students and teachers/researchers are the main themes. It shows that the Community would like to promote and develop the European dimension in teaching and learning. In the future there might be name changes or programmes merger to some degree, it is difficult to forecast but we know it exactly that the main idea of the programmes won't be changed. These programmes and actions has greatly promoted the cooperation between the member states in the field of higher education and contributed to the building of Single Market and more political and economic integration.

Like many other countries, the goals of Chinese higher education policy are framed with the following understanding:

- Higher education is viewed as a significant contributor to macro-economic reform and future economic prosperity;
- Higher education can help to achieve the restructuring of economy by providing more highly educated and skilled workforce;
- The development of knowledge-based economy led by new high technologies requires education, particular higher education, to provide critical human resources and intellectual support;
- Higher education as an important part of the national innovation system shall confirm with national priorities;
- The strategic importance of higher education stresses the need for improved efficiency within higher education, particularly with regard to management structures and the use of resources.

The gist is that education, particularly higher education, should wholly support national economic development and the progress of science and technology by providing all kinds of human resources and knowledge contribution.

Compared with the EU, China has different solutions and programmes due to its own historical background and educational development. Project 211 and the EU programmes are used for seeking answers to the different regional and national problems but same emerging global challenges. Through restructuring higher educational institutions, reforming the

finance of higher education and renewing the ideas of education, consequential results can be seen in many respects in China. However, there are at least three problems in higher education reform.

The first problem is the paradox in policy thinking, which is manifested by the disparities of the policy intention and the measures being taken in the process of reform. A look at the *Guideline of China's Education Reform* shows that Chinese higher education policy is being driven by many market-related notions: management efficiency and strong executive leadership, unit-cost effectiveness, institutional responsiveness to social-economic demands, effective utilization of resources, the tendency of decentralization and devolution, the introduction of user-pays principles, etc. Unfortunately, the measures being taken do not conform well with the above policy intention; for instance, the direct intervention from the government in the process of the selection of "211 universities" and the institutional reorganization, the deliberate hierarchical structure of higher education institutions, and the strategy of unbalanced development. A direct result is the problem of divisions: the elite versus the non-elite institutions, and regular versus irregular higher education. The institutions are not located on an equal base for competition. When the prestige of a university is not achieved through competing with others on an equal base, rather through the favorable treatment from the government, the imitation of the accepted disciplines, of the "solidly established standards", how can a decentralized competitive system be established in the university system? Without a mechanism of competition, from where does the motivation of innovation come? Besides, the hierarchic structure of the universities seems to limit their adaptability to their varied functions.

Secondly, the overwhelming policy emphasis on higher education as an instrument of economic success tends to ignore the discourse of the ideas of modern university (see Peters, 1999, for a detail discussion). There are two side negative effects of this policy emphasis. One is that it downgrades the tasks of teaching and basic research, with great emphasis on short-term considerations, and the change of university as a social institution to university as a market-oriented enterprise (Bai, 1998). Another is a tendency, in shifting the university as an affiliation of politics to an affiliation of economics (or more exactly from an affiliation of planned economy to an affiliation of market economy), that not much consideration is given to the autonomy of the university (Li, 1998).

Thirdly, there is a lack of consideration of the problems in the process of the amalgamation of higher education institutions. When the process is initiated and pushed by the government from the top, sufficient consideration may not given to the existing conditions and factors which have restricted the development. The core problems of the merger and amalgamation have been summarized as "name", "position", "money" and "historical affection complex". "Name" is about the worry of losing the name or very identity of an institute. "Position" or power sharing concerns the losing of privileges or vested interests of both the leaders in posi-

tion and common teachers. In terms of money, it is the concern of income reduction. Because of the difference in capacity or nature of the institutes, some may obtain more income and become richer, others may not be able to do so and become poorer. As brand is very important to a university, it is the result of many years of hard work, staff members of the institute may have contributed painstaking labor for it. Once it is lost, they may have a sense of loss and affection disturbance.

Chinese policy makers should give attention to the role of higher education in promoting European integration, a topic that may have special relevance in China, given the huge size of the country and the diversity of different regions. In 1999, the President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, expressed an ambition to restore the premier position in the world of Europe as a destination for overseas study, a position that it lost to the United States. His view is that, like the worldwide attractiveness of the very diverse cultural landscape of Europe, the diversity of higher education should make Europe an attractive place to study. He underlined that Europe should not always try to enhance its competitive position by copying American models and policies, but rather by promoting the richness of the diversity of its higher education systems and institutions. Faced with common global challenges, it is necessary for China to continue to reform higher education deeply and learn much more ideas from the developed EU countries.

Chapter 5

Higher Education Policies of the EU and China Towards the New 21st Century

The conference on world higher education held in Paris in 1998 presented a clear classification of the challenges facing higher education in the world in the 21st century: directionality, quality and internationalization. "Because of the universality of knowledge, knowledge can only be deepened, developed and spread with the joint efforts of international academic organizations. This means the academic environment, schools and student organizations have deep-rooted international characteristics. The internationalization of higher education is the goal of all academic institutions in the world". Structures that facilitate the exchange of ideas, students and faculty are gaining in popularity. "Above all, internationalization can no longer be an appendage to the university but must be built into the core of its being" (Allaway, 1991). How to plan the policy of higher education and organize the structure and content of curriculum towards new century is a new task for the EU and China policy-makers. The emphasis in this part will be put on the future policies of higher education between the EU and China.

5.1   Globalization and Internationalization: a Challenge for Higher Education

In principle, internationalization is as old as the universities themselves. Universities have nearly always had links and contacts that reached well beyond the nation in which they were located. Knowledge is universal, and international contacts and collaboration have always been basic characteristics of university life. What is new is the introduction of the concept of 'internationalization' as a common denominator for activities based on strategic decisions to establish relations with institutions in other countries or regions of the world.

This internationalization of higher education is a response to a number of long-term developments taking place in our society, particularly its so-called 'globalization'. Driven by economic and technological developments, this globalization of knowledge, capital, workforce

and markets rests on the pillars of the new information technology and on an enormous accumulation of globally available knowledge. Institutes of higher education play a crucial role in generating and transferring high-grade knowledge. Such institutes have therefore become of great significance to the economies of the countries in which they are located.

Globalization is sometimes used interchangeably with internationalization, although both the definitions and the differences between the two terms are unclear. According to Knight's (1997) assertion, "[g]lobalisation can be thought of as the catalyst while internationalization is the response, albeit a response in a proactive way" (p. 6). In addition, Levin (2001) regards internationalization as one set of behaviors influenced by globalizing processes. These processes include not only political and economic globalization but also social and cultural, including educational globalization. Based on these assertions, globalization refers to no single or simple phenomenon, but to a world system incorporated with multi-phenomena such as political, economic, social, cultural, and technological forces (Dudley, 1998; Edwards & Usher, 2000; Marginson, 2002; Held, et al., 1999). On the other hand, internationalization may be understood as a response to the impact of globalization or a set of behaviors influenced by globalization processes (Knight, 1997; Levin, 2001).

Altbach (2004) sees globalization as the broad economic, technological, and scientific trends that directly affect higher education and are largely inevitable. Politics and culture are also part of the new global realities. Academic systems and institutions may accommodate these developments in different ways, but they cannot ignore them. These phenomena include information technology in its various manifestations, the use of a common language for scientific communication, and the imperatives of both mass demand for higher education (massification) and societal needs for highly educated personnel. Academe is affected by, for example, patterns in the ownership of multinational publishing and Internet companies, the expenditure of R & D (Research and Development) funds worldwide, and international patterns of cultural diffusion. All of these elements, and many more, are parts of a global environment that impacts higher education in different ways.

At the beginning of this new century, global innovations and social development are bringing about great and even revolutionary changes in the politics, the economy, the social systems, science and technology, and educational systems of the world. Internationalization has become a irreversible trends in contemporary social life. The internationalization of higher education has become critical to educational success of a country.

Internationalization includes specific policies and programs undertaken by governments, academic systems and institutions, and even individual departments or institutions to cope with or exploit globalization. Internationalization describes the voluntary and perhaps creative ways of coping. With much room for initiative, institutions and governments, can choose the ways in which they deal with the new environment. While the forces of globalization cannot be held completely at bay, it is not inevitable that countries or institutions will necessar-

ily be overwhelmed by them or that the terms of the encounter must be dictated from afar. Internationalization accommodates a significant degree of autonomy and initiative (Knight, 1997; Scott, 1998; De Wit, 2002).

The world of globalized higher education is highly unequal. Western industrialized nations, and the domination of English creates advantages for the countries that use English as the medium of instruction and research. All this means that the developing countries find themselves dependent on the major academic superpowers. The powerful universities have always dominated the production and distribution of knowledge, while weaker institutions and systems with fewer resources and lower academic standards have tended to follow in their wake. While the Internet and other manifestations of globalization are heralded as bringing knowledge equality to the world, the evidence is mixed. In some ways, globalization opens access and makes it easier for students and scholars to study and work anywhere. But in many respects, existing inequalities are only reinforced and new barriers erected.

Globalization affects many sectors of society. Higher education is no exception. Universities worldwide respond to challenges presented by globalization in various ways. In the new 21st century, countries throughout the world have become increasingly international in character. Systems of government and higher education are searching for ways to prepare their citizens with the necessary skills for a more competitive and international community/marketplace. In the sphere of higher education, postsecondary institutions are faced with the challenge of responding to the internationalization of knowledge that has already taken place and continues to expand as the barriers between different nations diminish. Universities and colleges are expressing the desire to create new educational structures and methods that reflect the new truly global environment.

Higher education has entered into a period of rapid, even revolutionary change. The system is becoming far more competitive. Policy makers are arguing for less dependence on regulation, more use of market forces as well as greater accountability. The nature of teaching and learning is increasingly transformed by digital technology. New providers—in the form of virtual institutions, for profit spin-offs of traditional institutions, corporate universities, for-profit degree- granting operations, and more—are expanding the choices available to students. Institutions all over the world—public and private—are under pressure to seek alternative funding sources and create new revenue streams. A number of institutions are positioning themselves as global entities, establishing branch campuses around the world and joining global partnerships. These changes, taken together, are creating a system wherein the capacity of institutions to compete in the new higher education marketplace, by being responsive, entrepreneurial, and flexible, is of critical importance to their survival.

The impact of the new competition, the increasing use of digital technology, and the changing nature of society make this a time of great promise, *if* policy makers and academic leaders respond to the opportunities. But there are grave dangers as well. The likelihood that

market forces by themselves will bring improved service to society is hardly a sure thing. Whether higher education gains the advantages of market forces or not depends on the policies chosen in the immediate future.

While De Wit (2002) argues that there have always been international elements in higher education, dating back to the medieval roots of the university, internationalization has not been the primary goal of academe. In Europe, the major emphasis on internationalization came with the advent of the European Union and the recognized need to provide a higher education system that would not only promote mobility from country to country, but also build a sense of European consciousness among students. De Wit argues that the imperatives of the market are now driving internationalization trends worldwide. Universities and academic systems seek to make themselves attractive to overseas students and to build links with universities in other countries to enhance their global reach. This often means teaching in English in addition to the national language, developing the means to market higher education programs effectively, treating intellectual property as a commodity, and adopting strategies of profit-driven corporations.

There has been a wide-scale global effort to internationalize systems of higher education. The push for an increased international character to curriculum, students, faculty, and information points to the trend of an increasingly international world—one in which the barriers to communication have been cut down by technology. However, as nations throughout the world seek bi-lateral and multi-lateral agreements with one another the issue is no longer how to become global in character but rather how to maintain one's unique culture in the face of the ever-extending wave of internationalism.

5.2   Higher Education Policies in the EU towards the New 21st Century

What could, then, happen in the future in the EU? Based on the integration of economy, polity and currency, the EU has envisaged the challenges of new information society and recommend to the Member States so much more policies and measures. Universities must cater for new needs in education and training that stem from the knowledge-based economy and society. These include an increasing need for scientific and technical education, horizontal skills, and opportunities for lifelong learning, which require greater permeability between the components and the levels of the education and training systems (COM (2003) 58 final). Recommendation on Quality in Higher Education, which was adopted by the Council on September 24, 1998, envisages the introduction of quality assurance methods in higher education and the promotion of European cooperation in this field. A "European Quality Assurance Network" of bodies responsible for quality assessment and quality assurance has been set up. The Commission has produced, in October 1999, a guide that aims to help local authorities to set

up a "Second Chance School". This guide presents the different steps to be taken when setting up such a school and addresses both methodological questions such as "Which local partners should I mobilise to support my project" or "Which qualifications should my teachers have" as well as very practical issues such as the legal status, the funding or indeed the building of the school. The *Agenda 2000* proposals see the Union rising to the challenge: innovation, research, education and training are to become core axes of internal policy. The primary aim of education is the development of human potential, of the whole person, enabling all citizens to participate as fully as possible in cultural, economic, political and social life.

The Commission wrote a *White Paper* entitled "Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society" (CEC, 1995) in 1995. The paper suggested a response in the field of education to changes arising from the impact of technology and internationalization. In order to improve workforce skills, the European community should enhance its knowledge and the learning of skills through education, vocational training and apprenticeship programs. The Commission also established the *Socrates* Program aimed at enlarging the European community through increased mobility in the sphere of education, for both individual students and faculty members, through financial aid and on a larger scale through the promotion of collaboration between universities. ECTS promotes study abroad by improving the means of transferring academic credit between different institutions a student attends. Thus institutions are able to compare and measure learner outcomes (European Union Online, read 10 Dec. 2001).

In 1996, the Commission adopted a plan of action to introduce information technology to schools throughout the EU. The Commission also wrote a *Green Paper* entitled, *"The Green Paper on Obstacles to Transnational Mobility"* (COM (96) 462), that proposed methods for eliminating impediments on all levels.

In 1998, The Council of the European Union recommended to Member States that they establish transparent quality-assessment and quality-assurance systems in the field of higher education. The aim is to safeguard and improve the quality of higher education while taking due account of national conditions, the European dimension and international requirements[1].

In 1999, following a proposal from the Commission, the Council adopted the promotion of European pathways for work- linked training through *Europass Training.* Periods of training in any member state are recognized. The Commission also adopted *eEurope* in an attempt to "usher in the digital age and encourage increased use of the Internet in schools and universities to allow young people access to the information society." At the Helsinki European Council, the EU decided to extend their focus to lifelong learning.

As higher education and training are regarded as key areas in the process of economic and social reform, in order to promote the development of higher education systems for the eli-

---

[1]   Council Recommendations (EC) No 561/98

gible countries by cooperating with partners in all Community Member States in as balanced a manner as possible, the European Community launched the third phase of the trans-European cooperation scheme for higher education (Tempus III)[2]. The Tempus III programme, which was initially intended only for the countries of central and eastern Europe, the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union and Mongolia, and beneficiaries of the PHARE and TACIS programmes, now also covers many other countries.

5.2.1 Enhancing the Transparency and Competitiveness of European Higher Education

European universities are characterized by a high degree of heterogeneity, which is reflected in organization, governance and operating conditions, including the status and conditions of employment and recruitment of teaching staff and researchers. There are some 3 300 higher education establishments in the European Union and approximately 4 000 in Europe as a whole, including the other countries of Western Europe and the candidate countries. They take in an increasing number of students, over 12.5 million in 2000, compared with fewer than 9 million ten years previously[3].

The Ministers of Education of 29 European countries signed Bologna Declaration on the harmonization of the architecture of the European higher education system in June 1999. Its aim is to establish the European area of higher education and to promote the European system of higher education in the world. It proposes the adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, the establishment of a system of credits, and the elimination of all remaining obstacles to free mobility. This part we will discuss the potential importance of this Declaration for both the comparability and the competitiveness of European higher education.

The Bologna Declaration states that in order to establish the European area of higher education and to promote the European system of higher education in the world, the following objectives will have to be attained:

- Adoption of a system of degrees that are easily readable and comparable in order to promote the employability of European citizens and the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education;

- Adoption of a system based on two cycles, the first, three years in duration at least, recognized in the European labor market and in the higher education system as an adequate level of qualification;

---

[2] Official Journal L 120 of 08.05.1999

[3] COM (2003) 58 final

- Establishment of a system of credits, i.e., development of the European Credit Transfer System as well as credit for experimental learning and learning in non-higher education contexts, provided that such credit is recognized by the university system as a proper means to favour the most wide and diffused student mobility;

- Elimination of the remaining obstacles to the effective exercise of the right to free mobility and equal treatment with particular regard to:

  - Student access to all services relating to education;

  - The recognition and valorization for teachers, researchers, and administrative staff of periods spent in a European context doing research, teaching, and/or training, without prejudice to their rights to pensions and social security benefits;

  - Promotion of criteria and methodologies for quality assessment;

  - Implementation of the necessary European dimensions of the higher education space, particularly with regard to curricular contents, inter-institutional co-operation, mobility schemes, and integrated programmes of study, training, and research.

Actions for the attainment of these objectives are planned for the short term and, in any case, within the first decade of the third millennium and in full respect of the diversity of cultures, languages, national education systems, and of university autonomy. To that purpose, ways of intergovernmental co-operation (when applicable on the basis of the subsidiary principle) will be pursued.

Unlike what many people from other regions in the world may think, the role of the European Union in the field of higher education—and in that of education in general—is extremely limited. The limitation relates to the so-called *Subsidiary Principle*, which implies that in the areas which do not belong to the exclusive competence of the Community (e.g., education), community policy will only be developed in areas in which national policy-making is insufficient (Article 3b of the Maastricht Treaty, 1992). In the case of education, the result is that community action will contribute to the quality of education by encouraging co-operation among the Member States and by supporting and complementing their actions if necessary. If the latter occurs, it will be with the full respect of the sovereignty of Member States with respect to the content and structure of their educational systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity (Article 126 of the Maastricht Treaty, 1992).

These limitations, and the political sensitivities of the Member States regarding Commission proposals on issues such as educational content, quality, and structure, gave rise to a situation whereby the idea of harmonization was an avoided area in the European debate on higher education. A proposal for the harmonization of systems could therefore only arise at the level of national governments. When such a proposal finally came, it was nevertheless quite unexpected.

In the Sorbonne Declaration, the idea of harmonization referred to the architecture of the European higher education system, to the overall framework of degrees and cycles, and not to the content or structure of curricula. And although the word "harmonization", as such, does not appear in the Bologna Declaration (only "convergence" is mentioned), there is still a great deal of discussion and misunderstanding about this concept. Misunderstanding is to some extent understandable, since the Bologna Declaration includes a somewhat vague paragraph on "European dimensions of the higher education space, particularly with regard to curricular contents..." Moreover, the background documents prepared for the Bologna meeting suggest that the change in the degree system should be more than a mere re-packaging of existing curricula. Thus, the introduction of new curricula with a guaranteed level and formal accreditation ("European quality labels") was proposed (Haug, 1999). Skeptics of Europeanization are obviously alerted by phrases of this sort, even though any real fear of a top-down driven imposition of European contents and standards would not be justified by the political reality of European higher education. Bottom-up forces can only drive the process.

Inter-institutional co-operation and national-level governmental action will be crucial, since it is the individual Member States of the Europe Union and a large number of other European countries that signed the Declaration. They did not thereby grant any new or extra authority to the European Commission for the implementation of the European higher education space. Subsidiary thus remains the guiding principle.

It should be born in mind that the first purpose of the new system of degree is to promote the employability of European citizens. The current unemployment rate in the European Union and the low level of labor market mobility present a clear rationale for such an effort, for the current situation reduces the competitiveness of Europe in the global economy.

One of the main obstacles to mobility is the diversity of qualifications and the lack of transparency. Potential employers, who wish to recruit from other Member States or throughout the European Union as a whole, are rarely in a position to make valid comparisons of qualifications. It was found that the existing conventions on the recognition of academic degrees and the structure of European information and recognition centres (the NARICs and ENICs) do not focus sufficiently on the *effects civilus* of degrees and are thus insufficient in linking intellectual power to employability. Therefore, another main challenge of the Bologna initiative will be to move beyond academic recognition towards competence appraisal, as employability rather than instruction is becoming the keyword for the development of a competitive Europe (Barblan, 1999). This effort calls for the active involvement of labor market partners, employers, and professional organizations, and their future employees, the students, in the process. Only such a broad involvement of non-academic actors in the implementation process can make the initiative a success.

The second purpose of the new degree system is to increase the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education. This object is based on the regrettable fact

that Europe has lost its number one position in the world as a destination for study abroad. Another motive is the threat that is felt from non-traditional and non-European providers of higher education that enter the European market, by means of branch-campuses, virtual university, and the like.

Increased transparency would, in principle, enhance the position of Europe on the world market for higher education. However, it is not yet clear to what extent this really represents a European concern. The European Commission has so far not demonstrated any systematic interest in the balance of student flows from and to the European Union as a whole. Adequate statistics are not available. The focus has been, hitherto, on intra-European mobility.

The Bologna Declaration includes a phrase on "the promotion of criteria and methodologies for quality assessment". The European Commission, in the recent past, aimed at initiating co-operation in this area, as has been the case in certain EU countries. In some of these, systems for quality assurance have not yet been (fully) developed, while in other countries sophisticated systems are in place. Community action has not been very successful so far in this area. Aside from cultural and system differences, national governments consider quality assurance to be one of their core responsibilities.

5.2.2 Initiatives on the European Higher Education Space

Sorbonne (1998) called for reform of European higher education, especially the integration of higher education qualification systems. Bologna Declaration (1999) created a European higher education sphere through the creation of a shared framework including common qualifications for the undergraduate and postgraduate level, and the ECTS for compatibility. Continued to focus on the free mobility of students and quality assurance. The main difference between the conditions under which the Sorbonne and Bologna declarations were created is that, apart from the number of signatories, universities were invited to participate in the preparation of the document, although, the final version was produced by the political leaders. As for the content, there is a shift towards a language of cooperation between systems rather than restructuring to achieve a common structure. The Bologna declaration gives more emphasis on quality assurance and the European dimension in higher education. The Bologna declaration also calls on universities to "respond promptly and positively".

The Bologna process is not one but several processes, where the political process, the one aiming at a European Higher Education Area does not provide a detailed plan for how this vision is to be achieved. Rather, it has sparked of an intensive debate within Europe that will create new answers to the challenges higher education is facing. In a sense, the over-tones of the political process seem just as important as the declarations. It is as if the politicians

have taken a position and are now waiting to see what the national authorities and individual institutions will do with it.

Lisbon European Council (March 2000)

Lisbon European Council (March 2000) set the objective of Europe becoming more competitive in the global market thus extra efforts must be made to increase and improve the use of new information and communication technologies. In March 2000, at the Lisbon European Council, Heads of State and Government set the Union the goal to become by 2010 "the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion".

The aim of the Lisbon Special European Council (23 and 24 March 2000) was to invigorate the Community's policies, against the backdrop of the most promising economic climate for a generation in the Member States. It was therefore fitting to take long-term measures on the basis of this outlook.

Two recent developments are profoundly changing the economy and society. Globalisation means that Europe must set the pace in all the sectors where the competition is intensifying. The sudden arrival and growing importance of information and communication technologies (ICT) in professional and private life call for a radical overhaul of the education system in Europe and, beyond that, guaranteed life-long learning opportunities.

Salamanca (March 2001)

The next step in this development was the summit in Prague on 19 May 2001. Before the meeting, the European University Association (EUA) had invited representatives of the higher education sectors to a meeting in Salamanca, March 2001, to define the position of the Universities. The EUA stressed the importance the two-tier system and a general credit system as essential components of the European Higher Education Area. The credit system should make both transferability and accumulation possible. The EUA also welcomed the intention to improve mobility of students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff. Salamanca Convention, March 2001 pointed to the importance of maintaining guiding principles such as autonomy, higher education as a public good and diversity in all aspects of universities from language, to curriculum, to institutional type.

The European Higher Education Area needs to build on academic core values while meeting stakeholders' expectations, i.e., demonstrating quality. Indeed, quality assessment must take into consideration the goals and mission of institutions and programmes. It requires

a balance between innovation and tradition, academic excellence and social/economic relevance, the coherence of curricula and students' freedom of choice. It encompasses teaching and research as well as governance and administration, responsiveness to students' needs and the provision of non-educational services. Inherent quality does not suffice, it needs to be demonstrated and guaranteed in order to be acknowledged and trusted by students, partners and society at home, in Europe and in the world. Quality is also the basic underlying condition for trust, relevance, mobility, compatibility and attractiveness in the European Higher Education Area.

Prague Meeting (May 2001)

The choice of Prague to hold this meeting is a symbol of their will to involve the whole of Europe in the process in the light of enlargement of the European Union. Prague Meeting shifted the focus away from mobility and integration to quality assurance, including issues of recognition and accreditation.

The Prague summit starts by stressing that higher education should remain a public responsibility and that students are full members of the Higher Education Community. Further, the six objectives of the Bologna process were assessed.

Readability of degrees:
- Higher Education institutions should make best of existing legislation for academic and professional recognition.
- Existing networks and organizations such as NARIC (National Academic Recognition Information Centres) and ENIC (European Network of Information Centres) to promote simple, efficient and fair recognition.

Adoption of a system essentially based on two cycles:
- The work in several countries to review structures was noted with satisfaction
- Programmes leading to a degree should have different orientations and profiles in order to accommodate a diversity of individual, academic and labour market needs

Establishment of a system of credits:
- The common use of ECTS or similar systems together with Diploma Supplements will foster progress in the direction of easier access to labour market and enhancement of compatibility, attractiveness and competitiveness of the European Higher Education.

Promotion of mobility:

- Ministers reconfirmed their commitment to pursue the removal of obstacles for mobility

Promotion of European cooperation in quality assurance:

- Quality assurance is important for the comparability of qualifications in Europe
- Mutual trust and creation of a common framework of reference for quality assurance should be created through the European Network of Quality Assurance (ENQA)
- Institutions of Higher Education should disseminate best practise and design scenarios for mutual acceptance

Promotion of the European dimension in Higher Education:

- Modules, courses and curricula with European content, orientation or organization should be further developed by the Higher Education sector.

The Prague Summit further emphasized the importance of lifelong learning, the role of students as competent, active and constructive partners in establishment and shaping of a European higher education area and the need to promote the attractiveness of European higher education.

We can sum up that higher education is a topic of continuous concern for the EU policy makers. A new dimension has been added through the recent European initiatives, which go beyond coordination of national structures and activities, transnational mobility and recognition of qualifications between countries. At the core of this new dimension is a vision of a European Higher Education Area, to be reached by 2010. This is a political vision, and not a detailed structure to be implemented by national authorities and institutions. It is dynamic and is modified step by step in a "learning-by-doing" approach.

5.2.3 eEurope—an Information Society for All

Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) are becoming an essential part of the life of the European citizen—in the economic sphere, in education, in social lives—and they offer tremendous potential for growth, employment and inclusion. The changes they are bringing, perhaps the most significant since the Industrial Revolution, are far-reaching and global and they are not just about technology. They will affect everyone, everywhere. Bringing people closer together, creating wealth, sharing knowledge, they could enrich everyone's lives. Managing this transformation represents a central economic and social challenge for the European Union.

The success of the new economy will depend on consumers' ability to take full advantage of the opportunities on offer. For this, they need to be able to access the information they seek and interact successfully on the Internet.

With Europe evolving from a predominantly industrial society to a new information society, the European Commission (EC) saw a tremendous economic and social potential offered by new information and communication technologies (ICTs).

In December 1999, the European Commission launched the eEurope initiative. The eEurope initiative and parallel launches had a positive impact overall in the Member States and a progress report was issued at the Lisbon Summit of March 2000. It was at this summit that Heads of State and the member Governments committed to a number of metrics, including target dates, to bring eEurope forward.

The European Council Meeting in Lisbon (23rd—24th March 2000) set the ambitious objectives for Europe to become the most competitive and dynamic economy in the world. It recognised an urgent need for Europe to quickly exploit the opportunities of the new economy and in particular the Internet and associated technologies.

There is no doubt that ICTs offer enormous potential for improving life, and, to ensure that the whole of Europe reaps the benefits of the Information Society, in 2000, the European Commission (EC) launched a new initiative—eEurope 2002—An Information Society For All. eEurope 2002 is intended to accelerate positive change in the Union and is a key element in the strategy for modernizing the European economy.

5.2.4 Concrete Future Objectives of Education Systems

On the basis of a proposal from the Commission and contributions from the Member States, the Council adopted the "Report on the concrete future objectives of education and training systems" on 12 February 2001. This is the first document, which outlines a comprehensive and consistent approach for national policies on education in the context of the European Union. The approach is based on three objectives:

- Improving the quality and effectiveness of education and training systems in the EU

Education and training are an excellent means of social and cultural cohesion and a considerable economic asset with a view to making Europe a more competitive and dynamic society. It is necessary to improve the quality of training for teachers and trainers and make a special effort to acquire the basic skills, which must be updated in order to keep pace with changes in the knowledge society. Literacy and numeracy also need to be improved, particularly with regard to information and communication technologies and general skills (e.g. learning to learn, teamwork, etc.). Improving the quality of facilities in schools and training institutes by

making the best use of resources is a further priority, as is increasing recruitment in scientific and technical fields, such as mathematics and natural sciences, in order to ensure that Europe remains competitive in the future economy. Finally, raising the quality of education and training systems means better matching of resources and needs, and enabling schools to develop new partnerships to support their new, wider role.

- Facilitating the access of all to "lifelong" education and training

The European model of social cohesion must be able to allow access for all to formal and non-formal education and training systems by making it easier to move from one part of the education system to another (e.g. from vocational education to higher education), from early childhood right through to later life. Opening up education and training systems and working to make these systems more attractive, and even adapting them to meet the needs of the various groups concerned, can play an important part in promoting active citizenship, equal opportunities and lasting social cohesion.

- Opening up education and training systems to the wider world

This objective involves building the European education and training area through mobility and foreign language teaching, and strengthening the links with the world of work, research and civil society as a whole.

The Lisbon European Council recommended using the open method of coordination in order to achieve the new strategic goal: "to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world". It involved 'fixing guidelines for the Union combined with specific timetables for achieving the goals which they set in the short, medium and long terms; establishing, where appropriate, quantitative and qualitative indicators and benchmarks against the best in the world and tailored to the needs of different Member States and sectors as a means of comparing best practice; translating these European guidelines into national and regional policies by setting specific targets and adopting measures, taking into account national and regional differences; periodic monitoring, evaluation and peer review'.

The open method of coordination, the most developed form of which is currently the Luxembourg process, consists of a coordinated strategy in which the Member States set common objectives and instruments. The common objectives were set out in the report on the future objectives of education and training systems, and the instruments will be the definition of indicators and targets to be met (benchmarking), exchanges of experience and peer review.

For each of the three strategic objectives and key issues, the Council sets out the organisation of the follow-up, a list of activities under way and the concrete results which have already been approved and which Member States have undertaken to pursue.

For the first objective ("improving the quality of education and training systems"), the following results are to be pursued:

- Halve the number of 18- to 24-year-olds with only lower-secondary level education by 2010;

- Ensure that all education and training institutions have access to the Internet and to multimedia resources by the end of 2001;

- Take steps to ensure that all the teachers involved are qualified in the use of these technologies by the end of 2002;

- Bring about a substantial increase in per capita investment in human resources every year.

For the second objective ("facilitating access for all to education and training"), the results to be pursued consist of halving, by 2010, the number of 18 to 24 year olds with only lower-secondary level education who are not in further education or training.

Finally, as regards the third objective ("opening education and training to the world"), the following results are to be pursued:

- Promote training for entrepreneurs and self-employed workers;

- Encourage people to study two European Union languages in addition to their mother tongue(s) for a minimum of two consecutive years;

- Promote the mobility of students, teachers, trainers and researchers.

In keeping with the open method of coordination, this work programme also sets out the main instruments to be used for measuring progress and comparing results across Europe, at both European and international level.

What's EU up to concerning higher education? As higher education reaches out beyond frontiers and as more and more students follow part of their courses abroad, governments of individual states are under increasing pressure to adapt their systems of higher education. Yet, for the past two centuries, higher learning has been set firmly within the bounds of the Nation State. With the rise of a 'higher education space' in the European Union, a range of powerful and influential decision-making bodies are giving new meaning to the 'supranational dimension' in the world of academe. Higher education international cooperation might be the instrument that Europe needs, both internally and in relation to the outside world, to be a winner in the globalization of education.

5.3 Higher Education Policies in China towards the New 21ˢᵗ Century

5.3.1 Challenges and Reforms for Chinese Higher Education in the 21ˢᵗ Century

Challenges for Chinese higher education in the 21ˢᵗ century

In recent years, the role of science, technology, and education (STE) is becoming more and more prominent in China's economic reform and development. In 1995, the idea of "Reinvigorating China through Science and Education" has been formally adopted by the government as one of the two major development strategies. The fever on "knowledge-based economy", which had swept China since 1997, further confirmed the role of STE in China's future development. An important endeavour is the reform process currently undergoing in Chinese higher education system. What's China up to concerning higher education? Under tremendous pressure from the general public, China has been increasing its higher education enrolment by double digits over the past several years. For example, China's regular universities and colleges took 1.6 million new students in 1999, an increase of 47.4 percent over the previous year (Lan, 2000). The increase of enrolment in colleges in 1999 had a great impact on society. Not only more students enrolled, but also, more importantly, there was a strategic shift in Chinese higher education from an elite-oriented to a public-oriented system. This led to improved intellectual standards in China and enhanced the chances of social mobility. Great changes also took place in the educational system and structure, while modifications to special subjects, as well as curricula, were made.

However, increasing enrolment could not solve the problems inherent in the old system. China was still facing challenges (Gu, 2000), among which the following four are of special significance:

The challenge of the accelerating development of science and technology
The pace of development of science and technology was striking in the 20ᵗʰ century, especially so in the last few decades. In addition to the developments in nuclear and electronic technology, greater achievements were also made in many fields, such as natural sciences, astronomy, studies of the marine environment, information technology, biology, etc. At the beginning of the 21ˢᵗ century, science and technology were developing at even greater speed with more and more disciplines integrated and knowledge updated. How higher education can adapt itself to the new development of science and technology and how it can produce more qualified people has become a common concern of every country.

The challenge of social reform and innovation

Since the end of the Cold War, the division of power in the world has undergone considerable changes. However, the world is still not at peace, rather, the international competition is becoming more and more intense. The application of science and technology in every field of society has triggered social reform as well as changes in values. Although material wealth has increased, morality has worsened. This can be seen in a higher number of drug-users, an increase in crime rates and many other social problems. These problems have become issues that educators regularly have to contend with.

The challenge of reform in the economic system and methods of production

The move in China from a planned economy to a market economy involves changes in administration, enrolment, student grants, specialisation and curricula. At the same time, methods of production are also shifting from diversified to intensive, which require a more innovative and practical approach from graduates.

The challenge of the conflicts between Chinese culture and Western culture

The first conflict is that of Chinese culture and Western culture. The open-door policy will certainly strengthen international communication and facilitate the introduction of advanced science and technology. However, at the same time, it will inevitably bring about cultural infiltration from the West. Colleges, as a cultural agency, should have the responsibility of deciding what to adopt, what to borrow, and what to leave from the Western culture. Only this way can colleges select elements from the reservoir of international cultural heritage, which would be beneficial to Chinese culture.

Another conflict lies in the clash between traditional and modern Chinese culture. China is a country with a long history and outstanding cultural background. As a legacy of the past, Chinese culture will inevitably be both quintessential and deficient. Therefore, the higher education system in China will also be compelled to choose what is useful from Chinese culture and create a new culture on the basis of the traditional one.

Reforms of the higher education system

In recent years, a new system for investment in higher education through various channels other than the government is being established gradually. The government encourages enterprises and private businesses to provide financial support for higher education, which acts as a kind of supplement to the government's investment. Meanwhile, each individual university has been given more opportunity and freedom to control and manage its own affairs. At the same time, the new "Higher Education Law of the People's Republic of China" has been passed by the highest legislature, the Standing Committee of the People's Congress. Many

rigorous rules and regulations related to higher education have been revised and established in the form of the law.

Chinese higher education has been no longer free to the students since the year 1997. Chinese Governmental and Communist Party doctrine has officially accepted the appropriateness of tuition. As expressed in a passage from the Chinese Central Educational Science Institute in 1990:

> *It is appropriate for university students to pay a suitable amount of tuition. The Chinese wage system today is being rationalized. Hence, those who receive a higher education will earn comparatively higher or more personal income. It is likewise rational for them to invest a bit—to pay a suitable amount of tuition when they are receiving their higher education.* (Johnstone, Web site, read at 10.08.2004)

Chinese universities and Chinese higher education authorities, both national and provincial, might consider as they attempt to formulate rational and effective policies governing the combination of tuitions and fees, to supplement tax-based revenues, and financial assistance, to ameliorate the barriers to access or other problems that may be caused by the imposition of these tuition and fees.

In the past, students were provided with employment by the government when they finished their tertiary education. Now there has also been a change in the graduate employment situation in that most of the students now need to look for their own job under the guidelines of the policy issued by the government when they graduate from universities or colleges.

Before the 1980s, the Chinese higher educational system was comprised of a large quantity of inefficiently run and narrowly specialized professional colleges that could not adapt to the new market economy. Institutions were owned and run by a variety of central ministries. In the 1980s, a major push for reform occurred. Among other things, it called for an overall decrease in the number of higher educational institutions, and less national control by various ministries.

Though reforms began in 1985, mergers were not used as mechanisms for structural change in higher education until the 1990s. In 2000, the vice-premier of the Chinese government Li Lanqing, announced the end of a reconstruction, during which 452 institutions had gone from central to local control and 612 higher institutions have been merged into 250 (MOE web, read 10.09.2000). Mergers were seen as a way to enlarge overall enrolment size of institutions by combining resources to accommodate the rapid growth in higher education. A common belief existed that consolidation helps achieve cost-effectiveness and optimization of insufficient resources in higher education via higher student-teacher ratios, less waste and overlap and sharing resources (Zhao, 2002). Mergers did not meet with universal acceptance and support, however. The trend towards creating large universities was criticized on the grounds that, "bigger is not always better." It has been pointed out that just having a wide

range of study fields does not ensure that they will be world-class quality. Chinese higher education reforms have been dominated by the government, but with little attention paid to the university's role (Chen, 2001). Even though it is not perfect and completed yet, the higher education reform in China have moved forward.

In addition above reforms, curriculum reform is important too. In 1994, the Chinese government devised a project entitled "The Plan for Innovation the Curriculum in Higher Education Towards the 21st Century in China". The plan addressed over 100 disciplines based on the new concepts and tried to make it more relevant to the changing and development of the Chinese society. At the same time, Chinese education policy makers reformed the tertiary education model and focused on improving the quality and capacity of students. In order to monitor the results, scientific assessment methods were used in various teaching evaluations. It was envisaged that higher education quality could be monitored and supervised efficiently.

The most immediate effect was the impact that the market economy liberalization had on university and college curricula. Institutions now offer new classes on hot topic, that is, those for which there is a market (computer use, special vocations, foreign languages, particularly English and so on).

Another mechanism for expanding the curriculum to meet new demands is through cooperative educational programming. Similar to the consortium model in the United States, clusters of urban universities will cross list courses and allow for mutual recognition of university credits in selected areas. The idea is to break down the concept of an enclosed university and allow for broad based cooperation. The joint appointment of faculty is another outcome of this effort (Ji, 1997).

Responding to the market has produced some curriculum reform but the central authorities have budgeted funds to encourage a more planned and systematic higher education curriculum reform. Zhong Bingling, Director of the Higher Education Division of the SEC announced that in 1997 over 200 curriculum reform projects were funded involving faculty members, researchers and administrators at several major universities. New undergraduate concentrations are being developed and special interest is being placed on the teaching of foreign languages and computer science (Chinese Web site, http://www.edu.cn. read at 10.9.1999).

5.3.2 "Project 211"

The implementation of "Project 211" is an important measure taken by the Chinese government in its effort to facilitate the development of higher education in the context of the country's advancement in social and economic fields. The "Project 211" started in 1995, which

is the Chinese government's new endeavor aimed at strengthening about 100 institutions of higher education and key disciplinary areas as a national priority for the 21st century. The funding required for "Project 211" can be generated through a co-financing mechanism involving the State, local governments and higher education institutions. Primarily aiming at training high-level professional manpower to implement the national strategy for social and economic development, the project has great significance in improving higher education, accelerating the national economic progress, pushing forward the development of science, technology and culture, enhancing China's overall capacity and international competitiveness, and laying the foundation of training high-level professional manpower mainly within the educational institutions at home.

The overall goals and missions

During the 9th Five-Year (1996—2000) Plan period, the government will initiate actions to strengthen a number of institutions of higher learning and key disciplinary areas. It is envisaged that after several years' efforts some l00 institutions of higher learning and a group of key disciplinary areas will have greatly improved their quality of education, scientific research, management and institutional efficiency. In addition, these institutions will also have made remarkable progress in reforming the management system and consequently become the bases for training high-level professional manpower and solving major problems for the country's economic construction and social development. As a result of such efforts, this group of institutions will set up national standards in overall quality, with some of the key universities and disciplinary areas approaching or reaching the advanced international standards. The majority of them will have enhanced their physical conditions and staff competence, in addition to noticeable achievements in human resources training and scientific research. Adapting to regional and sectional development needs, these institutions are expected to play a key and exemplary role.

"Project 211" consists of the following three major components for development:

The improvement of overall institutional capacity
This requires great efforts in bringing up a large number of academic leaders and competent teachers who have high academic attainments and prestige both at home and abroad. In particular, the training of young academic leaders should be accelerated, so as to maintain a stable teaching and administrative contingent with political integrity and academic quality, rational structure and professional competence. The reform of education and teaching will be carried out in depth in order to optimize the structure of academic programs (specialities) and to enhance the overall student development in moral, intellectual and physical as-

pects, thus ensuring substantial improvement in the quality of education. Measures are to be taken to enhance the infrastructure and laboratory facilities indispensable for teaching and research, thus creating necessary conditions for training as well as attracting outstanding talents. Steps are to be taken to improve efficiency through moderate institutional expansion, enhance scientific research, and strive for the commercialization of research findings so as to accelerate the pace of transferring scientific achievements into productivity. While facilitating the reform of the administrative as well as the internal management system of universities, efforts will be made to strengthen international exchange and co-operation in higher education, and raise the international profile of Chinese higher education institutions.

The development of key disciplinary areas

The main thrust of the development of key disciplinary areas is to enhance the capacity of training high-level manpower in the frontier fields of science and technology. Among the institutions with favorable conditions, efforts will be made to identify key research bases, which can exert significant impact on the country's social and economic development, scientific and technological advancement, and the national defense. These bases will have the capacity to deal with major problems in science and technology and have the prospect for breakthroughs in relevant fields. Improving the experimental facilities for the training of professional manpower, efforts will be made to broaden the coverage of various disciplines, and foster the emergence of groups of disciplinary areas and research bases. With common theoretical foundation and inherently close relationships, these groups are favored for resources sharing and have unique features and advantages in developing a capacity for the training of high-level professional manpower in a sustainable manner. Efforts will also be made to establish a system of key disciplinary areas covering major professions and sectors for national economic and social progress, facilitating the development of academic disciplines and science and technology, optimizing the division of labor, and achieving mutual reinforcement.

The development of the public service system of higher education

The development of the public service system of higher education comprises three components: the Chinese Education and Research Network (CERNET), the Library and Documentation Support System (LDSS) and the Modern Equipment and Facilities Sharing System (MEFSS). Linking up all major universities in China and the INTERNET, the CERNET will provide information service to the sectors of education, science and technology, and customers from all walks of life in China. The LDSS backed by the CERNET, will establish a national comprehensive documentation center and a number of documentation centers for various disciplines, thus forming a documentation and information sub-network with extensive connections to similar systems both at home and abroad. In light of regional conditions and development priorities of the disciplinary areas, the MEFSS service center will be set up in

major cities where a large number of universities are located so as to raise the efficiency in facility utilization.

Plans and tasks during 1996—2000 period

Top priority will be given to the strengthening of universities to help them approach and reach the advanced international standards for the overall quality of teaching, scientific research, and the training of professional manpower, so as to establish their international prestige and position among universities in the world.

Priority will be accorded to the upgrading and improvement of the infrastructure for teaching and research in about 25 universities, which, with a high concentration of key disciplinary areas, have an important bearing on China's socialist modernization drive, and shoulder a larger share of responsibility in developing the public service system. These institutions are expected to greatly upgrade their quality of training for professional manpower and have some of the key disciplinary areas approaching and reaching international standards, thus playing a key and exemplary role among universities in China. Emphasis will be place on supporting the development of institutions and key disciplinary areas which are closely related to the basic and pillar sectors of the industry, and on the improvement of the training capacity of high-level professional manpower and technical personnel who are urgently needed for national development. This clearly indicates that "Project 211" is mainly oriented to economic development of China.

5.3.3 Action Scheme for Invigorating Education Towards the 21st Century

According to the requirement of the new century, how to reform and develop higher education is a new proposition for China. China should lose no time in preparing to meet the new challenges. The Fifteenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (1997) set the grandiose goals and trans-century tasks of socialist modernization, and mapped out the overall plan for implementing the strategies for invigorating China through science and education. To fulfil the tasks and achieve the goal set by the Fifteenth National Party Congress, to implement the strategy for invigorating China through science and education, the Chinese government has made an "Action Scheme for Invigorating Education Towards the 21st Century" (Ministry of education, December 24, 1998, approved by State Department, January 13, 1999). This Action Scheme is formulated in order to push forward educational reform and development in a comprehensive way and to improve the quality of the whole nation and enhance its innovative capacity. It is blueprint for educational reform and development for

the new millennium. It has been conceived as an instrument for implementing the Education Law of the People's Republic of China and is an outgrowth of the Guidelines of China's Education Reform and Development (CPC and State Council, 1993).

Continuing and speeding up the "211 Project" to enhance HEIs' capabilities in knowledge innovation

With the advent of the Ninth Five-Year Plan period (1996-2000), the Project has entered a substantially constructive stage. Efforts should be made to ensure the completion of the first phase of the "211 Project" by the year 2000, and to initiate on this basis the second phase of the project for further improvement of the knowledge innovation capability and research level in HEIs (Higher Education Institutes).

The funds needed for the second phase should still be jointly raised by the central government, all the sectors-concerned local governments and the HEIs. The intensity of investment contributed by the central government will be no less than that of the first phase. This part of funding is mainly used to strengthen those programs already initiated for developing selected fields of study. Project management should be improved to ensure cost-effectiveness of the fund used.

Founding a number of first-rate universities and disciplinary areas or fields of study reaching international advanced level

It is of strategic importance to develop China's own first-rate universities ranking among the best ones in the world. As the former President Jiang Zemin (1998) pointed out in his speech at the conference celebrating Peking University's centenary, "To realize modernization, China must have quite a few first-rate universities of international advanced level". Through long-time developmental efforts and the accumulation of scholarly achievements in a few leading universities in China, the level of research in a small number of fields, including some high-tech fields, has attained or approached international advanced level. They have highly qualified faculty, and the undergraduate and graduate students trained are of a high quality, laying the requisite conditions for developing these leading institutions into first-rate ones in the world.

It goes without saying that all the first-rate universities in the world have invariably built up the fame and prestige through many-years' unremitting efforts. The development of a first-rate university requires governmental support and financial input. What is more important is the commitment and persistent and dedicated efforts exerted by its leaders, faculty and students over the years. Especially, graduates from these universities should enjoy publicly acknowledged repute on their posts, both at home and abroad. Of course, these leading institutions should have a high concentration of distinguished professors. Therefore, it is a historical process to develop a university into a first-rate one in the world, and during the process, it must stand the tests of social practice.

Implementing "modern distance education project" to build up an open education network and a lifelong learning system

Modern distance education is a new type of education that has come into being with the development of modern information technology. It is a major means to build up a lifelong learning system meeting the needs of people living in an era of knowledge-based economy. The "Modern Distance Education Project" (Launched 01.01.2001) implemented on the basis of existing distance education facilities and making full use of modern information technology can effectively take full advantage of available educational resources. This is in line with the international trend of developing science and technology education. In view of the shortage of educational resources, this is a strategic step to extend access to education for the large population of our country and therefore the development of this important infrastructure must be intensified (MOE, 1998).

"Modern Distance Education" is a key project among those of the 21st Century Education Invigorating Plan approved by the State Council. With China's education, scientific research computer network, satellite TV education as the basis, it will form an open education network and build an education system. To achieve this goal, China will renovate its current satellite education network. The Ministry of Education is in charge of the development of modern distance education program and is responsible for organizing the formulation and implementation of the national "Plan for Developing Modern Distance Education". The strategy for developing the "Modern Distance Education Project" is characterized by governmental support at the initial stage and self-financed operation in the long run. The advanced means of information technology should be adopted in light of China's actual conditions to keep upgrading modern distance education.

Putting into effect the Higher Education Law, developing higher education actively and steadily, and speeding up reforms to enhance the quality and cost-effectiveness of educational provision

Effective measures should be taken to implement the following provisions of the Higher Education Law of the People's Republic of China: "Higher education institutions should be oriented towards societal needs, operate autonomously according to law, and practice democratic management" so as to enlarge the institutional autonomy of HEIs. In the light of local demands and available financial resources and teaching staff, and with the adoption of new mechanisms and new patterns of educational provision as prerequisite conditions, it is envisaged that the total enrollment of students in HEIs would have increased to enable more upper secondary school graduates to have access to higher education. The increased enrollment will mainly aid local development of tertiary vocational education. In the meantime, the enrollment of postgraduate students in HEIs should be considerably augmented. The average size in terms of total enrollment of an independent regular HEI should reach approximately 4,000.

China should speed up the pace of the structural reforms of higher education and carry out in-depth reforms of higher education. With regard to structural reforms China will continue to practice the guidelines following "joint operation of institutions, readjustment of educational institutions and programs, collaboration between HEIs and research institutes and enterprises, and merging of institutions." In the next 3 to 5 years, a new system of two-tier management by central ministries and local governments with proper division of responsibilities will gradually take shape to ensure proper division of responsibilities between central ministries and the provincial governments, with the latter exercising the main responsibility of coordination organic integration of the interests of the sectoral ministries and the provinces concerned under the guidance of the state's macro-level policies. Under this new system only a few HEIs which either have an important bearing on the overall development of the nation or mainly serve the needs of specific sectoral departments will remain under the control of the central ministries or agencies concerned, while all the other HEIs will either be directly managed by the provincial governments or be jointly managed by the provincial and central authorities with the former assuming the main responsibility. The national treasury will continue to appropriate funds to encourage and promote the reform of the management system, readjust and optimize the location of HEIs. The establishment of non-state private HEIs will be encouraged.

In summary, the objective of the current structural reform is to make Chinese higher education system capable of meeting challenges of the knowledge-based economy - more accessible by the public, flexible enough to respond to the changing market needs, and highly efficient to provide good educational services at a low cost. The reform focused on co-operations between central and local governments, and mergers between universities. It is against this background that the idea of knowledge-based economy hit home with many Chinese scholars and government officials. While there is still a debate on the concept and its implications for China, the government wasted no time to embrace its basic principle and take actions in several fronts in the hope that China could steer a new course of knowledge-based development in the 21st century.

5.4 Analysis on Future Higher Education Policies between the EU and China

The phenomenon of globalisation is frequently claimed to be making an increasingly serious impact on higher education throughout the world. Higher education is adapting to one of the most challenging developments in its history: the emergence of a society that is global, networked and in which knowledge is the main economic driving force.

In higher education today there is a global tendency towards internationalization. Efforts at pursuing internationalization have ranged from large-scale nationwide or transnational governmental efforts, for example the extensive student and research exchange programs such as ERASMUS and SOCRATES that are funded by the European Union, to smaller attempts on the part of individual institutions. Compared with EU, China is at a disadvantage and has to face more serious cultural conflicts and more intense competition for knowledge and qualified personnel than elsewhere.

The concept of internationalization in education is not only an ideal but has also been put into practice in universities in both the EU and China. However, it should be noted that although internationalization is unavoidable, different countries with their specific political systems, economic situations and cultural traditions, will be faced with problems and challenges particular to each, and they will take various measures in the process of internationalization.

In the early 1990s, the issue of 'internationalization' became one of the central themes in the debate on higher education. Studying abroad became an important issue. It was seen not only as the best way to learn about other countries, ideas, languages and cultures, but also as an important part of professional and academic career development. Today, an international dimension is even seen as one of the quality criteria of education—which is why it has become an integral part of the universities' strategic planning.

We can find that European countries have clear policy goals to enhance internationalization and improve their competitive position as destinations for students and as sponsors of international degree programs. In Europe, as the Student Mobility study points out, there has been considerable growth in intra-European mobility in such European Union programs as ERASMUS and SOCRATES. De Wit (2002) discusses these programs and points out that they are central to the EU's efforts to build a sense of European unity and encourage integration in education and in the labor market. Recently, the EU has pledged to harmonize degree structures and programs so that it will be easier for European students to transfer from one university to another.

The emergence of a global higher education market in the second half of the 1990s and enhanced international competition have led to growing awareness of the need to strengthen the position of European higher education. These realities formed one of the main arguments in favour of the curricular changes leading to compatibility with international degree structures—that is, the development of a European Higher Education Area. Bologna is taken as a key document that marks a turning point in the development of European higher education. It should be emphasized that the declaration and process constituted a commitment freely taken by each signatory country to reform its own system and thus achieve convergence at the European level. Bologna was, and could only be, a joint but voluntary commitment undertaken by national governments (i.e., bottom-up and not legally binding), reflecting the limited

competencies of the European Commission in the area of higher education policy. The role of the European Commission in the process was thus limited at first, but gradually enlarged during the subsequent process.

The challenges of competition, globalization, and the knowledge-driven economy were acknowledged by the members of the European Council at their meeting in Lisbon in March 2000. They agreed on the strategic target for 2010. In the view of the council, these changes required not only a radical transformation of the European economy but the modernization of social welfare and education systems, as well. Therefore it called on the Education Council (the education ministers of the EU) and the European Commission to undertake a general review of the concrete objectives of education systems, focusing on common concerns while respecting national diversity. At the same time, the council defined a new approach to political coordination in areas such as education and training: the "open method of co-ordination," which has as its main purpose achieving progress toward the main EU goals by helping member states to develop their own policies. This provided both the initial impetus and the political means for the preparation and adoption in 2002 of a detailed work program on the future objectives of education and training systems.

This new direction made clear that education was seen as a key factor in achieving success according to the Lisbon agenda. In March 2002, the Barcelona European Council underlined this by pointing out that education was one of the bases of the European social model and that Europe's education systems should become a "world quality reference" by 2010. It also demonstrated that the commission was enlarging its field of operation and policy implementation in education. It now openly states that in addition to areas covered in articles 149 and 150 of the EU treaty outlining European competencies and the implementation of EU programs such as SOCRATES, the council will also undertake action in the context of the EU in the form of political cooperation between member states. This approach is not based on EU directives but consists of recommendations, communications, consultations, and other working documents. In recent years, this kind of political cooperation has increased in education and training (e.g., lifelong learning and e-learning) and has been boosted by the Lisbon summit.

The European Commission sees the open method of coordination as a new instrument, one that will hopefully pave the way for coherent policies in areas such as education, where a common policy is not feasible but where a real need exists for a European educational area. While respecting the breakdown of responsibilities envisaged in the treaty, this method provides a new cooperative framework for the member states with a view to bringing about the convergence of national policies and attaining certain common objectives. The process involves jointly identified and defined objectives; common yardsticks (statistics, indicators) enabling member states to know where they stand and to assess progress toward the objectives set; and collaborative mechanisms to stimulate innovation, promote the quality and

relevance of teaching and training programs (dissemination of best practices, pilot projects, etc). This approach of common objectives, translated into national action plans, and implemented through consultative follow-up and peer review (pressure) shows common features with the Bologna process.

Recent developments in European higher education policy demonstrate that convergence (not harmonization) and shared goals have been accepted by most actors. Moreover, despite its unchanged limited competencies, the role of the EU in this field is being enlarged. European actions in higher education have expanded over the last decades in terms of their reach across policy levels and geographical borders. Increased international competition urged national governments to enhance cooperation in order to achieve greater cohesion between higher education systems, Europe being an obvious level for joint action. The greater need and willingness to cooperate has helped to overcome some of the fears for reduced sovereignty. Resistance to harmonization and standardization, however, seems to remain, at least at the political level.

Internationalization is a challenge more than an opportunity for Chinese higher education. High economic growth between 1978 and 1997 has fundamentally changed demands on the skills and knowledge of the Chinese population, putting inevitable pressure on the education system. Chinese government attaches great importance to the international cooperation and exchanges of higher education. Since the reform and opening up to the outside world in 1978, international cooperation and exchanges in higher education have been going on in a more and more active way. In the past 20 years, China has established educational cooperative and exchanges relationship with 154 countries and areas, sent 300, 000 students aboard for study to more than l00 countries and areas for studies, received 210, 000 foreign students from 160 countries and areas, sent 1800 teachers and experts to teach aboard and employed 40, 000 foreign teachers and experts (China Education and Research Network Web, 2001). Recently, through the reform of sending and management of overseas students, the Chinese government adopted the policy of "supporting overseas studies, encouraging overseas students to come back after they complete their studies and guaranteeing their freedom of coming and going" to encourage the overseas students to come back and serve the country in various forms after they finish their studies. By opening to the outside world, China broadly learn the useful foreign experience, promote the reform and development of its higher education and enhance mutual understanding and friendship between China and other countries.

The issue of quality in higher education has been all the more pressing since China suffered the consequences of outside competition. In a context where developed countries spend 5% of GDP on education on average, China spends 2% of GDP (Current Issues in Chinese Higher Education, 2001). Growing internationalization entails a considerable brain drain affecting not only universities, but also secondary education. The number of Chinese students choosing to study and live abroad is rapidly increasing. Progress towards membership of the

World Trade Organization, in particular, will open up the prospect of greater international competition in China's markets and the urgency of developing the skills and creativity needed for success. For China, a country in the process of carrying out reforms, internationalization is a challenge more than an opportunity, because internationalization only provides an opportunity to participate in international competition rather than eliminate competition. Internationalization makes the competition between national powers even more intense, more inclusive and broader in scale. China is faced with special challenge in the course of the internationalization of its higher education system. The Chinese government has on many occasions explicitly expressed its willingness to participate actively in internationalization. At an international conference on higher education held by UNESCO in Paris in October 1998, Mr. Chen Zhili, the state education minister of China, made the following promise in the name of the Chinese government: "We would like to continue our co-operation with UNESCO and to join the efforts of other countries to further promote the development of global higher education."

Although internationalization itself is theoretically neutral and fair, differences in resources and national power will lead to unfair results in practice. The combination of differences in national power with internationalization inevitably results in unfair distribution of interests among countries in international affairs. This is what China has to face while internationalizing its higher education system. The problem is that China must participate in international competition and cooperation, while being handicapped by the educational disadvantages. China must thus eliminate, or at least reduce the disparities in education. This must be achieved by the spread and the application of knowledge, reflected by the establishment of new systems, institutional frameworks, new thinking and ideas.

Globalization and internationalization are now central issues for higher education worldwide. International students are now a significant factor in the higher education. The flows of students overseas move largely from the developing countries to the industrialized nations. China has more than 10 percent of the total number of international students in the United States. There has been considerable stability in these patterns over time for the United States. However, a long-standing concern for China has been its "brain drain". The majority of Chinese students who study in the United States, for example, do not return home. China is eager to make its own universities more attractive for foreign students. Therefore, Chinese universities should be more receptive to outside ideas and broaden the horizons of their faculties and students. They should also carry out educational reforms and improve the quality of education. They need to improve the flexibility of their policies and expand exchanges with foreign countries. In addition, they should be academically tolerant and open-minded. Only in this way can higher education in China become more adaptable and more competitive. It is necessary for Chinese policy makers to navigate the trends in international higher education and the complex relations between academe and society, nationally and globally. Chinese

higher education has a long way to go to come to grips with the internationalization imperatives of the new millennium.

In knowledge economy human resources play a major role and therefore the availability of high quality human resources is the basic ingredient for economic progress. Developing countries are continuously loosing their best human resources to developed countries. In this regard, there is a very clear pattern that exists among countries shaped by their degree of advancements/developments. More advanced countries with attractive job markets are always attractive for the bright and talented young people who are living in less advanced countries and regions. Governments have to pay attention to their human resources and they have to devise comprehensive and dynamic strategic plans for developing and maintaining their human resources parallel to their development plans. Therefore brain drain, brain gain and brain exchange issues have to be on their agenda continuously. Governments must not only minimize "brain drain", but also maximize "brain gain" and facilitate "brain exchange" (OECD, 2004,)

The EU and Chinese higher education will inevitably be further reformed. Especially to China, great efforts must also be made in order to establish a modern higher education system with distinct Chinese characteristics. Further development and reform of the higher education system depends mainly on changes in attitudes and values. As said, improving the international reputation of Chinese higher education is one of the goals of the overall "Project 211". Intensifying international cooperation as well as attracting talent and staff from overseas are some of the means to reach that goal. However, the "Project 211" itself does not give specific instructions on the form and content or the direction of international exchange activities nor does it give criteria to evaluate these activities. The absence of specific guidelines is often a mixed blessing for the institutions. Although there seems to be a large amount of autonomy granted to the universities to determine their foreign cooperation policies, in practice widespread complaints persist about administrative interference, as most international activities or overseas travel plans need the stamp of approval from higher administrative authorities and foreign experts can often only be invited through their mediation. Despite these limitations, it is certain though that China's top-universities will further open up their doors to the outside world and increasingly cooperate in international scientific endeavors and fora. When approached by or considering cooperation with a Chinese university, the status of "211"-university could indeed give a clear indication of that institute's quality, reputation and intentions.

As of now, all project universities have been chosen. All money has been allocated. All celebrations have been made. What remains to be done is for policy makers and those university presidents to cool down and think about what exactly is their future university model that can meet the international standard, and serve best for China's modernization drive in 21st Century. This is perhaps far more difficult part of this project. Yet, there is not a ready-made

model for China to follow. Nor is there a ready-made model overseas for China that fits well its local situations. Faced with the new 21st century challenges, China should pay more attention to the internationalization of higher education and try to find a position in the competition of world education stage.

First, to defend academic neo-colonialism, the Chinese government and universities should support services for overseas study, and to promote policies that support foreign students. The government should provide foreign students with financial aid, and universities should offer foreign students Chinese language training to support their study in Chinese colleges and universities.

Second, to practice structural adjustment and educational reform, the government should design policy-driven and finance-driven reformation to stimulate international competitiveness, whereas universities should change organizational structure centering on decentralization and privatization to cope with educational globalization.

Third, to reach international standards and academic quality, universities should be full autonomies. In addition, universities should improve their curricula and research activities to the level of global standards. Thus, Chinese scholars should endeavor to raise the quality of research to meet the standards of international economy and academy.

Fourth, to prevent the homogenization of national identity and culture, higher education should emphasize Chinese cultural identity and pay attention to the teaching of cultural heritage.

Fifth, to build a new information-communication technology (ICT) society, information technology should be a means to develop both life-long education and distance education, as well as to enhance the internationalization of higher education.

Finally, to accelerate the internationalization of higher education, universities should foster experts in international relations and affairs. All students must be educated for international understanding.

Chapter 6

Main Differences of Higher Education Policy in the EU and China

Education reform in many countries during the last two decades seems to have been shaped by two sets of forces. One is growing public distrust of educational bureaucracies in a climate of rapid political change (Wong, 1994a)[1]. The other is growing international competition in the context of the global economy (Kearns & Doyle, 1991). Since the consequences of these factors for education policies were also likely to vary between regions and countries with different cultures and institutions, global higher education reform processes and outcomes would benefit from examination from a comparative perspective. The purpose of this chapter is try to understand the variation in higher education policies between the EU and China and to analyse the reasons underlying the differences. Based on the previous studies, the emphasis will be put on the analysis of higher education policy goals, important policy issues, solutions and trends in the EU and China.

6.1   The Goals of Higher Education

6.1.1 Global Competitiveness of European Higher Education

The European Union defines its mission as "to organize relations between the member states and between their peoples in a coherent manner and on the basis of solidarity" (European Union Website, 3 Dec.01). Nations came together in a process of cooperation with the aim of integration on all levels from political to economical to educational. Member states work towards unification and the creation of a larger European community while maintaining a respect for differences among nations.

One of the priorities for the EU has been education. The majority of the EU's educational policies are similar in scope and vision to larger goals: they focus on the need to integrate

---

[1]   The rise in popular support for conservative coalitions in many industrialized countries during the 1980s called into question the tradition of the "social welfare state" and raised new hopes for market-oriented initiatives.

Europe's educational system. An emphasis is made on the importance of enhancing the qualifications of members of the European community (European Union website, 3 Dec. 2001) as well as using education as the means to forge a new European citizenship (Helmut, 2000). One of the major goals is to improve mobility of students and professors among different nations. However, it remains very important to the EU to respect and maintain both cultural and lingual diversity among member states.

Higher Education is a topic of continuous concern for governments, institutions of higher education, various industrial and service sectors. In order to enhance the employability and mobility of citizens and to increase the international competitiveness of European higher education, a new dimension has been added through the recent European initiatives, which go beyond coordination of national structures and activities, transnational mobility and recognition of qualifications between countries. At the core of this new dimension is a vision of a European Higher Education Area, to be reached by 2010.

It is the most important reform process that European higher education has seen for decades, and it has a number of original and characteristic features. The Process is in fact national and European at the same time: it is effectively carried out at national level, meaning by Ministries of Education, higher education institutions and staff and students, but the general sense of direction is given at international level, by the Ministers and their representatives, by the representative bodies of higher education institutions and students at European level, and by international organizations as the Council of Europe and the European Commission. While the Process is certainly reflected in the work programs of these two institutions, it is not run by them. Rather, the Bologna Process is run by its members outside of the established institutional frameworks for European cooperation.

The Bologna Declaration is the most convenient starting point for an outline of the European Higher Education Area. The Declaration arises from a concern that higher education in Europe is less attractive than it should be, indeed less attractive than it used to be, that too many European students look for their higher education outside of Europe and that too few non-Europeans come here to study. The Declaration is obviously not an attempt at detailed analysis, but it does say something about why, in the Ministers' opinion, there are problems with higher education in Europe and what could be done to remedy them. Change, innovation and adapting to changing circumstances are very much a part of the European university heritage. Among other things, in the Bologna Declaration, the Ministers call for: efforts to make higher education in Europe more competitive; increased transparency; increased academic mobility; a reform of the degree system; a better adaptation of higher education programs and qualifications to the labor market; improved recognition of qualifications.

While many of the concerns expressed in the declaration may be termed "instrumental" in the sense that they are intended to increase the immediate value of higher education in relation to the labor market or as a service to students and employers, the Ministers, in a

passage given less publicity, also underline the role of higher education in developing and maintaining democratic societies.

6.1.2 Modernization of Chinese Higher Education

The modernization of higher education is one of the most important parts that compose the social modernization, especially, higher education, which will play a more important role in the system of China's socialist market economy and national development. The modernization process demands more rapid development of higher education in the country, and this puts much pressure on the higher education system. Economic development creates greater demand for higher education systems to fulfill. To realize modernization, China needs more talented human resources, and science and technology will also be key. Therefore, strengthening the quality of education and putting the focus on educating people to be good human beings is important. One of the latest changes in China's higher education is the dramatic growth in student numbers. According to Mr. Zhou, 7 million students were studying in universities and other higher education institutions in 1998. In 2003, there are 16 million students. "Higher education is developing rapidly—15 percent of young people attend higher education institutions today and we hope that we will reach 30 per cent over the coming years" (Zhou, 2004). China now has the largest higher education system in the world. It's a very remarkable achievement because China has more than doubled its enrolment in five years. This expansion is happening in a policy context that views higher education as a tool for achieving an integrated global system along market lines (Yang, 2002).

However, Chinese input into higher education is too limited. While increasing access to higher education, Chinese government is paying more attention to the quality of higher education because the policy makers realize that quality is the precondition for economic development and the lifeline for higher education. As China has a huge population, there is a gap between provision and demand, and especially the concern of how to provide a quality education to students. The biggest challenge is to meet the great demand from the public for better education, and to provide high quality education not only in terms of increased funding, but also in terms of better teaching, better management, and the philosophy of education. For this purpose Chinese higher education need more reform and innovation.

6.2 Important Issues of Higher Education Policies

6.2.1 Important Issues of Higher Education Policies in the EU

The EU has no desire to impose uniformity on European educational systems, but member states recognize that there are shared challenges. These include the growth and diversification of higher education, the employability of graduates, skill shortages in key areas and the expansion of private and transnational education. The new economic trends (growth development, market economy, globalization, sustainability, etc.), the reign of new technologies and of the ensuing technoculture, as well as the construction of the so-called "knowledge society", along with the shrinking of the Welfare State in conjunction with the gradual loss of social meaning as to the role of the State (Gravaris, 1991, 3—36), and the—not so rare—dissociation of public education from its social dynamic have redefined the role and the basic components of all the grades of traditional educational systems.

Education is considered to be an inalienable social good only in its rudimentary form. "Moving" upwards, this is no longer a matter-of-course. Higher education, in much the same way as labor, often tends to become a *stake*, whereas educational policy *per se* tends to disaggregate itself (Pyrgiotakis & Papadakis 2002, 240—242). What is the position and the role of an educational policy that wishes to contribute to the molding of the European Higher Education Area, as understood already from the Declaration of the Sorbonne (May 25, 1998) and as the focal point of the Declaration of Bologna and Prague?

There are at least three important related issues that currently dominate the debate on higher education in Europe. These are: quality assurance in higher education, harmonization of the structure of the education systems and strategic positioning of universities.

Quality assurance in higher education

Since the 1960s, Europe has seen an enormous increase in student numbers. This is a result not only of significant demographic growth after the Second World War, but also of a desire to transform university education into a mass activity—in other words, to provide 'education for the many'. The origins of this desire lay in political and ideological objectives, such as the emancipation of people in the lower socio-economic groups.

The 'massification' of higher education has profoundly altered universities everywhere in Europe. It has totally changed the scale of the institutions, and also the conditions governing their teaching and organization. One of its consequences has been that European governments, and also society at large, started to demand a high standard of quality of university

education programs. The universities, which are financed primarily by governments, had to prove that they really did provide high-quality education. For this reason, over the last two decades many European universities have been focusing on the quality assurance of their education programs. At the same time, many European countries have attached a high priority to developing, implementing and operating national systems of education quality assurance.

European unification

In the last decades—the EU has been actively involved in developing a 'European dimension' in education, encouraging the mobility of students and staff, and promoting cooperation between schools and universities. In this process, every member state of the EU retains full responsibility for the content of teaching and for the organization of its own education system; the EU's role is to encourage cooperation between member states and to financially support their activities. Various EU action programs, such as *Erasmus* and *Socrates*, have been developed to help universities initiate and extend programs for international collaboration and for student and staff exchange, and also to support students financially when they study abroad.

At the meeting of its Council in Lisbon in March 2000, the EU, in response to the challenges of globalization and of the information society, formulated a strategic objective for Europe "to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion". Research, both academic and industrial, has to provide the basis for this ambitious endeavor, and universities therefore play a central role in it. The determination of the EU to implement this strategy has led to the concept of the 'European Research and Innovation Area'. The *Sixth Framework Programme*, which is the main funding scheme for research collaboration of the EU, highlights the intertwining of research, knowledge production, technological innovation, and higher education. At the EU Council meeting in Barcelona in March 2002, the strategic objectives formulated at the Lisbon meeting were underlined and the ambition was formulated that Europe's education systems should become a "world quality reference by 2010". Shortly before this, in February 2002, the EU adopted a working program for a coherent overall approach to future national education policies. This would be based on three objectives: a) to improve the quality and effectiveness of education and training systems; b) to make lifelong learning more accessible to everyone; c) to increase the international outlook of our education and training systems.

The discussions on higher education have led to a series of agreements between the European ministers of education that will have far-reaching consequences for European higher education. Here is a brief look at some of the highlights of these agreements. On May 25, 1998—on the occasion of the 800th anniversary of the founding of the Sorbonne—the educa-

tion ministers of France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom signed a joint declaration on harmonizing the structure of European higher education. On June 19, 1999, ministers of education from 29 European countries signed a second declaration in Bologna. On May 19, 2001, in Prague, the ministers of education from 32 European countries released a communiqué in which they reconfirmed their plans. And on September 18 and 19, 2003, they held the fourth meeting on this subject in Berlin. Constructive suggestions for the implementation of the *Bologna Declaration* were formulated by the *European University Association* (EUA) at its convention in Salamanca on March 29—30, 2001, and these were offered to the ministers of education before their Prague meeting. At the EUA's convention on May 29—31, 2003, in Graz, additional conclusions and suggestions were formulated as input for the ministerial meeting in Berlin.

The intention of the *Sorbonne Declaration*, *Bologna Declaration* and *Prague Communiqué* is to bring about a far-reaching harmonization of the structure of the European higher education systems. It is also intended to improve the transparency of the systems—making it easier to compare them—and to achieve greater international mobility for students, teachers and researchers. In addition, the declarations aim to increase collaboration between European institutes of higher education and research. In the view of the signatories to the declarations, the Europe of the future should be not only a Europe of the euro, the banks and the economy, but also a 'Europe of knowledge'. They envisage a Europe in which, by spreading their study and work over more than one university, students and scientists will help to disseminate knowledge throughout the continent. They also envisage a Europe whose education system gives students every possible opportunity for self-development.

Strategic positioning of universities

It's now incontrovertible that most European universities pay serious attention to the quality assurance of their education programs. University managers are fully aware of the importance of this issue, and are prepared to take all actions necessary to improving quality. Europe is now entering the 'Age of Transparency and Strategic Positioning'. It's equally indisputable not only that there's a huge and growing population of potential students who want to participate in university education, but also that there's an enormous worldwide supply of universities. At the same time, the world has globalized and all kinds of regulations—both supra-nationally and at government level—have made it possible for students to study in other countries. So, the time has come to an end that a student, almost by definition, studies at a university in the region where he was born. In the future, European students can select a university anywhere in Europe that best meets their wishes, ambitions and talents.

To attract the modern 'mobile' students, a university has to show potential students why it's attractive for them to study there. European universities will increasingly try to 'position' themselves in strategically selected domains of the international education market, where they may best satisfy the demands of both their students and the employers of their graduates. Inevitably, this will create a far greater diversity of European universities.

6.2.2 Important Issues of Chinese Higher Education Policies

The current transition of the Chinese economy from a static, centrally planned economy to a dynamic socialist market economy, along with rapid economic growth, has led to a series of profound social and economic changes. During the 1990s, these changes have impacted the higher education system in the following especially striking ways.

Reform of the overall operation mechanism of Chinese higher education

The first and foremost issue for reforming Chinese higher education system is to establish a new institutional framework and operation mechanism fitting in with the new context of the dynamic market economy of the information age.

However, the existing institutional framework and operation mechanism of the Chinese higher education in the 1980s and 1990s was still basically the one, which took its shape in the context of the centrally planned economy since 1950s. It is not difficult to find that within such a framework the system is highly centralized, and universities were attachments to governmental agencies. The higher education system has been departmentalized and segmented. Obviously, such a higher education system based on the planning rationale could not well fit in with the new market economy.

In the new market economy, the interaction of labor market demand and supply are fundamental to the human resource model. It influences the wage structure by level and type of education, and the expected benefits from higher education as well as the demand for higher education opportunities. Such demands stimulate the provision of higher education, which results in the outputs of graduates from universities to labor market. The relative competitive advantage of the graduates of difference type and level education in the labor market performance will serve as a feedback to the university operation.

For example, if one type of graduates is over supplied, the competitive advantage of this type of graduates will be reduced in the labor market, thus the demands for this type educational opportunities will be reduced, too. So universities have to adjust their programs accordingly. This is what exactly happens in today's China. However, the market is not omnipo-

tent, not a panacea. Market failure also happens from time to time. Thus, the state will still have a very important role to play in this market context. The government will have many action channels in such new framework. It can influence, supervise and coordinate the operation of higher education system through (a) formulating and implementing the country's macroeconomic policies, which will influence the total demand and labor market needs, and which also influence the employment and wage policy in the public sector; (b) education policies and funding policies, such as financing those programs of national priorities; (c) developing a quality control system for higher education institutions; (d) establishing a legal infrastructure for both protecting and regulating the operation of colleges and universities; (e) and information services.

To develop and institutionalize such a new framework is a tremendous task, because there exist a strong structural inertia from the existing framework as well as from the existing conception of how higher education system should be. Thus, the key to higher education reform is the reform of the system of governance and administration. This should be a series of reforms, including reorientation of the government/university relationship, stipulation of the legal status of higher education institutions, granting more autonomy to universities enabling them operate according to the needs of socioeconomic development and labor market demands, but not dictated by the government plan. The state will function through formulating higher education laws and providing policy guidance, and through coordination, evaluation and accreditation. Much has been done along this direction of reform in recent years, and the new operation mechanism is now gradually replacing the old one.

Rapid expansion of enrollments

According to the Chronicle of Higher Education, in July 1999, MOE officials and the State Development Planning Commission announced that China's public regular colleges and universities would be allowed to enroll a total of 1.53 million new students, or 331,000 more than originally planned. The move started in 1999 was another attempt by the Chinese government to find new ways to revive the slumping economy. As pointed out, the perceived economic significance of family consumption and investment in higher education by the central authorities would help facilitate the pursuit of economies of scale in the higher education sector. But policy-makers' expectations to help reboot economic growth are the direct driving force for higher education to radically expand enrollments.

The higher education system has expanded very quickly over the last few years, with the number of new students enrolled in universities and colleges rising from 1 million in 1998, to 1.5 million in 1999, and to 2 million in 2000. In 2000, total postsecondary enrollments exceeded 10 million. Overall enrollment rates have reached about 10 percent of the age cohort.

It is estimated that postsecondary education enrollments will total 16 million by 2005, creating one of the largest higher education systems in the world. Enrollment rates will exceed 15 percent, which according to international standards would mark a transition from elite to mass higher education.

An MOE official explained that the effect of the increase on the economy is three-fold. First, the enrollment of more students in universities creates a demand for more buildings and equipment, which, in turn, will stimulate the development of some relevant sectors of the economy, such as construction and service industries. Second, there is a shift of over 300,000 high school students to tertiary education institutions each year (in the expansion). This will relieve pressure on the employment sector (by over 300,000 positions) at least for the next three or four years. Third, household money savings will flow out of the banks as more university students pay their tuition fees (Asian Times, 1999). Obviously, the expanding enrollment is intended to immediately stimulate consumption and reinvigorate domestic demand.

Many questions arise about the radical enrollment expansion. First and foremost, is there any significant empirical evidence to support the hypothesis that radical enrollment expansion will stimulate economic growth? After careful studies by Professor Wei Xin (1999) and his research group at Peking University, conservative answers were provided. On the side of supply of higher education, regular higher education institutions do not have the potential for expansion to the degree that policy-makers assumed. Nevertheless, it is almost impossible for the private institutions to expand enrollment under the current strict control of state regulations and rules. On the side of demand, the ability of the general public to pay tuition and fees is questionable. Currently, it is almost impossible for the governments to make such a huge investment. If this financial burden is transmitted to students and families through rising tuition and fees, higher education then becomes even more unaffordable for the low-income majority.

Second, what about the quality of education after colleges and universities expand their enrollments, some even beyond their capacities? To improve teaching and learning is a challenge for all institutions. For instance, specialized colleges normally offer 2—3 year certificate courses. But with the expansion of higher education in 1999, many 2—3-year colleges that are allowed to offer certificate courses are also providing bachelors degree courses. Guangming Daily (1999b) warned that this trend would threaten the quality of education.

Third, what about employment after four years of education? The National Coordination Workshop for Employment of University Graduates 1999 stated that the employment situation was not satisfactory in some ways because of the aftermath of the Asian financial crises and downsizing of governments and state-owned enterprises. MOE urged the relevant government agencies to offer opportunities to new graduates and it also asked universities to encourage students to enter non-government organizations and self-employment enterprises (Southern Daily, May 23, 1999). After three or four years, when the graduates are ready for

employment, can the unemployment pressure be relieved? Can the economy recover and labor markets be reinvigorated to take in the large number of college graduates?

Reform of higher education finance

The enrollment of higher education institutions in China rose from about 1 million in early 1980s to about 10 million in 2001. The higher education system expanded so fast that state appropriations for higher education simply could not keep up with the rising costs, which led to tight budgets for universities. Although the Chinese government has made a great effort to fund education, the fact is that today almost all universities and colleges face serious financial constraints. Obviously, without successful tackling the financial constraints, Chinese higher education system could not maintain a healthy development and upgrade its quality to international standard. The major financing restructures include the following points:

First, reform effort has been made to change the structure of government spending in favor of education. Despite the increase of the state appropriations to higher education since early 1980s, public expenditure on education in China remains relatively low by international standard. In the late 1990s, China spent less than 3% of its GDP on education, as compared with an average of 6% for developed countries and 4% for other developing countries. A decision was made in the late 1990s that the rate of increase of appropriation to education at all governmental levels should be higher than the rate of increase of their revenue. The unit allocation per student should be increased, and teacher salaries and non-salary per student allocation should be increased for teaching and learning purposes. The central government decided to increase its allocation to education by one percent of its total budget higher than previous year continuously for five years from 1999 to 2002, which means that in the year 2002, five percent more of total central budget of the country goes for education.

Second, developing a cost-sharing and cost-recovery system. In order to fill the gap between financial demand and supply, Chinese government and the departments concerned have been solving the problem through two paths: one is to enlarge financial resources and explore more channels to raise educational funds, the other is to improve the utilization efficiency of educational resources. Among many channels of fund-raising, cost-recovery policy implementation has been regarded as having theoretical support and practical value.

Chinese higher education institutions were totally funded by the government before the implementation of opening-up and reform policy. The Chinese central government announced a document of *Decision on the Reform of Educational System* in 1985. In this governmental document, the section related to tuition policy declared that higher education institutions "could enroll a small number of student who pay tuition". In fact, a few of institutions have begun to put this soon-to-be policy into practice before 1985. From the mid 1980s

to 1992, the two-track enrolment of paying tuition and no paying tuition existed at the same time in Chinese higher education system. The majority of students did not need to pay tuition and boarding fees. A small amount of students paid tuition and fees for higher education enrollment. In 1992, the State Education Commission of China made a proposal of one-track enrollment policy. Since 1993, more and more higher education institutions have changed the enrollment policy from two-track to one-track. In 1997, each college student began to pay a certain percentage of recurrent expenditure per student for higher education. Cost recovery policy has been implemented in all regular higher education institutions in China (Chinese website, read at 10.09.2000 http://www.edu.cn).

Third, another reform in financing higher education is to allow universities to take their human capital advantage and the advantage of science and technology to generate revenue by themselves. This is one of the promising strategies for increasing resources to higher education. The revenue generated by universities themselves increased remarkably since 1985 when higher education institutions were given autonomy to do so. Universities could generate funds by research contracts with industries, by technical consultation for enterprises and communities. Universities could also generate revenue by providing commissioned training and educational service for industries, and mobilize resources through fund-raising activities.

Fourth, universities are also encouraged to improve their financial situations through enhancing management to improve institutional efficiency and effectiveness to turn a relatively high cost system into a more cost-efficient and cost-effective one. It could be achieved by internal reorganization of universities and colleges to rationalize small departments, broaden specialties, eliminate duplications of programs, and make more effective use of staff and physical resources including raising student/teacher ratio (from 3:1 in 1983 to 16:1 in 2000) and improving utilization of classrooms and laboratories. Arrangements should be made whereby institutions or departments could share expensive equipment, faculty and other resources. One possible approach for cost-saving is to achieve economies of scale, which lies in consolidating small institutions into larger ones together with efficiency measures mentioned above.

6.3   The Main Solutions to Higher Education Policy

The rise of the knowledge-based economy has generated new global infrastructures that information technology has played an increasingly important role in the global economy, the popularity and prominence of information technology has unquestionably changed the nature of knowledge, and is currently restructuring higher education, research and learning. The changes in the socio-economic context resulting from the globalized economy have

inevitably led to changes to the university sector. It is in such a wider policy context that an increasing number of institutions of higher learning are being established with new missions and innovative configurations of training, serving populations that previously had little access to higher education. In addition, the rapid expansion of higher education in the past few decades in many countries has also created the need for reform. Apart from accommodating a larger number of students, higher education institutions are required to improve their administrative efficiency and accountability in response to the demands of different stakeholders like government, business, industry, and labour organizations, students and parents as well. As we are heading into an age of communication and information, there is a strong need to rethink about the nature of knowledge and the way education is operated and run. What we are now confronting is to move from having a quality education system for *most* people to developing a quality education system for *all*. In order to promote life-long learning/continual education and to make the society a learning society, the way that education is managed should have undertaken a fundamental change. The EU and China governments have to tackle their unique educational issues and problems by different solutions.

6.3.1 Developing a 'European dimension' by Means of Mobility and Co-operation Programmes

The EU is promoting convergence and comparable qualifications in higher education, for example, through co-ordinated reforms, compatible systems and common action. The EU does not have a common education policy; on the contrary, its role is to create a system of genuine cooperation between the Member States by preserving the rights of each Member State in terms of the content and organization of its education and training systems. The challenge facing the European Commission and its Directorate-General for Education and Culture is to help preserve the best of the diversity of educational experience in Europe, while harnessing it to raise standards, remove obstacles to learning opportunities and meet the educational requirements of the 21st century.

Since the Lisbon European Council in March 2000, the European Union, in response to the challenges of globalization and the information society, set out its new strategic objective for the coming decade, that is: becoming the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. This implies major changes, particularly efforts to strengthen cooperation on education and training policy. A detailed work programme on the future objectives of education and training systems has been prepared for this purpose. It will be implemented using the "open method of coordination" between Member States, which was also defined in Lisbon. This new instrument will hopefully pave the way for coherent

policies in areas such as education where a "common policy" is not feasible but where there is a real need for a "European educational area". The Barcelona European Council (March 2002) underlined these ambitions by pointing out that education was one of the bases of the European social model and that Europe's education systems should become a "world quality reference" by 2010.

The drive towards more diversified and constructive Community-wide cooperation in these fields has proved irreversible. Considerations other than mobility alone have gradually assumed greater significance. Yet the basic premises of cooperation remain, that its success depends on the exceptional variety of education and training systems throughout the Community.

The situation in Europe is, however, not homogenous. Differences are associated with differences in educational structures and funding systems. Diversity between countries is generally considered one of the most important assets of the continent. At the same time cooperation on European level is sometimes hindered by structural differences and there are several initiatives to cope with obstacles that may reduce the efficiency of European economy, particularly within the EU.

6.3.2 Restructuring Chinese Higher Education System by Means of Reform and Openness

Unlike EU cooperation, the higher education reform in China was started in the mid-1980s when the CPC had attempted to create more opportunities for higher education. Right after the Cultural Revolution in the mid-1970s, China was in lack of qualified staff and appropriate curricula, resources and facilities. Therefore, the Chinese authorities decided to borrow knowledge, techniques and technologies from the West. Teachers were brought into universities from overseas to provide Chinese staff and students with access to foreign learning. Meanwhile thousands of Chinese students were sent overseas to study for higher degrees. After restoration and consolidation for a few years, reforms of higher education were launched in the mid-1980s.

There is a relationship between unit recurrent cost and the size of the enrollment, that is "efficiency of scale", the larger a school, the lower the cost. Chinese universities should significantly reduce costs if they could increase student teacher ratios. During the 1990s the Chinese government looked to mergers as a way for improving economies of scale and creating strong, comprehensive universities. Mergers were thought to be the shortcut to producing world-class universities, because they would theoretically be academically prestigious and create comprehensive universities large enough to handle increasing enrollments (Chen, 2001).

6.4   Trends of Higher Education Policies

6.4.1 A Surprisingly Dynamic Process of Convergence in European Higher Education

In the wake of the Sorbonne Declaration signed in May 1998 by a more limited number of countries, the Bologna Declaration on the creation of a European space for higher education is a pledge taken by 29 countries to reform the structures of their own higher education system in such a way that overall convergence emerges from the process at the European level.

In several aspects, the degree structure, credit systems and quality assurance, European countries are harmonizing their higher education systems. How do we operationalize europeanization? I argue that europeanization equals transformational change in general, and with respect to government policies in particular. Transformational change denotes both the emergence of new supranational policies at the EU level and national adaptation towards these. Together, these aspects are phrased policy convergence.

Policy convergence is measured and identified by "decreasing variations in relevant indicators" of EU and national policies (Martin & Simmons, 1998:753). Far reaching convergence implies the replacement of existing national policies with a comprehensive new community policy. More moderate convergence implies a merger or integration of community and national policies (Hèritier, 2001, 44). The lack of policy replacement or policy integration is labeled policy divergence. Policy divergence is measured and identified by increased variation in relevant indicators of policy. Hence, the distinction between policy convergence and divergence refers to the degree to which domestic policies are, or become more, similar to EU policies. This distinction has to do with the degree to which different policies appear like images of one another (Bennett, 1991). Convergence is often seen as a fixed state of affairs, denoting policies 'being more alike'. However, the concept of convergence also attributes a dynamic element of 'becoming more alike' (Bennett, 1991, 219). This latter conception of convergence, however, does not imply unidirectional or linear processes of convergence.

Different yardsticks might measure europeanization (Olsen, 2002). Scholars measure europeanization by focusing on particular processes of policy shaping, policy-making, policy implementation and policy re-formulation at the EU and the national levels of governance (e.g. Rometsch & Wessels, 1996). Other scholars emphasize particular institutional and constitutional traits of the EU together with aspects of institutional adaptation at the national level (e.g. Egeberg, 2001; Knill, 2001). The degree of europeanization is measured by assessing the degree of convergence in policy content across levels of governance (Kjellberg & Reitan, 1995, 21). The content of politics refer to the problems to be solved, the general and more specific objectives and goals to be reached, the normative basis for politics, as well as the instruments applied for implementation (Bennett, 1991, 218; Kjellberg & Reitan, 1995). The

Europeanized policy is seen synonymous with the convergence of policy content across levels of governance. In the long run the issue of quality (including quality standards and quality assurance) will be of crucial importance. Globalization and marketization of higher education will ask for greater worldwide transparency in standards and quality benchmarks. Europe will be able to defend its own political legacy in higher education policy when it will be able to anticipate and take the lead in a more global approach on standards and quality.

6.4.2 Policy Shifts toward Decentralization and Diversification in China

Decentralization of administration

Like the Chinese economic system, the higher education system was highly centralized for many years. The existing higher education system in China basically derived from the Soviet model, and its pattern of governance is still a prominent force in its impact on the universities. In recent years, however, Chinese higher education has been shifting from a rigid model of state control to a model of state supervision that is more in accord with the transformation from a planned to a market economy.

Before reform started in the 1980s, higher education governance could be characterized a "centralized" or "state dominated" model in China. Under such a governing model, the Ministry of Education (MOE) took responsibility for the design of curricula and syllabuses, designing textbooks, student admission, graduate job assignment and exerted control over matters like budgets, salary scales and personnel issues (Mok, 1996). Provincial and local education commissions and bureaus were just mediators of national policy. Such a centralized governance model is found to be inefficient in administration and ineffective in service delivery. In order to create more higher education opportunities, the Chinese government has adopted a policy of decentralization since the 1980s to transfer of authority (particularly financial) and decision-making from higher to lower levels. Under the policy of decentralization, local governments are given more flexibility and autonomy to chart the course of higher education development. It is particularly true for those socio-economically prosperous regions, i.e. the southeastern coastal areas, where the provincial or municipal governments can allocate more resources to finance higher education. Now the MOE is charged with responsibilities to coordinate higher education development, while the central government and local government are engaged into a new relationship in light of the principle of "*gongjian*" (joint administration). By "*gongjian*", we mean the local governments are charged with more responsibilities in higher education financing, provision and management while the central government only acts the roles of regulator and coordinator. In addition, local governments

have to manage staff establishment, labor and wage of universities; while individual universities now enjoy far more autonomy and flexibility to run their own businesses (Mok & Ngok, 2001; Mok & Chan, 2001; Mok, 2001b).

In the past decades or so, a few major reforms related to higher education were introduced, with the central features of decentralization and marketization (Kwong, 1997; Yin & White, 1994; Mok, 1997). It is note-worthy that the comprehensive higher education reform blue-print places emphasis on local responsibility, diversity of educational opportunities, multiple sources of educational funds, and decentralization of power to individual higher education institutions in the governance of their own affairs despite the fact that the State Education Commission (SEC) still performed the role of "guiding" and "monitoring" the whole higher education sector (Mok & Ngok, 2001).

Our above discussion has suggested that although the nature of the state/government does change in a very broad sense, what actually transformed is the state moving from the primarily carrying out most of the work of education itself to determining where the work will be done and by whom. In terms of control, we also observe that the state may take different roles in different governance activities, thus the extent of state intervention is found varied.

The discernible trend of restructuring of the role of the state in running the public sector has undoubtedly affected the governance of education, and eventually led to a fundamental change in state-education relationships. One of the changes is the adoption of decentralization policy. Educational decentralization is a popular reform of governments around the world even diversified strategies and outcomes that different countries have adopted (Hanson, 1998). One point that deserves attention here is that when talking about centralization and decentralization, they are processes of "-ization" rather than static situations. We must also note that the range of models for the governance of education is very wide. A scrutiny of the recent developments in China has suggested that even though the policy of decentralization has been adopted, the state's role as a regulator and overall service coordinator has been strengthened rather than weakened.

Diversification in financing

Because a market economy gradually replaced the rigid centralized planning, and localities and employers could retain much of their earnings without including them for taxes, the growth of government revenues fell far behind that of GDP, increasing at an annual average of only 2.6% (World Bank, 1997).

Unlike many developed countries, China has not sufficiently utilized private resources to support public higher education. Though booming in 1990s, private higher education in China is still under strict governmental control and scrutiny. The reasons for this practice

stem from the government's political and ideological considerations, the profit orientations and the low quality of education in private colleges and universities.

Under the centralized command plan system before the reform started, higher education institutions were exclusively financed through governmental appropriation according to budgetary planning. The previous year's allocation was used as basis for the next year's allocation, with possible incremental adjustment according to the situations of the institution and the whole sector. Unused funds, if any, had to be returned to governments by institutions at the end of the year. The centralized, tightly controlled budgetary system did not provide incentives and initiatives for efficient utilization of funds and institutional efficiency improvements.

The higher education financing system has been restructured through educational reforms. The major financing restructures include the following. First, along with decentralization in administration and management, decentralization in financing has been achieved. The central government delegated financing responsibilities to provinces and central ministries to finance institutions. Second, institutional autonomy and a simple formula-based approach (i.e., head-count of enrollment) were introduced in funding institutions. The institutions are given autonomy in spending money, and the governance authorities exercise the supervisory functions to hold institutions accountable in addition to overseeing their political correctness. The institutions are not required to return the unused funds at the end of the budgetary year. Third, financing is diversified in order to mobilize resources. The institutions are encouraged to generate and mobilize resources in any possible way.

6.5   Summary on the Differences

The higher education and university system in Europe is very diverse. The Bologna process constitutes an effort to organize the diversity within a more coherent compatible and transparent European framework. The organization and funding of higher education in Europe vary: in some countries responsibility lies with central government and in others with local and regional government. Although education in the EU is the responsibility of the Member States, it is important that efforts be stepped up at European Union level to improve the quality and competitiveness of European higher education. Among the new challenges facing European higher education institutions are the internationalization of education and research, pressure to increase student numbers, the need to intensify cooperation with the surrounding society, changes in the ways knowledge is produced and new social functions. The fast-changing working environment and accelerating pace of technological development present challenges for European higher education and research, but also offer new opportunities which it must be possible to harness effectively. Therefore, Europe needs excellence in

its universities to optimize the processes which underpin the knowledge society and to meet the target, set out by the European Council in Lisbon, of becoming "the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world". Higher education institutions have an important part to play in achieving this goal. Their role in innovation processes has grown and their impact on the economic competitiveness of regions, regional development in general and social cohesion is considerable. Universities and equivalent institutions are crucial to ensuring the success not only of Europe as a whole but also of its various regions.

For about two decades since the late 1970s, higher education in China has been experiencing tremendous changes and reforms. The reforms such as policy shifts toward decentralization of administration and diversification of financing have resulted in a great development in a number of fronts in the higher education sector. The rapid expansion in enrollments, reported to have increased to about 10 percent (Plafker, 1999) at the end of the century, was hailed as transition toward mass higher education (Hayhoe, 1993). However, compared with the general practice in the European higher education system, the first impression of the Chinese higher education system appears, among others, diseconomies of scale, short in history, and immature in development.

There were only 1,000 public regular colleges and universities in China, with a total enrollment of less than four million before 1999, which is the start of expansion in higher education when the enrollment ratio reached 10 percent. According to most recent Chinese official statistics, the number of these public institutions with an enrollment of 5,000 or more is less than one-seventh (CSSB, 1996, pp. 112—113). The average enrollment increased from 2,927 in 1996 to 3,112 in 1997 (CEY Editorial Board, 1998). Obviously, there exist diseconomies of scale in the higher education sector.

In terms of history, the first university (now Peking University) in the modern sense was established in 1898. After that, sociopolitical instability and turbulence in China in the first half of twentieth century largely precluded serious development of higher education. After the founding of the People's Republic in 1949, the higher education sector, though it soon gained great development under strong influence of the Soviet model, was nearly abolished during the most radical years of Cultural Revolution (1966—1976) (Cleverly, 1985). After 1978, the American model of higher education was the one copied in China (Pepper, 1996).

Still at a stage of immature development, the higher education system in China is now more likely to be hyperpoliticized and ideologized even in the reform era. Still struggling to grow out of the political control and command plan, higher education institutions are not well prepared for either the opportunities or the challenges of the free market. Besides, most institutions do not have clearly defined missions, performance-based management, or financing mechanisms. Few institutions have long-range institutional development goals. Internal and external inefficiencies and resource waste are still prevalent. Furthermore, after the policy of tuition and fees was applied in all public regular institution in 1996, effective

and adequate financial aids from governments are generally unavailable, nor is the perfect market available where students and parents of poor families can obtain loans to invest in higher education. It is very difficult for students from poor families to obtain equal higher educational opportunities.

Compared with the fully developed EU counterpart, higher education in China, to a certain extent, is still fumbling toward institutional autonomy, academic independence, and professional development. Chinese higher education institutions are making efforts to overcome inefficiencies, inequities, and underdevelopment (World Bank, 1997) through, for example, obtaining World Bank loans and following its recommendations. The new "Great Leap Forward" in the enrollment expansion in 1999 is the radical move that the policy decision-makers deem as a new way to develop higher education and, more importantly, to help revive the nation's economy.

After the Cultural Revolution, Chinese policy makers chose resolutely to give lower levels of the society more responsibility and to distinguish between the CPC, the local government, and enterprises. Each of these elements should have its own responsibilities. The central government wanted step back from the Soviet economic and organizational model, which was no longer deemed to be the only model that could solve economic and societal problems. This opened the way for more decentralization in all parts of Chinese society, a process that had long since been very popular in the West. This development inspired a new policy approach in China and had a tremendous impact on the organization of Chinese higher education. In spite of the establishment of a more market-oriented organization of institutions of higher education and an important decision by the Ministry of Education in 1999 to expand the enrollment in higher education, the actual enrollment as a proportion of the 18 to 22 year olds did not change very much. In comparison with the developed countries, gross enrollment in higher education is still low because China has kept the system of selective entrance exams for students intact.

The knowledge-based economy throughout the world is having a strong impact on the development of Chinese society, in a wide area of the economy, science, technology, and culture, and especially on the development of Chinese higher education. During this developmental process, along with the economic transition, all aspects of Chinese higher education have undergone very profound changes to meet the challenge of international competition and to adapt the higher education management to the needs of China's socialist modernization construction. As a consequence, higher education administration has been reformed.

The government has instituted a framework under which most of the institutions of higher education are administered by provincial governments and are operated jointly by local and central governments. The provincial governments now enjoy greater responsibility, authority and benefits in bringing local higher education under their unified planning. The central government is now trying to restrict itself to the planning and macro-management at

the national level. The institutions of higher education have been gradually given full responsibility for their operations. In conclusion, it can be seen that the Chinese higher-education management system and the organizational structures have been continuously changing and developing. These reforms are likely to continue. With each process of reforming the higher education system, new problems have arisen and will continue to arise. Whether the reforms have been successful is yet to be determined.

In summary, different higher education goals, different important issues and different solutions lead to the different trends between the EU and China. Higher education is becoming increasingly internationalized both in its reach and curricula (OECD, 1996b). Increasing internationalization—understood as a worldwide integration process in which neither borders nor nation states are dissolved—has fuelled regionalization trends all over the world. Maybe the most important (successful, that is) example is the case of European integration. The EU is promoting convergence and comparable qualifications in higher education, for example, through co-ordinated reforms, compatible systems and common action. The higher education system seems to be moving towards higher convergence. However, there is also a distinction between internal and external internationalization in the case of EU. European education systems are responding to a largely common set of pressures and problems with diverse solutions, which are conditioned by their specific national institutions and histories (Meijer, 1991). While in China, higher education system has become more flexible, the trends towards decentralization and diversification are obvious.

The Chinese government endeavor in various ways to promote the internationalization of higher education. In spite of this endeavor, chronic problems represent barriers for academic globalization. Chinese higher education is highly bureaucratic, educational administrators in Chinese colleges and universities still have authoritative attitudes and leadership styles that are obstacles for promoting university autonomy and diversity.

Therefore, one should recognize the gap, which mainly in the ideas and management related to higher education policy between the EU and China. China should learn much more modern ideas and successful experiences from European higher education. However, one should also not forget that China is still a developing nation with over 800 million people in the countryside, making it a daunting task to move from a rural to an urban society. Further, China is still in the process of making the transition from a planned economy to a market economy. The complexity of making these two transitions at once presents enormous challenges. If one looks back to see what China has achieved over the past two decades when it was determined to follow the path of openness and reform, there is every reason to be optimistic on what's the future would be if China can maintain the course of knowledge for development. From my perspective, the changes in China are positive and important. They benefit the Chinese people, giving them more opportunities to attend a college or university, and they help facilitate global exchange and cooperation. Not only more students enrolled

but also, more importantly, there was a strategic shift in Chinese higher education from an elite-oriented to a public-oriented system. This will lead to improved intellectual standards in China and will enhance the chances of social mobility. However, great efforts must also be made in order to establish a modern higher education system with distinct Chinese characteristics.

Chapter 7

Main Similarities of Higher Education Policy in the EU and China

The higher education is changing throughout the world, especially during the last two decades. The demand is growing rapidly for higher education services, private providers emerge, globalization enter in the higher education institutions, students became more demanding and governments are no longer able to provide sufficient funds for higher education providers. Governments in the society are increasingly concerned about the role of higher education in improving the competitiveness of their countries, and their place in regional and global markets. The purpose of this chapter is to find main similarities of higher education policies in the EU and China and analyse how the two systems have been affected by similar global trends. The main emphasis will be put on the emergence of private higher education and improvement for education system and curriculum.

7.1 The Emergence of Privatization of Higher Education in the EU and China

7.1.1 The Privatization of Higher Education in the EU

Privatization of higher education is not a new phenomenon in the world of economy. But privatization has assumed greater significance as a policy strategy of the development of education in recent times, essentially, but not wholly, due to stagnating—and in some countries declining—public budgets for education, on the one hand, and on the other, increasing social demand for higher education, manifested in slogans like "higher education for all" (Roderick & Stephens, 1979).

There has been remarkable growth in privatization during the last two or three decades in several countries of the world. Private education has grown for several reasons, which can be summed up in two categories: excess demand and differentiated demand for higher education (James, 1987). First, the social demand for higher education exceeds the public supply,

and the private market seeks to meet the unsatisfied demand. Secondly, demand for different quality/presumably high quality and content in education also contributes to the growth of privatization. On the supply side, private entrepreneurs are ready to provide higher education either for philanthropic or other altruistic motives, or for profit. The dividends could be social and political gains, or quick economic profits.

The nature and scope of private colleges and universities vary worldwide. In much of Europe, postsecondary education is almost exclusively state supported, with only a very limited private sector—mainly comprised of religious institutions that provide theological education. Tuition is nominal, with virtually the whole higher education budget coming from the state. In Western Europe, there is no significant trend toward the expansion of private universities, whereas in Central and Eastern Europe, private initiatives are showing the largest growth.

As we have analyzed in the previous background chapter, China copied the total political, economic, and cultural patterns and practices of the Soviet Union. Higher education came increasingly to resemble the Soviet system in the 1950's and 1960's. The same influence is found in the new EU members from the former USSR. The system of higher education of some new EU members was a part of a massive system established by the former Soviet Union. The system was characterized by tremendous differentiation in types and missions of institutions. Higher education institutions were centrally financed and controlled through the education ministries. They existed to train citizens for all sorts of skilled roles in economic production, science, and culture. And the wide variety of higher education institutions that were established in the Soviet era continues to exist in present-day. There are comprehensive universities in addition smaller institutes focused on teacher training, foreign languages, technology (separate academies for engineering and petroleum sciences, for example), agriculture, law, economics, medicine, fine arts, and physical education.

The collapse of the former Soviet Union has propelled its former republics along tortuous paths toward self-determination. Some of the new members from former Soviet Union have undertaken projects to improve the delivery of public policies by means of private ownership and market arrangements. For example, after the collapse of communism Poland implemented a lot of institutional changes in almost every field of economy. The privatization (selling off the public assets) was widespread, so higher education was one of the many activities where the rules of the market started to play the major role. The policy was to enable and facilitate the adjustment of universities and colleges to the new circumstances that occurred after 1989. In 1990 the Act on Higher Education was implemented by polish government established rules for founding private higher education providers, tax exemption for non–profit higher education institutions. The restrictions that affected the student's freedom to choose the higher education providers were lifted, and greater authority and responsibility was delegated to higher education institutions. The act introduced new institutional arrangements that were very different from the previous one. Existing public universities and colleges had to adapt to new circumstances and to work out skills and ways of acting that would let them

survive and develop. Many private providers emerged in the higher education field and relief the state of provision the educational services. All these changes lead to create a new shape of Polish higher education.

The growth of private higher education in Hungary is an important element in the effort to train students in fields now greatly in demand. Also, the private sector is expected to help achieve national targets for increased enrollments, but without a concomitant increase in state support. The 1997 White Paper on higher education describes a coherent government development policy over the medium term (1997—2002). The Paper assigns an important role to the development of private higher education, which should greatly contribute to an expansion of enrollments as well as competition in market-oriented fields of study.

7.1.2 The Privatization of Higher Education in China

Like her Western and European counterparts, the emergence of the commodity house, fee-charging principle adopted in medical and health care, and the rise of private schools in socialist China are highly indicative that China has followed a global trend of "marketization" and "privatization" (Harris, 1990; Wong, 1994). The principle of marketization (*shichanghua)* denotes a process whereby education becomes a commodity provided by competitive suppliers, educational services are priced and access to them depends on consumer calculations and ability to pay" (Yin & White, 1994).

Different countries (regardless of their levels of development) have a varied public-private mix of educational services (James, 1992; Tilak, 1991). The globalization of the Chinese economy is compelling universities to adapt and compete like never before. With the phasing out of a planned economy, Chinese higher education has moved toward reforms similar to those in other parts of the world, including a proliferation of non-government-supported institutions of higher education. Privately run (*minban*) colleges and universities are entering the scene for the first time since 1949, and their numbers are increasing rapidly. By 1998, the number of privately run (*minban*) colleges and universities was put at 1,800. The government identifies over 1,000, enrolling close to one million (950,000) students. However, quality is a problem, and only 37 of these colleges and universities have approval to issue standard credentials. Of these 37, only 4 issue a standard undergraduate degree.

Economic modernization drive has not only fostered the growth of a market economy but has also caused a structural change in education. The flourishing market economy and the policy of decentralization adopted by the Chinese leadership have supported the emergence and growth of private higher education in China. All in all, the resurgence and growth of private higher education indicates that China has already shifted from state monopoly to a mixed economy of education. Reshuffling the monopolistic role of the state in educational provision, reform in educational structure started in the mid-1980s has manifested a con-

vergence towards a mix of private and public provision (Cheng, 1995; Hayhoe, 1996; Mok, 1996).

Adopting the policy of decentralization in China's educational realm has allowed far more flexibility and diversity in the delivery of educational services in the mainland (Cheng, 1995). Unlike the previous era when the state held primary responsibility for the provision of educational services, and thereby uniformity could be maintained, the emergence of an educational market in the 1990s thus offers an alternative or a complement to the public/state run educational system. The CPC has gradually "forsaken" its monopoly over the provision of educational opportunities, thus fostering the growth of various types of schools run by the non-state sector (Cheng, 1994, 1995; Mok, 1996). Re-emphasizing the importance of individual responsibilities and encouraging local communities and social organizations to create additional educational opportunities, the state has continuously reduced its subsidy, provision and regulation in the educational realm (Liang, 1993; Cheung & Iu, 1995).

The private education law of PRC, promulgated on December 28, 2002, is China's first national legislation on private education. The three articles (16, 53, and 55) of the law covers mainly on higher education. The law's main thrust concerning higher education is to provide a legal framework to facilitate private growth and initiate a longer process to accredit, merge, dismantle, and change institutions at that level. Above all, the emergence of private education in China has revealed that China's education is going through a process of "privatization" and "marketization". The recent changes in China's educational provision have clearly indicated the retreat of the state in terms of provision, regulation and subsidy of educational services. This development markedly hints at a trend of "privatization" in the educational arena.

In short, the market-oriented re-allocation of financial resources, the extension of fee paying, the encouragement of private education, the commercialization of intellectual property and the reduction of state provision have clearly shown that a market oriented approach has emerged in China's educational sphere. Even though the state has not deliberately set out to promote private education, there are obvious reasons to believe that the state's persistent call for decentralization and diversification of educational services has created ample room for the growth of private education. Revitalizing local initiatives, individual efforts and overseas support, the central government therefore encourages a more direct relationship between those who provide educational services and those who pay for them, thereby a close partnership between the industrial field and the educational sector has been developed (Xu, 1990). Re-focusing curricula towards a more practical orientation and emphasizing the importance of vocational training, together with the flourishing of private education in the 1990s and the emergence of fee-paying students, are highly suggestive that China's education has become more responsive to the new market setting (Yin & White, 1994).

One point which deserves attention here is that, even though the above discussion has suggested that educational development in the 1990s has undergone the process of privatization

and quasi-marketization, the development of which has not yet reached the point at which an "internal market" as such has evolved. In the present situation, the split between purchaser and provider is not as clear in China's educational realm as it is in her Western counterparts. In addition, China's recent educational development resembles the Western experience of privatization and marketization by a "slimming of the state" to deliver more efficient and effective public services. Nonetheless, a closer scrutiny indicates that China's experience of privatization or quasi-marketization is certainly different from her Western counterparts. It is note worthy that the strategies of privatization and marketization adopted by the CPC are highly "instrumental" one, the use of which is intended to improve administrative efficiency and effectiveness rather than to mark a fundamental shift of value orientation towards "public choice" ideas because the CPC has not committed itself ideologically to the private sector (Christiansen, 1996).

Compared with government-controlled common colleges and universities, the proportion of private institutions is still quite small. Unlike the EU countries, China has not sufficiently utilized private resources to support public higher education. Though booming in 1990s, private higher education in China is still under strict governmental control and scrutiny. The reasons for this practice stem from the government's political and ideological considerations, the profit orientations and the low quality of education in private colleges and universities.

Unlike the EU or the "marketization" experiences in the West, the Chinese "marketization of education" has not yet entirely oriented a "managerial approach" thereby reforms in managing educational institutions and the introduction of control mechanisms in the university sector are believed to be effective ways to improve the performance, efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery (Taylor et al., 1997; Welch, 1998). What really characterizes Chinese experience of "marketization" is closely related to the "institutional transition", meaning a transition from a highly centralized economic planning system to the market economy (Li, 1997). In the midst of the transition, the Chinese Government has gradually retreated from the public domain, trying to mobilize non-state sectors and governments at the local level to engage in public service/policy provision. As such, market forces are being adopted to generate additional resources to run education. Thus, the marketization of higher education project in China could be understood more fully by examining the interactions between the demonopolization of state's role in the public domain and the challenges and pressures resulting from the institutional transition, together with the need to create more higher education opportunities to further develop its economy. Seen in this light, the Chinese mercerization project has been locally driven rather than purely driven by the growing impact of globalization.

Analyzing the current educational developments in China from a public policy perspective, we may find that the higher education reforms in China is pursued within the context of managing state-building (or government-capacity) and economic growth in a state-directed

(or government-directed) paradigm of governance rather than to de-power the state/government. In addition, the introduction of higher education reforms in the society can be interpreted as the strategies adopted by the government to cope with problems of political and bureaucratic governance instead of purely problems of severe economic and social difficulties.

Despite the fact that the government has initiated policy of decentralization in the higher education sector in the recent years to allow individual universities to have more autonomy to be responsible for their own development plans, it is wrong to argue that the state/government has retreated entirely from the higher education domain. Instead, the government of China has taken a rather proactive approach to review their higher education systems and started reforms to nurturing more creative and innovative citizens for future development. Even though we may identify similar patterns and trends in higher education developments in the EU and China, our above discussion has suggested that the EU and the Chinese government are able to make use of the globalization discourse to package/shape the local political agenda. Most important of all, the above study has revealed that the presence of diverse regional, national and local agendas have given different meanings to common so-called global trends (Cheung, 2000).

7.2 Position of Higher Education

The emergence of a global higher education market in the second half of the 1990s and enhanced international competition have led to a growing awareness of the need to strengthen the position of European higher education. These realities formed one of the main arguments in favor of the curricular changes leading to compatibility with international degree structures—that is, the development of a European Higher Education Area.

The Bologna Declaration was the start of a process that will lead to the creation of a European higher education area. Much of the attention after the Bologna meeting was focused on the implementation of a two-tier degree system. At the Prague meeting the emphasis appeared to have shifted to the importance of quality assurance, recognition issues, and accreditation. The ministers stressed the quality of education and research as crucial issues in the realization of the European higher education area. The ministers also agreed on the importance of enhancing the attractiveness of European higher education to students from Europe and other parts of the world. The readability and comparability of European higher education degrees worldwide should be promoted by the development of a common framework of qualifications, as well as by coherent quality assurance and accreditation or certification mechanisms and increased information efforts. The challenge will be whether institutions of higher education in Europe will be able to cross regional and national boundaries to become players in the European and global higher education market.

It would be noted that EU Salamanca (2001) pointed to the importance of maintaining as guiding principles the autonomy of higher education; higher education as a public, rather than a commercial, good; and its diversity in terms of languages, systems, types, profiles, and curricular orientation. Quality assurance, compatible qualifications, and attractiveness are seen as crucial elements for the realization of the new European higher education space.

In addition to the trend of educational decentralization, higher education development in China has been affected by the strong tide of marketization and privatization. Universities nowadays experience pressures from governments, the main providers of higher education, to demonstrate maximum outputs from the financial inputs they are given. At a time of economic constraint, people begin to ask for better use of limited public money, thus more attention is given to the issue of "value for money" and how the investment in higher education can really facilitate social and economic development (Mok & Lo, 2001; Lee, 2000; Law, 2001). In order to make the delivery of higher education more efficient and effective, there has been an increasingly popular trend of marketization and privatization in the higher education sector in China (Kwong, 2000; Bray, 2000).

Similar to the experiences in European developed countries, such changes are closely related to the "marketization" of education, hence private sector principles are adopted to run education (Whitty, 1997). In order to reduce the state's increasing burden, different market-related strategies are adopted such as the increase of student tuition fees, reduction in state's budget in higher education, strengthening the relationship between the university sector and the industrial and business sectors, and encouraging universities and academics to engage into business and market-like activities to generate more revenue/incomes. Obviously, the recent proposed reforms in these societies are concerned with the ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their higher education systems (Mok, 2000b, 2001; Bray, 2000; Hawkins, 2000).

After the official endorsement of the socialist market system in the 1990s, strong market forces have affected educational development. Despite the leaders' discomfort about the term of "privatization", signs of state withdrawal from the provision of social welfare are clear. In the last decade or so, the Chinese government has allowed the rise of the market in the education sector. The emergence of private educational institutions, the shift of state responsibility in educational provision to families and individuals, the prominence of fee-charging, the growth of privately run (*minban*) colleges and universities, as well as the introduction of internal competition among higher educational institutions have clearly suggested that Chinese higher education has been experiencing a process of marketization. The Chinese people are very much concerned about higher education and there has been a very strong need for more higher education opportunities. Acknowledging the fact that depending upon the central government alone can never satisfy the pressing demands for higher education, Chinese residents are willing to spend their own savings on providing their kids with higher education

(Zhu, 2000; Li, 2000). It is against such a socio-economic context that market principles and practices are adopted to run higher education in China (Yin & White, 1994; Kwong, 1996, 1997; Mok, 1997, 1999, 2000; Mok & Chan, 2001; Chan & Mok, 2001).

Today, as higher education becomes more competitive and market forces play a bigger role in the structure and behavior of colleges and universities, individual institutions will need to interact with the market in order to remain competitive and survive. Academic leaders will need the power to make programmatic changes swiftly, collaborate with other academic and corporate entities, even to raise venture capital, as they strive to keep up with the demands of constituents and the fast pace of change in society. The market for education has become far more diverse and competitive. Surviving and thriving in this environment requires organizations that are light on their feet, ones that are able to adapt quickly to changing crosscurrents and to seize the new opportunities these challenges create. However, market forces and increased autonomy are not a simple panacea for all of European and Chinese higher education's problems. They must be approached with great care, and they must be used with other policies that protect against the unwanted side effects that often accompany market forces.

7.3   The Focus on Improving Educational System and Curriculum

"A key to success in the knowledge-based economy is a trained labour force. It is not surprising that so many countries have focused on improving their educational system" (Stiglitz, 1999). He argues that success in the knowledge-based economy requires creativity, higher order cognitivity skills in addition to basic skills. Those countries that find ways of fostering this kind of creativity will, in the long run, have a competitive advantage in the knowledge-based economy.

7.3.1 Towards a New European Higher Educational System and Curriculum

One of the major trends in many EU countries is a strong governmental push towards shorter studies, reducing the *real* duration of studies to the official. More recently, governments have articulated plans to reduce also the theoretical duration of studies. The development of two-tier curricula including a shorter first qualification plus postgraduate studies can also be seen in this context. In many European higher education institutions which traditionally used to offer long curricula, two-tier curricula have been introduced in recent years, leading for example to Bachelor and Master degrees. In addition, international degree programmes taught in English are developed and national degrees are compared with foreign degrees.

EU experts consider that a good educational system is one where any formation is open to everybody wanting and being able to acquire it. "Once the [cognitive] basics have been secured, two conditions would appear to be necessary if individuals are to be able to exercise responsibility in building up their abilities: adequate information and guidance; access to training along with all the opportunities available for mobility" (*White Paper*, 1995, p. 35).

Improving the quality of education systems products: towards a new curriculum?

The willingness of EU experts to improve the quality of the educational products is reflected in their concern for curricular reform and for a global reorganization of education systems. On the one hand, the nature of the curriculum should be made more relevant to the needs of the economy by stressing problem-solving ability rather than mere knowledge accumulation and developing the ability of learning to learn (autonomy) rather than merely learning contents (*The Report*, 1996). This should be eased by a systematic use of information technology (as the computer and other new information technologies). This could help the teacher in his task, and simultaneously give more weight to personal initiative of the students during the learning process. The new system should foster the autonomy of the student in order to achieve a real "pedagogy of innovation" (*White Paper*, 1995, p. 29). While the world of learning should be closer to the values of entrepreneurship and the world of economy (this was the second objective stated in the *White Paper*, 1995, pp. 60—63), a solid knowledge basis in sciences and mathematics (*White Paper*, 1995, p. 28), arts and humanities (*White Paper*, 1995, p. 30) should also be imperatively cultivated. The main idea is that such a new curriculum, instilling problem-solving abilities; general cultivation and innovation abilities should provide the workers with competitive advantages allowing them to survive in an ever-changing economy. The Lisbon European Council (March 2000) defined the "basic skills" in this sense as "IT skills, foreign languages, technological culture, entrepreneurship and social skills" (*Memorandum on Lifelong Learning*, 2000, p. 10).

Improving the adaptiveness of education systems through decentralization and evaluation

The overall organization of education systems could be made more adaptive and more responsive to the needs of society by increasing the degree of autonomy and the degree of competition between schools. "Experience has shown that the most decentralized systems are also the most flexible, the quickest to adapt and hence have the greatest propensity to de-

velop new forms of social partnership" (*White Paper*, 1995, p. 48, 26-net). "In Member States whose systems are more decentralized or allow more competition among educational establishments, or where private sector education is more developed, it is already more natural to respond to users' needs. The clear danger is that this will encourage an educational elitism which benefits those able to pay; children with special needs end up in state-run schools of inferior quality" (*The Report*, 1996, §178, p. 78).

Moreover, evaluation procedures should be encouraged. "The evaluation is indispensable, as it provides key pieces of information allowing the questioning of accepted practices. However, evaluation has a second and equally important function. Publicly accessible, comprehensible and well-founded evaluation provides a clear picture of the types of education and training available. This greater transparency is necessary so that users know what they are doing when they choose a particular field, establishment or training course. Thus, sound evaluation will greatly improve the average productivity of the education and training systems, since the learner can exercise free choice" (*The Report*, 1996, §190, p. 83).

In order to achieve such a curriculum and organizational reform of education systems, the European level is a very relevant level of decision (even if subsidiary principles require that the real implementation should be left to the states or regions of the EU). The EU has indeed a broad view across all the experiences all over Europe, and it can compare them in order to identify the most successful experiments and suggest applying them elsewhere. Evaluation procedures should also be encouraged by the EU, in order to foster the overall efficiency of the system and improving the average productivity of ET systems (*The Report*, 1996, §189 to 192, p. 83).

7.3.2 Towards a New Chinese Higher Education System and Curriculum

"The key to success in the reform of the higher educational system…is to change the management system of excessive government control over the institutions of higher learning, expand the powers of decision-making of the institutions of higher learning to have the initiative and ability to meet the needs of economic and social development" (CPC, 1985). The lessening of governmental control and the expansion of decision-making power made it possible for institutions of higher learning to have considerable autonomy in student enrollment, curriculum design, textbook selection, personnel management, funds disposal and international exchanges. One emerging change is the development of a credit system. Since transfer is virtually unheard of in Chinese higher education, the credit system gives students greater flexibility in their degree programs. They can graduate whenever they have the proper number and arrangement of credits rather than following a lockstep curriculum. Combined with the lifting of the age limit of 25 years for enrollment, the credit system makes Chinese universi-

ties more open to older and part-time students (Kathryn Mohrman, 2003). All these newly acquired decision-making powers—often taken for granted in the West—marked a new stage in Chinese university management (Du, 1992).

Towards a hierarchical multi-level higher education system

To meet the challenges of the world's new technology revolution, China is now sparing no effort in carrying out the 211 Project—to concentrate its financing power on building up 100 key universities as well as some key subjects and specialities facing the 21st century. By so doing, a group of universities and colleges as well as some subjects and specialities may reach the world's most advanced level in the 21st century. It is aimed at cultivation of more high quality talents and thus enhancing China's ability in developing science and technology. By carrying out this project a number of colleges and universities as well as certain branches of learning may become a leading force playing an important role in the development of the national economy and social progress. This is a picture that would emphasize the increased hierarchy in Chinese higher education system building around 100 elite institutions.

In a knowledge economic society, institutional differentiation is a logical response to the increased specialization and importance of knowledge. Chinese higher education institutions have been granted remarkable autonomy and academic freedom during the two reforming decades. But the forces of financing and marketing limit the power of autonomy and academic freedom. The present institutional differentiation is a process of institutions' struggling for resources, marketing their services. Obviously, the Chinese government realized that market forces could not build a higher education system which was able to compete in the new age of knowledge-based economy. The 211 Project was proposed to build a hierarchical multi-level higher education system, as well as a leading force for competition in the knowledge society.

Towards more integrative and comprehensive approaches to knowledge

The reform in teaching and learning is the core of reform. The curriculum and instruction scheme were formed and evolved in the past forty years based on the rationale of the central planned economy, in which students were enrolled, trained, and allocated as elements of production of the planned economy. It was characterized by an over specialization. In the mid 1980s before the reform, the higher education in China was divided into more than 1400 specialities (Min, 2002). Students were usually locked into a very narrow specialization, had little autonomy in what to learn in school and what to do after graduation, and had little flexibility

and adaptability to the technologically and economically induced changes. Even in the period of planned economy, this over specialization resulted in a wastage of skills and expertise.

As the economic transition led China to a dynamic market economy, the rapidly changing labor market needs and accelerated rate of renewal of production technology and work process called for a more competitive, and more flexible and adaptive labor force. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary and imperative to implement reforms to broaden the specialization of students to increase their flexibility and adaptability. The Ministry of Education has therefore given directives for the improvement in teaching of culture, thus enhancing university students' overall quality. Methods of education should be reformed so that people will develop in intelligence, ability and overall quality in a humanist fashion. All of them represented a move away from narrow specialization, toward more integrative and comprehensive approaches to knowledge. One typical manifestation of market influences on the curriculum is the tendency to become more "provisional" and flexible.

In the reform, more emphasis has been given to a wider knowledge base, especially the basic theories, basic knowledge and basic skills through more general education. Not only the specialities had been broadened, such as the over specialized machinery programs merged into a more general mechanical engineering program, interdisciplinary studies have been encouraged so that the students in humanities and social sciences could have basic knowledge in science, mathematics and informatics, while students in science and engineering could acquire basic knowledge in humanities and social sciences to better understand how to better serve the socioeconomic development with what they learn at school. Since the mid 1980s, the curriculum and instruction scheme have been changed by combining the narrow specialities to broaden the fields of studies for students. The total number of specialities was reduced from more than 1400 to about 249 now. Further reform along this direction is urgently needed (Min, 2002).

At the same time, ideo-political education still exist in China's universities. Ideo-political education in Chinese universities is implemented both by formal programs (obligatory and elective courses) and non-formal activities. The most prominent part of such education includes two undergraduate teaching units: *Marxist Theory* and *Ideology and Morality.* They are compulsory for all students, and the titles, contents, syllabi, outlines and teaching hours are all decided by the central government. Each university has specific fulltime staff to teach and administrate these programs.

On 1 August 1985, the CPC Central Committee issued *Guanyu Gaige Xuexiao Sixiang Pingde he Zhengzhi Lilun Kecheng Jiaoxue de Tongzhi* (Notice of Teaching Reforms in Courses of Ideology and Morality and Political Theories in Universities) to officially require universities to change from the "Old Three" to the "New Three" (*Basic Principles of Marxism*, *Chinese Socialist Construction* and *History of Chinese Revolution*).

Changing *History of the Chinese Communist Party* into *History of Chinese Revolution* aimed to demonstrate the great achievement under the Communist Party by showing the failure of the democratic revolution of the old type led by Dr. Sun Yat-san and by downplaying the internal dissensions within the Party. It tried to prove that the Communist Party's chosen path to socialism was solidly based on China's rich cultural traditions and on the inexorable historical trend of human society. *Chinese Socialist Construction* attempted to justify theoretically the policy and practice of building China into a modernized socialist country with Chinese characteristics. *Basic Principles of Marxism* is a restructuring of the previous *Philosophy*, *Scientific Socialism*, *History of Communist Movement* and *Political Economy*.

The transformation from the "Old Three" to the "New Three" was a summary of the reform in ideo-political education at Chinese universities. What deserves our special attention is that the courses began to pay attention to introducing and analyzing other contemporary trends of thought (Peng, 1986, p. 3). This showed that some careful efforts had been made to implement changes to the knowledge structure of ideo-political education in Chinese universities, including a somewhat altered attitude towards the current philosophical thinking in Western societies.

Since the 1990s, with the material socialist targets at developing production force, China's higher education has demonstrated increasing instrumental rationality and "scientism". Such a perception of knowledge, together with the introduction of the market into higher education and the changing attitudes of university students, has problematised the longstanding practice of ideo-political education in Chinese universities, which operated well for decades in the planned system against a context of the Cold War.

New interdisciplinary programs are being created on campuses to address specific opportunities, from environmental engineering to international business, and to counteract the narrowness of many traditional programs. Key universities also are encouraged to become more comprehensive. Formerly specialized universities can now branch out into new fields that perhaps may be more attractive and lucrative than their original missions. Individual campuses can create their own curricula, but any new concentrations must be on the Ministry of Education's list of 248 approved majors. In fact, many reforms occur within previously approved programs because a new track can be determined at the campus level while a new program must go to government authorities. Some universities, however, are part of experimental efforts that allow them to make more decisions unilaterally. The degree of flexibility seems to vary from one campus to the next, from one week to the next. We are seeing a hybrid system with both old and new elements. Key universities must raise most of their own money, but the central government controls enrollments and tuition levels, thus determining the income stream from student resources. Similarly, the number of faculty members in each program is determined centrally, so the expense side is also out of the hands of campus decision makers. What's more, the Ministry of Education assigns individual students to universi-

ties and majors. Certainly there is discussion between ministry and campus officials, but the final say comes from the center.

Curriculum reform was coupled with the reform in teaching and learning process, which marked a shift of emphasis from the memorization of factual knowledge to the cultivation of students' ability in creative and critical thinking, problem solving and information acquisition and generation, and intellectual independence. The economic transition and the knowledge revolution changed the way of teaching and learning. Reform in teaching and learning not only encourage students to acquire the existing knowledge, they are encouraged to develop the ability to explore and project what will happen in the future. Thus more heuristic and participatory method of teaching was adopted. Young people should not be trained for short-term jobs but be assisted to develop ability to cope with new learning challenges throughout their life. University should not only develop young generation intellectually, but also morally, physically, and aesthetically in order to better achieves all round development of young generation. Unfortunately, the examination system still puts a premium on memorization, so students who have opportunities for a broader education may have formed their intellects by rote rather than innovative thinking.

Market influences are reflected in the distribution of students' interest in various specialties. In places of the early enthusiasm for kinds of curricular innovation and integration that were based on scholarly considerations, a commercialization of the curriculum set in during the 1990s, with universities desperately seeking approval for new programs that would be likely to attract large numbers of self-paying students and so enhance university income. Market influences are also reflected in the distribution of students' interest in different periods of economic construction. In the first half of the 1990s, the hot subjects were foreign languages and international finance. At the end of the 1990s, the hot subjects are engineering and computer studies. Attention will be needed to counterbalance practical, specialized vocational training with adequate liberal studies which will serve to make students more aware not only of their own subject but also of the inter-relationship between different branches of knowledge. In the market-oriented providing and demanding of higher education, a problem of imbalance in the proportional distribution of academic disciplines is already existing (Yin & White, 1994). It is hoped the more promising options can become the building blocks of a new policy structure, more market oriented, more responsive to the needs of society, but structured to avoid the undesirable effects that often accompany market forces.

7.4   Summary and Analysis on the Main Similarities

Like what the hyperglobalists have argued that the increasing connections and interactions between different nation states and the freer and quicker interchanges and movements of

capital, goods, services, people, technologies, information, ideas have inevitably transcended national borders, thus suggesting an inevitable convergence of human activities and the receding role of the nation-state (Ohmae, 1990; Fukuyama, 1992; Waters, 2001). Putting our above observations together, there are many changes common to both higher education in the EU and China in the 1990s and its seems to suggest that higher education developments in these two societies have been affected by similar global trends.

The tide of privatization is popular not only in the developed countries but also in the developing countries (World Bank, 1988). Although the institutional arrangements differ from country to country, most of them implemented similar means to achieve the common goals. These similar means are more or less associated with privatization. It is not surprising that private education is gaining importance in China given the overall context of huge national efforts toward building up a "socialist market economy." In addition, both the EU and China have similar focus on improving educational system and curriculum during the 1990s. However, we could find that many China's reforms parallel American higher education. It's almost as if some university leaders are saying, "The United States has the best higher education system in the world so let's adopt American models." The danger is that programs that work well in one culture may be a mistake in another (Kathryn Mohrman, 2003).

Both the EU and China are seeing a remarkably common worldwide change agenda because they are all trying to respond to essentially the following same three big problems.

The first problem is lack of resources. Most institutions in China are in severe *austerity*, and most institutions even in the EU wealthiest countries seem always *on the edge of austerity*. At a national or societal level, the austerity is even more gripping. Fundamentally, the university's natural trajectory of expenses is to outpace the natural trajectory of its revenues—a condition greatly exacerbated by the need in so many countries (China among them) for more universities and greatly expanded university enrollments.

The second one is inefficiency. It might be called simply "doing the wrong things with the revenues available" (Johnstone, 2002). Whereas lack of resources is more often associated with insufficient revenue for the university's scale and mission, *inefficiency* is the misallocation of whatever revenues might be available. Yet the two are obviously and importantly linked, since a partial solution to the dilemma of austerity can be the achievement of greater efficiency. Whatever the financial constraints, and however inadequate the revenues may be, there remains a need to do whatever we do in the most efficient manner, maximizing our outputs or benefits for the available revenues.

And the third is inequity. It is understandable to want universities, like other forms of higher education, to contribute to a reduction of inequities—at least those differences in wealth, income, status, opportunity, and political power that arise mainly from circumstances of birth, such as social class, gender, language, ethnicity, and home region. There is no question but that higher education *can* be a powerful vehicle for some individuals to rise

above the circumstances of their births. But the fact of the matter is that both access to, and success in, the university has a strong statistical correlation with these very circumstances of birth in virtually all countries, including the EU and China. Left alone, with no policies of intervention, the university is more likely to be a perpetuator and even an accelerator of intergenerationally transmitted inequalities in income, status, and power.

Turning back the clock on competition or preventing the impact of market forces is not the answer. Not only is it highly unlikely that the inexorable march of market forces can be stopped, but more importantly, change is needed. The convergence of these forces may, for the first time, provide a powerful enough stimulus to force universities and colleges to face a set of issues that mar the performance of an otherwise great system of higher education. The impact of the new competition, the increasing use of digital technology, and the changing nature of society make this a time of great promise, *if* policy makers and academic leaders respond to the opportunities. But there are grave dangers as well. The likelihood that market forces by themselves will bring improved service to society is hardly a sure thing. Whether higher education gains the advantages of market forces or ends up looking like healthcare or electric power depends on the policies chosen in the immediate future.

Our above discussion has indicated that even though we may observe similar strategies are adopted by different EU countries and China in response to the so-called tide of globalization, we can still see that different regional and national governments may use the similar strategies to serve their own political purposes. As Hallak (2000) has rightly suggested, modern states may make use of the globalization discourse to justify their own political agendas or legitimize their inaction.

The EU officials point to a severe and potentially dangerous competitiveness problem of the EU exports vis-à-vis America and Japan. Competitiveness has now become a key objective of the European construction, as is illustrated by its adjunction to the list of the objectives to be pursued by the EU in the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997). The EU stresses this problem in a dynamic perspective, stressing the increasing pressure that currently low developed economies may exert in the near future on European economies, and foremost on their labor markets.

Similarly, it could be said that the reforms and rapid expansion of Chinese higher education are due to the pressure of the new global knowledge-based economy. As China established a socialist market economy system and deepened the reforms of various undertakings, the higher education system reform has become the crux of various reforms in education. The ultimate goal of the current economic reforms in China is to develop a dynamic market economy, in order to make China an integral part of the international economy. The target of current Chinese higher education reform is to establish an institutional framework to fit into this new social and economic context. The process of transition of the Chinese economy from the ossified centrally planned economy to a dynamic socialist market economy has led

to a series of profound socioeconomic changes, which have strong impact on the Chinese universities. And also, the economic reforms coincide with the information revolution, which have led the world into a new age of knowledge-based economy. The ability to generate, accumulate, deploy, and utilize knowledge becomes crucial for development. As knowledge based institutions, universities are called to play a more important role in the coming century. Furthermore, the information economy is international by nature. Capital, production, management, market, labor, information and technology are organized across national boundaries, which have resulted in a strong tendency of globalization. China's entry into the WTO is part of this process. Cross-cultural interactions, exchanges of students and faculty members, joint teaching and research programs, frequent academic communications, especially through the utilization of the internet, have formed an irresistible and irreversible trend of internationalization of higher education, which have further pushed China's changes from outside world.

Chapter 8

Conclusion and Discussion

The purpose of this last chapter is to summarize, analyse and reflect on the main findings of this study and then draw the conclusion. Policy implications and recommendations to Chinese policy makers will be discussed.

8.1   Main Findings and Conclusion of the Study

This dissertation sets out in this wider policy context to analyse and contrast the differences and similarities in terms of the strategies that the EU and China have adopted. As a result of careful study, I have given a detailed picture of the status and development of the basic educational ideologies, strategies, contents, governance and decision-makings in both the EU and China systems. I have also explored the different backgrounds and considered the distinctive responses in Europe and China to future challenges in higher education. In addition, I have approached with much attention the role of higher education in promoting European integration, a topic that may have special relevance for China, given the huge size of the country and the diversity of different regions.

Although the two entities are different in so many ways, such as in their political systems, social cultures, historical traditions and levels of economic development, the significant changes in the higher education policy were designed by the EU and China policy makers principally to address economic issues. Both the EU and China focus on the role of human capital and social capital and regard higher education as making an important contribution to the construction of knowledge economies and democratic societies. But they took different paths. The followings are two main findings of the study.

8.1.1 Higher Coherence of the EU Higher Education from Diversification to Unification

For the European Union and its member states education was for long a sensitive issue. European integration having grown more and more deeper in the fields of legislation, economy and the job market, the EU has shown an interest in education as well. The EU wants to tie the education markets with the integrated regional system, to back up the development of the European labour market and the overall competitiveness of the continent. Increased international competition urged national governments to enhance cooperation in order to achieve greater cohesion between higher education systems, Europe being an obvious level for joint action.

Since the signing of the Maastricht Treaty, the European Union has taken a deeper step, which has enhanced the cohesion of the ongoing integration for the EU countries. European actions in higher education have expanded over the last decades in terms of their reach across policy levels and geographical borders. The 1990s saw a transition into pan-European enterprises that aim for the harmonization of national systems. The current highpoint is what is known as the *Bologna Process*, which started from the two international declarations signed in Sorbonne (1998) and Bologna (1999). The Bologna declaration aims at the creating *the European Higher Education Area*, or even more generally *a Europe of knowledge.* Bologna is a first but important step towards the integration of the European higher education systems into a globalised market. It is hoped that such an area will promote better European-wide recognition and transferability of study attainments, ever-greater mobility of the academic community, strengthened cooperation in quality assurance and a review of higher education structures. Convergence in these parts in Europe will pave the way for an even larger scale worldwide integration of systems. It is clear that it is one of the ambitions of the Bologna process to strengthen the competitiveness of European higher education in the global marketplace and to compete with America and other regions active in exporting higher education.

Throughout the various periods, the EU's main rationale for action has remained an economic one, which is clearly visible in the Lisbon process. The role of the European Union has moved beyond mobility and recognition issues into the policy field at large. In the early 1990s, the European Union initiated strategies (and provided funding) for initiatives to internationalize higher education—however, it must be recognized that all of these initiatives have been *regional* in scope and direction. Educational opportunity programs such as TEMPUS and ERASMUS encourage a de-permeation of national boundaries for the sake of sharing ideas and resources for higher education, but are limited to within the geopolitical boundaries of the European Community. Such programs underlie the belief of the Association of European Universities that "the *European* dimension of higher education could be developed through increased mobility, linguistic competence and institutional networking" (CRE Info, 1994).

Now The European Union's offices in Brussels are currently working with the colleges and universities of member countries on such complex problems as diploma and degree equivalents, the increased mobility of students, and cross-national standards (Berdahl, 1991). Even though the European Union denies it is aiming at coercive uniformity, it still seems that supranational influences are shaping up national higher education systems in one way or the other. It is clear that member states are witnessing in higher education radical changes to systems and structures, and a process of convergence in the direction set out in the Bologna Declaration. This may in part be explained by pressure to reform coming from forces outside Europe—especially the economic impact of globalization on higher Education. "The nation state has served as the highest level of aggregation in any one system of higher education. This picture, however, is changing" (Neave, 1990).

As economic policy becomes regional, so too will educational policy become regional, as the two have become inextricably linked. Educational policies in most nations are increasingly driven by economic agendas. Burton Clark's (1984) discussion of the impact of market forces on systems of higher education illustrates one of the main links between economics and education, a link that I believe will compel higher education policy to follow in the footsteps of economic regionalism. In Europe, regionalism in the form of the European Union has become an impetus for educational reform, calling for modifications of many nations' higher education systems in order to produce the manpower to successfully propel the EU in the 21st century as a strong competitor in the global economy.

In the face of global economic retrenchment and relatively weakened state capacity in social service and policy provision, there has been the pressure for restructuring and reforming education driven by growing expectations and demands of different stakeholders in society. Widespread concerns over widened access, funding, accountability, quality and managerial efficiency are perceived as prominent global trends for education.

Globalization and the evolution of the knowledge-based economy have caused dramatic changes to the character and functions of higher education in most European countries. However, the impacts of globalization on universities are not uniform though business-like practices have been adopted to cope with competitions in the global marketplace. The pressure for restructuring and reforming higher education is mainly derived from growing expectations and demands of different stakeholders in society. In the last decade, government bureaucracy, public service institutions and higher education institutions and universities have been significantly affected by the tidal wave of the public sector reform around the world. Apart from improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public services, universities are confronted with a situation in which the principles of financial accountability and responsiveness to stakeholders prevail amidst the massification stage under the condition of global economic retrenchment. In response to such pressing demands for changes, policies and strategies of decentralization, privatization and marketization are becoming increasingly

popular in university governance. Reform strategies and measures like quality assurance, performance evaluation, financial audit, corporate management and market competition are adopted to reform and improve the performance of the higher education sector.

To some degree, the EU higher education system changes from diversification to unification. At the moment, reforms guided by the Bologna Process are being avidly prepared in many European countries. We could see such a remarkably consistent reform trends as expansion and diversification of enrollments, participation rates, and number and types of institutions; fiscal pressure—as measured in low and declining per-student expenditures and as seen in overcrowding, low-paid faculty, lack of academic equipment or libraries, and dilapidated physical plant; markets—the ascendance of market orientations and solutions, and the search for nongovernmental revenue; the demand for greater accountability—on the part of institutions and faculty, and on behalf of students, employers, and those who pay; and the demand for greater quality and efficiency to meet with the challenges of internationalization of higher education. While striving for a coherent Higher Education Area and comparable European degrees, policy-makers all over the continent keep repeating the meaning of concepts such as 'efficiency', 'quality' (and quality assurance), 'accountability' or 'competitiveness'. This illustrates the way in which higher education has been turned into a instrument for building a missing European identity, as well as a means to promote the needs of the economy, labour market and the emerging knowledge society. Hence, higher education system in the EU seems to be moving towards higher coherence. Divergent national policy-making is diminishing, which, thus, leads to a convergence of the systems. The pressure caused by constant competition within the single European market easily creates a situation in which only familiar and well-tested models are favoured. But the EU is composed of different countries and cannot be integrated like a single country. Its capacity and efficiency of education policy will be contained by long, sometimes very difficult, coordination between member countries, restrained by different national needs.

8.1.2 Transition of Chinese Higher Education from Unification to Diversification

Since the new state development policies of reform and "opening to outside world" were implemented in 1978, the Chinese government has placed top priority on education, in particular on higher education in order to produce urgently needed skills and talents for economic reform and national modernization. Chinese higher education is currently undergoing the biggest and most profound reform ever since the reorganization of higher education institutions in 1952. China has moved from a very centralized educational system in which the main decisions were taken by the central government to a decentralized educational system. Decentralization has been variously seen by governments as a way to reduce central expendi-

ture, to shift the burden of responsibility for unpopular measures, and to increase efficiency through giving more responsibility and motivation to direct providers (CERI, 1995). Interdisciplinary cooperation is being promoted, and institutional autonomy is gradually increasing. The organizational structures of the universities have developed a new organizational structure that is more flexible and more open. This more adaptable structure is intended to meet the developmental demands of modern universities with close links being created between their work and regional economic and social development.

The American model of a higher education system is gradually replacing the Soviet model for Chinese colleges and universities (Pepper, 1996). Higher education institutions have been gradually going through a process of "marketisation" (Yin & White, 1994), by seeking financial resources to survive in the market economy in the past two decades. Great changes have taken place in the funding structure, the management system, curricula patterns, and recruitment and assignment policies. To a certain degree, these changes are inevitable. Like many developing countries, China faces a formidable task of expanding the higher education system and improving quality, all within continuing budgetary constraints. The old pattern of the state as sole patron of higher education is incapable of taking the strain of a rapid expansion. This is the most important factor behind the tide of marketization in the 1990s and the current tide of rapid expansion of enrolments. In addition, the higher education sector has since been evidencing Westernization and globalization.

The significant issues such as reform, privatization, access, efficiency, equality, and equity are closely related to Chinese higher education systems that are experiencing radical changes and restructuring[1]. Chinese higher education system has changed from unification to diversification to some extent. There are ranges of issues that are helping to remold the Chinese higher educations system into quite a different structure than in the past. Today the higher education system can be characterized as being increasingly:

- *Flexible* in that universities and institutes now have more freedom and delegated powers to develop courses and programs to meet local conditions. Institutions now offer new classes on hot topic, that is, those for which there is a market (computer use, special vocations, foreign languages, particularly English and so on);

- *Internationalized* in the sense that the system now has many connections with foreign universities and educational systems through cooperative programs encompassing aspects such as exchange, research, the holding of conference and the delivery of foreign sourced programs and courses in China; Some 320,000 Chinese students have traveled abroad for advanced study since the country started reforms and open-up drive in

---

[1]   For these issues, see, for example, K. Lewin, A. Little, H. Xu, and J. Zheng (1994), J. Henze (1984), pp. 93—pp. 153, M. Tsang & W. Min (1992), and World Bank (1991; 1996; 1997).

1978 (Chinese website, read at 10.07.2004). Higher education is becoming increasingly internationalized both in its reach and curricula (OECD, 1996b);

- *Expansive* in that there are now a wider range of courses and programs (particularly in the areas of business and management education), and there has also been an expansion of the range of courses and programs at the top end and lower end of the higher education spectrum;

- *Competitive* in that higher education institutions are now openly competing with each other to attract students (and fees), post graduate students, and state funding and support;

- *Segmented* in the sense that universities and institutes have now been ranked into 211and non 211 universities and institutes, and also because universities and institutes are now openly ranked by the Ministry to introduce a higher element of competition and quality control;

- *Equipment oriented* in that increasing use is being made of multi media, competitive and other forms of technology to (a) improve on campus delivery and (b) better service distance education markets;

- *Commercialized* in that more and more universities and institutes are augmenting incomes by undertaking fee for service activity which can be divided into (a) consultancy (b) short course delivery and (c) the organization and conduct of university- company businesses.

China's modern higher education system is the result of learning from and in interaction with the West, sharing common historical roots with higher education in other countries. Thus, to a certain extent, Chinese higher education institutions, as do universities in other countries, face similar contemporary challenges, resulting from the advancement of science and technology, economic growth, social changes, and the internationalization and globalization of the world economy, as well as of higher education. However, one has to be aware that Chinese higher education institutions respond to common challenges in a specific institutional context, characterized by the transition of the Chinese economy from an ossified, centrally planned system to a dynamic, socialist market economy. This transition has led to a series of profound socioeconomic changes and has had a strong impact on almost every aspect of Chinese higher education. The new system has just started to take shape, but is far from being

institutionalized. One has to understand and view the dynamic nature of higher education development in China within this changing institutional context.

As seen above, the role of higher education in the EU and China is now more influential than ever in the construction of knowledge economies and democratic societies. The changes in the higher education systems in both China and the EU were largely driven by changes in economic environments and government proposals in the two entities. The EU and China policies actually derive from a range of considerations, including their historical traditions, level of economic development, and the nature of its political system, together with the regional and national priorities adopted and the changing demands of its people. Examination of major higher education policies in the EU and China reveals that the EU and China adopted policies in response to their unique social problems, higher education policies were also driven by globalization forces. Indeed, the EU and China took different paths that may make their remarkably distinctive higher educational systems more alike.

In conclusion, regions and countries with different political and socioeconomic systems and dissimilar higher education traditions have similar patterns in reforms in higher education. On the basis of the study, it seems that the coherency of the Chinese system is deteriorating. It has become more flexible, the trend towards internationalization is obvious, and it is expanding and yet holding on to its competitiveness through increased effectiveness and commercialization. The Chinese higher education policies is also directing towards a more segmented and, regarding the needs of education, a more equipment oriented education supply. In the EU on the other hand, the system seems to be moving towards higher coherence, but the above described principles concerning China can also be applied to the EU. The common contextual factors, particularly the increasingly trend of globalization, seem to have considerably shaped higher education policy in the EU and China. The higher educational systems are, thus, at least at a normative level becoming more homogenized. However, what is apparent is that the EU and the PRC have responded in practice to common problems in different ways in line with its particular traditions and education model characteristics. Before we jump to this conclusion, maybe we should also bear in mind that an alternative hypothesis that local factors are crucial and determining factors for changes. Therefore, the considerable convergence at the general policy objectives may not satisfactorily explain the complicated processes of changes and the dynamic interactions between global-regional-local forces that shape education policy-making in individual countries (Dale, 1999). Instead, a close scrutiny of the transformations and reforms in higher education of these two societies has revealed similar trends but such common strategies are used to serve unique regional and national social and political agendas.

8.2 Policy Implications and Recommendations to Chinese Policy Makers

Lessons can be learned by practicing or mistakes, but also can be learned from others' experience. The study reveals that the reforms undertaken in Europe and China, while retaining certain national particularities, increasingly displayed common dimensions and trends. Certainly, the way that policies are implemented, the theories behind their development, and the context of the higher education systems vary dramatically. In short, higher education has gone global but with a variety of accents. Policymakers are worry about the same set of topics. International study and analysis can help to yield insights on how to deal with same topics in individual countries. Higher education policy is not necessarily implemented according to policy rhetoric, which is a result of global, regional and local forces. While the higher education system in China is more homogeneous, whereas the higher education system in the EU is only just being homogenized. Thus, especially the European higher education policy in the 1990s was formed out of normative views as to what the higher education system should be like. This approach poses problems as the object of study comprises principles and declarations that these two societies have implemented to a restricted degree only. However, we still could get some ideas and enlightenment from this study.

8.2.1 Envisage the Problems of Chinese Higher Education

The World Bank conducted a study on Chinese higher education (1997) after the market economy was adopted. The study points out that "the fundamental challenge of current economic and educational reform is to orient institutions to a more open labor market as well as to a more open society" (p. xiii), and the changing operating environment of higher education as follows:

- From a command economy to a socialist market economy;
- From the practice of job assignments and lifelong employment in one institution to increasing choice and mobility of the labor market, responsive to changes in skill requirements;
- From a system that derives all directives for policy and action from the center to a more managerially and financially decentralized one, characterized by increased autonomy;
- From a situation that isolates higher education to one that sees it as fundamentally linked with government, business, and the local community, and with national and international institutions.

Overall, the entire system in the country is urged to shift from an input-driven model to an output- and demand-driven one, effecting wide-ranging changes in the whole field of higher education. The Chinese higher education is still in a state of considerable flux and transition. There are some more complex aspects of structural change which attest to the transitional nature of the state higher education system—and China in general, which are as follows:

While the system has become *increasingly deregulated and decentralized* (Goodman & Gerald, 1994), it is also still tightly controlled by Government—albeit often at the Municipal and Provincial level, where Education Commissions or their proxies exercise significant control over university or institute activity and programs;

While many universities have developed some aspects of private educational development, they still, by and large, remain firmly part of the state system with the privately-run (*minban*) system quite separately treated and categorized in China—the systems seem to continue to operate as two separate systems even though the state system is slowly edging into the private domain;

While educational cooperation between Chinese and foreign universities has helped to open up the system to international influences, many universities have tended to take various aspects of western education and *integrate* them into a Chinese educational framework and style rather than seeking to replace Chinese styles of education with western modes and styles, thus the Chinese educational ethos and system remains somewhat different to a western style and structure of delivering education;

Although many of the universities have introduced aspects of what might be termed a competitive and deregulated state higher educated system including the charging of fees, dealing with the abolition of jobs upon graduation and the supply of students by the state, and introducing a wider variety of courses and programs to meet local needs, many of these changes and initiatives have been introduced in a slow, cautious and somewhat incremental manner so that, for example, some universities were still being supplied with students through the status system, and some were also still able to promise hobs upon graduation via the state system.

More interestingly, the government of China is very "instrumental" in raising the quality of education and in promoting learning society with the intention to maintain the competitiveness of country in both regional and global markets, particularly preparing people for the future knowledge-based economy. Therefore, reform in Chinese higher education has just begun (Cheng, 1998). The relationship between universities and the government is not yet well defined, policies in many areas remain to be implemented. It is hard to make the conclusion that Chinese higher education system has radically restructured at this stage. Well, one thing is certain that the government is stepping back from detailed centralized control by greater government macro-control and macro-management, by encouraging higher education institutions to be more autonomous, self-regulating and market oriented in their operations. The

objective is to make higher education institutions more flexible, adaptive, and responsive to social needs and economic priorities. In that case, the future reform and development of Chinese higher education relies on a critical reflection, or a return to the basic ideas of market economy and knowledge-based economy, that is, the building of a decentralized mechanism of competition for academic achievements and a system of innovation (or a flexible institutional structure). In other words, what is more important to Chinese higher education is to try to find out under what conditions universities assumed their great variety of functions, and to what extent have they been able to cope with them. Market economy and knowledge-based economy have indeed brought intensive impacts and many challenges to Chinese higher education, but at the same time they have also provided chances for development. Chinese higher education system will play its role better than expected if the fundamental idea of market economy—the mechanism of competition—and that of knowledge-based economy—the enduring innovation—is built into Chinese higher education system.

8.2.2 Study Some Ideas from the EU Experiences

"It is not the strongest of the species that survive, nor the most intelligent, but the one most responsive to change" (Charles Darwin, 1859). We live in a period of rapid change in higher education, a period when we can learn much from the experience of others. Higher education policies can illuminate and pose alternatives. Whatever happens, and whichever direction China moves in, China should draw on its long history to continue the higher education reforms with its own characteristics, its own style and its own speed. However, if China could learn much more ideas and experiences from European countries and combine them with China's realities, it is likely for China to shorten time to develop higher education system and realize socialist modernization rapidly.

Much of the progress in internationalization to date has been supported by policies and programmes of governments and supranational institutions (such as the EU), which have enabled or facilitated particular pilot initiatives. The aim of all integration approaches put forward by the EU is to let it become one of the strongest economies in the world and to take a position parallel with that of the U.S. The EU added 10 new member nations on May 1, 2004 enlarging the union to a total of 25 countries with a combined population of 450 million or so. The EU countries have become an exciting laboratory for the world. Their experiments to build higher education area should contribute to the international education in its own way. Haug (1999) formulates key attributes of a "European Higher Education Space" which I think might serve as a reference for Chinese policy makers to some degree:

> "Quality: reforms concerning credit systems or degree structures cannot substitute efforts to improve and guarantee quality in curricula, teaching and learning;

Mobility: the most powerful engine for change and improvement in higher education in Europe has come, and will come from growing awareness of alternative approaches and best practice in other countries;

Diversity: measures not respecting the fundamental cultural, linguistic and educational diversity in Europe could endanger not only the progress already made, but also the perspective of continuing convergence in the future;

Openness: European higher education can only fulfill its missions within a world wide perspective based on competition and co-operation with other regions in the world."

I have also approached with much attention the role of higher education in promoting European integration, a topic that may have special relevance for China, given the huge size of the country and the diversity of different regions. For China, it is possible to promote mobility of students and teachers among different regions. Then the cornerstone of academic co-operation in Europe would also be a reference. The following ideas on mobility might be necessary and worthy to be considered by China's policy makers.

- It changes the mind, the way of thinking. In Europe where nationalism, regionalism, and xenophobia are again increasing, it seems crucial that the young European citizens experience a "cultural bath" in other countries. This is even more important for associated countries to participate in programmes;

- The students are not simple "consumers" of university teaching. They are also citizens participating in university life, and they wish to have the opportunity of a "mobility experience";

- What can be gained is not only the development of a "Europe of Knowledge" but cross-cultural awareness, a "Europe of culture". This seems of the utmost importance to the countries that are right now on the borders of the EU. "Coherence" is not only an economic concept relating to transport, energy, and other programmes - it should, first of all, be a cultural coherence, not in the sense of uniformity, but of mutual understanding and of common cultural perception of European history, of its richness.

"In questions of mind, there is no medium term: either we look for the best or we live with the worst" (Gardner, 2000). It is a real challenge for China to formulate systematic policies and strategies to assist universities in playing a more significant role in the development process of the new world economy of the 21st century. There might be no one-best model for higher education development in the new knowledge-based economy, but there is always a way to improve. Chinese political and educational authorities should look to both international experiences and domestic educational and socioeconomic realities in making and implementing higher education policies, before it is too late.

8.3   Further Considerations to the Research

Many educational researchers have observed a global convergence in both educational ideology and educational structure (Meyer et al., 1979; Ramirez & Boli, 1987). However, little attention has been paid to the divergence of educational policy approaches among regions and countries with different cultures and institutions and the consequences of cross-cultural policy variation for educational convergence. Given cross-cultural policy variation toward desired educational goals and values, the central question is whether the different reform paths are leading to educational convergence. These opposite policy measures, if implemented successfully, would make the two different systems, at least at a normative level more alike and homogenized. While the cases of selected European Union and China may not be generalized to other regions and developing countries, the perspective gained from this study might have implications for international education reform initiatives.

The study presents only a preliminary step of a wider analysis. To this point, I concentrated just on describing and analyzing the ideas and principles as exercised by European Union and China in the field of higher educational policy. What China might learn from the EU with regards to governance of universities, faculty development in universities, research support in universities, curriculum development and organization in universities etc. will be worthy to research in the future.

The study of education policy is complicated even in a single setting, so trying to study across settings is fraught with additional difficulties. One inevitably risks drawing comparisons without full knowledge of local circumstances, and seeing as similar what would, with closer analysis, look quite different. In these conditions researchers need to be especially careful to be clear about their presuppositions and the frameworks within which they are assembling data and deriving findings. My hope is that the research reported here is constructive for educational research of similar issues in international perspectives and will contribute to that process.

Appendix

The EU and China Research Materials

EU Materials

(1) Main Documentary Materials

The texts of the EU treaties are usually published in the Official Journal of the European Communities, the principal legal publication of the EU. The founding treaties are frequently referred to as "primary legislation." Following founding treaties such as *Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community* (1957), *Single European Act* (1986), *Treaty on European Union* (1992), *Treaty of Amsterdam* (1997) and *Treaty of Nice* (2001) provide the legal basis for the EU educational research area.

The legal bases of the EU education policy are Articles 3, 140, 146, 149 and 150 (3, 118c, 123, 126 and 127) EC. The Treaty of Rome did not make any extensive reference to education. It simply stated in Article 3 that the Member States should make a contribution to education and training of quality. Early initiatives were based for the most part on Article 128 (deleted with the adoption of the Maastricht Treaty) that dealt with vocational training and Article 308 (235). It was essentially with the entry into force of the Maastricht Treaty that a comprehensive reference was made to the contribution of the Community in this area. The Amsterdam Treaty changed the provisions slightly, the main change being that the co-decision procedure applied to vocational training. This was already the case regarding education in the Maastricht Treaty. It has to be underlined that according to the principle of subsidiarity each Member State has the full responsibility for the organization and content of its education and vocational training systems. Any act of harmonization of legal and regulatory provisions of the Member States is excluded from the scope of Articles 149 and 150. Article 149 of the Treaty provides a basis for action in the field of education. Article 150 stipulates that the Union implements a vocational training policy to support and supplement the action taken by the Member States. Actions taken according to these Articles follow the co-decision procedure and qualified majority in Council.

In contrast, "secondary legislation" refers to directives, regulations and other forms of law. European Commission paper, memorandum and report, European Council Decision will be analyzed in the dissertation. The following lists are the most important part:

European Commission papers such as *Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community* (COM (91) 349), *Green Paper on the European Dimension of Education* (COM (93) 457), *Guidelines for Community action in the field of Education and Training* (COM (93) 183), *White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment in the European Community* (COM (93) 700), *On Recognition of Qualifications for Academic and Professional Purposes* (COM (94) 596), *Cooperation in Education in the European Union: 1976-1994* (European Commission, 1994), *White Paper on Education and Training: Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society* (CEC, 1995), *SOCRATES: Manual of Good Practice on Erasmus under the Socrates Programme* (European Commission, 1996b), *Report: Accomplishing Europe Through Education and Training.* (European Commission, 1997c), *Towards a Europe of Knowledge* (COM (97) 563), *On the Initial Implementation Phase of the Socrates Programme: 1995—1997* (Commission of the EC, 1999), *A Memorandum on Lifelong Learning* (Commission of the EC, 2000), *Final Commission Report on the Implementation of the Socrates Programme 1995—1999* (Commission, 2000f), *Education, Training and Youth. A new Generation of Programmes (2000-2006). Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci, Youth and Tempus III* (Commission, 2000g), *Socrates European Community Action Programme in the Field of Education: Transition Socrates I—Socrates II* (Commission, 2001f) and so on.

To contribute to the development of quality education and training and of an open European area for education, Council of the European Union and European Parliament made *Decisions on establishing the Community action programme "Socrates"* (Council Decision 95/819/EC). To promote a Europe of knowledge and encourage lifelong education through learning foreign languages, encouraging mobility, promoting cooperation at European level, opening up to methods of access to education and increasing the use of new technologies in the field of education, Council of the European Union and European Parliament made *Decisions* on *establishing the second phase of the Community action programme in the field of education "Socrates"* (1999b & 2000a). To promote the development of higher education systems for the eligible countries by cooperating with partners in all Community Member States in as balanced a manner as possible, there is Council Decision adopting the third phase of the trans-European cooperation scheme for higher education (Tempus III) (2000—2006) (1999). To call on the Member States to introduce quality-assessment and quality-assurance mechanisms into their higher education systems and to promote cooperation between the authorities responsible for quality assurance in higher education, there is *Council Recommendation on European cooperation in quality assurance in higher education* (1998)**.** In this dissertation, the important EU educational *"ERASMUS (European Action to Support Mobility of University Students)", "ECTS (European Credit Transfer System)", "LINGUA", "SOCRATES"*

and "TEMPUS (Trans-European Mobility Scheme for University Studies)" will be analyzed in detail.

In addition, a series of conferences (Sorbonne 1998, Bologna 1999, Lisbon European Council March 2000, Salamanca March 2001 and Prague Meeting May 2001) have been a critical part of defining the new European higher education area. The Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education, convened in Bologna on the 19th of June 1999 will be especially important part I will analyze in the dissertation.

(2) Main Scientific Materials

Several general overviews of EU education policy have been written. A classical study in the field is Guy Neave's "EEC and Education" from 1984. Neave's book is still the most detailed study of the history of EU education policy although it had been published long before the first large exchange programmes were established. Neave (1990 and 2001) also paid attention to the roles of higher education in Western Europe and emphasis on preparing for markets.

More overviews have been provided by Beukel (1992; 1993; 1994) and Karlsen (1994). As an expert on EU education policy, Raivola (1990; 1993; 1994; 1995) has written widely on both the EU education programmes, legislation on recognition of diplomas and the challenges posed to education systems by European integration in the 1990s. Haug Guy (1999) focused on the trends and issues in learning structures in European higher education.

Much analytical work on EU education policy has been published in educational periodicals, mainly Higher Education Policy, European Journal of Education, and recently in the Journal of Studies in International Education. One of the earliest analytical papers on EU education policy was written by Smith (1980), who described a shift from the "europhoria" of the 1970s towards more pragmatically oriented educational cooperation in the 1980s—spurred by the economic recession and growing unemployment.

Many writers have addressed more limited issues, such as Bell (1989; 1991), Ryba (1992; 1995) and Hellgren (1994), who studied the emergence of a European dimension in school curricula. Höstmark Tarrou (1993) considered the opportunities EU programmes offered for teacher education and the possibility of influencing school curricula in this way. Tait (1996) analyzed the open and distance learning policy in the European Union in 1985—1995. Barry (1999) was concerned with an exploration of some of the policy and research implications of lifelong learning in the European Union. It is devoted to the description and critical analysis of the emergence of lifelong learning as the central strategy in the EU's policies for education and training. Thomas (1998) focused on reforms of the educational policy of European Union countries, implementation of the educational programs and principle of unity in diversity.

A notable body of empirical work is the series of evaluation studies on the Erasmus programme, carried out by the University of Kassel Centre for Research into Higher Education and work. Issues addressed in the nearly 20 studies published include the post-mobility experiences of Erasmus students, institutional coordination of the programme, implementation of the ECTS system, and transition to work and early career of former Erasmus students. Key findings of the evaluation project are summarized by Teichler and Maiworm (1997). The exchange programme Erasmus was identified as a vehicle, through which the EU sends signals to policy-makers. (Eliassen & Hagen 1990, 33—34).

In sum, existing research suggests that—rather than formulating a supranational education policy—the EU will continue to develop coordinative and incentive measures in the domain of education. However, the education programmes and legislation on professional recognition of diplomas have indirect effects on European education. The recognition directives lead to adaptation of lengths of studies, and to changes in curricula. The education programmes foster tighter transnational linkages between educational institutions and thus lead to greater borrowing of course contents from other Member States. Education policy is Europeanized bottom-up, by students and educators who participate in EU programmes.

China Materials

(1) Main Documentary Materials

Ministry of Education of People's Republic of China (PRC) is the supreme education administration body, which is responsible for carrying out related laws, regulations, guidelines and policies of the central government; planning development of education sector; integrating and coordinating educational initiatives and programs nationwide; maneuvering and guiding education reform countrywide. Since 1978, based on *Constitution of the People's Republic of China* (PRC) (1982, 1988, 1993)**,** Chinese government has promulgated such codes as *Degree Statute of the People's Republic of China* (1980), *Law of Compulsory Education of the People's Republic of China* (1986), *Law of Teachers of the People's Republic of China* (1993), *Education Law of the People's Republic of China* (1995), *Statute for Teacher's Eligibility* (1996), *Law of Higher education of the People's Republic of China* (1998), *and Private Education Law* (2002). These laws will be the basis of Chinese higher education policy in my research. Especially *Higher Education Law* is the first complete higher education legal document in term of legislature.

On July 31, 1997 the *Regulations on Running Schools by Non-Governmental Sectors* (1997) was promulgated, which, including 8 chapters and 60 articles, was to be put into effect since

October 1 of 1997. *The Private Education Law*, promulgated on December 28, 2002, is China's first national legislation on private education. The law covers all educational levels, while the article 16, 53, and 55 cover higher education.

Since 1978, Chinese government has released more than ten sets of education administration regulations. The Ministry of Education, within its jurisdiction, has issued more than 200 sets of administrative rules and regulations, significantly facilitating development of education of different natures (Internet website: read at 10.06.2004 http://www.edu.cn/20010101/21856.shtml)**.** The following documents will be the most important materials analyzed in this paper.

The Guidelines for the Education Reform and Development in China (1993) jointly promulgated by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and the State Council in l993 made certain regulations for the concrete target of the higher education development in China. "Higher education institutions shall educate specialized personnel to meet the requirement of the economic, scientific and technological development, resources shall be mustered on running well some key universities and specialties". According to the target, the pro-State Education Commission promulgated a regulation in 1995 "*Suggestions on the Improvement and Enhancement of Graduate Education*". Basic policies have been raised in the regulation for the reform and improvement of graduate education.

In order to enter a substantial key stage for the reform of teaching contents and curriculum, the former SedC (State Education Commission) launched the *"Reform Plan of Teaching Contents and Curriculum of Higher Education Facing the 21st Century"* in 1994, formally ratifying the establishment of 211 big projects and nearly a thousand sub-projects with tens of thousands teachers participating. This plan covers all areas of teaching such as teaching ideology, teaching contents, curriculum structure and teaching methodology. *Project 211* is the Chinese government's new endeavor aimed at strengthening about 100 institutions of higher education and key disciplinary areas as a national priority for the 21st century.

In 1997, The State Education Commission convened its workshop of examining the reform programs to be implemented in curriculum construction of higher normal education oriented towards 21st Century, with major attention paid to exploring ways of developing and reforming higher normal education as well as effecting transformation in course and curriculum construction (read at 10.06.2004 website http://www.edu.cn/20010101/21830.shtml). In 1998, The Ministry of Education issued the revised *Catalogue of Undergraduate Programs in Common Colleges and Universities* and *Guiding Catalogue of Undergraduate Engineering Programs*. In accordance with the basic principle of "expanding in proper and standard ways", the *Catalogue of Undergraduate Programs* included 11 disciplines of philosophy, economics, law science, pedagogy, literature, history, science, engineering, agronomy, medical science and management, covering 71 sub-disciplines and 249 specialities. (Li Haisheng, 2001).

On July 1 1998, the State Council promulgated the *Decisions on Readjusting, Canceling and Merging Administrative Systems in Schools Affiliated to Ministries.* The State Council decided to readjust the administrative systems of schools affiliated to the relevant central organizations, including 93 common colleges and universities, 72 adult colleges and universities, 46 polytechnic schools.

On December 24, 1998 the Ministry of Education promulgated *the Action Scheme for Invigorating Education Towards the 21st Century* (1998). As a blueprint for cross-century educational reform and development in China, the *Scheme* made clear the objectives of educational development in China from 2000 to 2010.

From June 15 to 18, the Central Committee of CPC (the Communist Party of China) and the State Council jointly convened the 3rd National Education Workshop since the policy of reform and opening China to the outside world was put into effect, and promulgated on the workshop the *Decisions on Deepening the Educational Reform and Propelling the Overall Development of Quality Education* by the Central Committee of CPC and the State Council (1999). Proceeding from the strategic point of international political and economic perspective, the *Decisions* and the workshop, with its mind set to bring into reality the prosperous development of socialism in China as well as the rejuvenation of the Chinese nation, entrusted the quality education with new tasks reflective of needs of modern times and came up with definite objectives and tasks for the initiative of deepening educational reform and advancing the overall development of quality education.

In 2000 there were such important decisions as *"Further increase in the enrollment size in colleges and universities"* (January of 2000), *"The Project of Reform on Higher Education in the New Century"* (February of 2000), *"Concrete plans for the formulation of the 10th Five-Year Plan as well as the Planning for 2015"* (March of 2000) and *"The Implementation Measures for Regulations on Teachers' Qualifications"* (October of 2000) (see "Chronicle of Major Educational Events in 2000" Website, read at 10.06.2004 http://www.edu.cn/20011225/3015272.shtml).

In addition to the above documents, a series of higher education conferences in the late 1990s are worthy to notice. On March 24, 1998 the 1st National Workshop on Education in Common Colleges and Universities was convened in Wuhan, which laid down the tasks to be fulfilled in future, among which stood out those of implementing educational policies, remolding ideologies and concepts, expanding the scope of programs, reforming educational contents and methods, enhancing quality education and improving educational quality. On November 1, 1999 the Workshop on Enrollment of Common Colleges and Universities in China was held in Tianjin, which summed up the achievements as well as experience in admission by common colleges and universities in 1997 as well as those in pushing forward the reform of national college entrance examination. The workshop additionally called for pressing ahead with the reform in subjects, contents and forms of the national college entrance

examination as well as the reform in the remote enrollment adopted by colleges and universities. On December 6, 1999 the Education Workshop 2000 was convened by the Ministry of Education, which pointed out that the core task to be fulfilled in 2000 was to act in the spirit of the National Education Workshop and speed up the educational reform and development. On December 9, 1999 the National Workshop on Higher Education Enrollment was convened in Wuhan, which, estimating that the total number of students enrolled by various colleges and universities would get on a trend of increase in 3 years to come, decided that 3 million students would be enrolled by various colleges and universities across China in the year of 2000. In addition, the decision-making power of making enrollment plans for junior college education was delegated to all provinces, empowering provincial governments as a result in arena of higher education development (Li Haisheng, 2001) (see "Educational Milestones" read at 10.06.2004 Website: http://www.edu.cn/20011225/3015272.shtml).

As we know, party congresses are the most authoritative public events in the politics of the Chinese Communist Party (CPC). Former President Jiang Zemin's theme report of the 14th, 15th and 16th Congresses (1992, 1997, and 2002) will also be the reference in this research. Former national leaders Jiang Zemin (4.5.1998), Zhu Rongji (19.3.1998 and 3.7.1998) and Li Lanqing (17.1.1998) delivered important speeches related to higher education in the various conferences. In 2000, many ministerial officials (Chen Zhili, Zhou Yuanqing etc. 2000) had published articles concerning education in various newspapers and magazines. These speeches and articles will be reference materials to the research too. (See "Chronicle of Major Educational Events in 2000" read at 10.06.2004 http://www.edu.cn/20011225/3015272.shtml).

(2) Main Scientific Materials

Most of materials on China emphasize the reform of higher education. Chen (2001) and Zhao (2002) referred to the remarkable move of restructuring Chinese higher education through amalgamation. Min Weifang (1991, 2001, and 2002) and Cheng (1995, 1998) paid attention to the constraints and strategies for the 1990s in higher education finance reform. Wong (1994) focused on privatization of social welfare in Post-Mao China. Yin and White (1994) studied marketization of Chinese higher education and provide a critical assessment. These researches expounded the importance of education in present social development from the point of view of competitiveness of the comprehensive national strength in the international society, the essence of China's market economy competition and the cultural and ideological progress, respectively. It has practical significance in deepening the reform of education.

Wang Yingjie (1997) addressed educational development and policy changes in China. "Only if Chinese government makes proper policies, can China's educational system satisfy the needs of a changing society and prepare educated people for the next development stage

of the nation. Only if China's education policies succeed, can the whole nation's dream of becoming a medium-level developed country be realized." Gu, Mingyuan (2000) provided the challenges of Chinese higher education facing the challenges of knowledge-based economy and probed the future development of Chinese higher education.

Western professors are interested in Chinese higher education. Henze (1992) analyzed the developments of Chinese higher education, which underwent an extraordinary expansion, paralleled by far-reaching differentiation and growing hierarchization. "In the process of implementing reforms we find increasingly divergent judgments on the reform results and the direction they are moving in, which lead to conflicts as to how to further develop higher education." He also emphasized intended effects of educational reform on higher education. "Reform had been adapted from those used in the economic and scientific arenas." Christiansen (1996) paid attention to devolution in Chinese higher education policy in the 1990s. Mok (1996, 1997, 1999, 2000, and 2001) focused on educational development and marketization in China. He had addressed a large amount of comparative study of Asian countries on educational reforms and coping strategies under the tidal wave of marketization.

From the American points of view, John N. Hawkins (1983) referred to education and social change in the People's Republic of China. In 1998, Hawkins focused on the higher education reform and science and technology in China. In 2000 Hawkins probed to "what motivated the reforms in the context of China's unique political culture". Some specific features of educational decentralization were examined such as finance, curriculum and management. "While the current leadership appears to be committed to decentralization, they remain conflicted over the need to maintain control while at the same time respond creatively to the needs of the new market economy."

Policies leading up to the current reform effort are well detailed by Hayhoe (1984, 1987, 1989, 1992, and 1993). Ruth Hayhoe focused on the Chinese experience of education and modernization for many years. She argued that "neither Western capitalist nor Western socialist patterns have been satisfactory for China so far and that a deeply felt need for China's modernity to create its own forms has found expression in each stage of development." In 2000 she addressed that "China's universities have been deeply involved in conflicts and have played a crucial role in China's development over the century." Hayhoe also analyzed the degree to which elements in China's own traditional institutional and epistemological patterns underpinned the "modern" universities that have emerged, and what contribution they might make to global higher education in the new millennium. She suggested a merging of the values of academy and university in a new vision of higher learning for the 21st century.

In sum, existing research suggests that China has made great progress in development of higher education, but it still faces a good deal of problems. China is a traditional but at the same time fast-changing society. Therefore, China has to adopt new policies to solve the problems so that the high demand of Chinese people for higher education can be satisfied. "The

analysis of social and economic developments in the PRC since 1976 supports the argument that state education policy have been strongly influenced by a growing internationalization of various subsections of society and by gradually increasing counteractive forces inherent in the reform process" (Henze, 1992).

List of References

1. China Documents

Action Scheme for Invigorating Education Towards the 21st Century (1999), made by Ministry of Education, PRC 24 December 1998, approved by State Council on 13.1.1999.

Catalogue of Undergraduate Programs in Common Colleges and Universities and Guiding Catalogue of Undergraduate Engineering Programs (1998), issued by The Ministry of Education in 1998.

China Education Statistical Yearbook (1996).

Chen Zhili, etc. (2000) MOE Internet, read at 10.06.2004. http://www.edu.cn/20011225/3015272.shtm

Chronicle of Higher Education. China Education and Research Network. In: http://www.edu.cn/HomePage/english/education/highedu/index.shtml

Chronicle of Major Educational Events in 2000, MOE Internet, read at 10.06.2004 http://www.edu.cn/20011225/3015272.shtml.

Constitution of the People's Republic of China (1982, 1988, 1993). Adopted at the Fifth Session of the Fifth National People's Congress and Promulgated for Implementation by the Proclamation of the National People's Congress on December 4, 1982, as amended at the First Session of the Seventh National People's Congress on April 12, 1988, and again at the First Session of the Seventh National People's Congress on March 29,1993.

Decision on Reform of the Scientific-technological System (1985), promulgated by the CPC Central Committee in March 1985.

Decision on the Educational System (CPC & MOE, 1985), promulgated by the CPC Central Committee in May 1985.

The Decisions on Readjusting, Canceling and Merging Administrative Systems in Schools Affiliated to Ministries (1998), promulgated by the State Council on July 1 1998.

The Decisions on Deepening the Educational Reform and Propelling the Overall Development of Quality Education (1999), jointly convened by the Central Committee of CPC and the State Council on the 3rd National Education Workshop in June 15-18,1999.

Degree Statute of the People's Republic of China (1980), adopted at the 13th Session of the fifth National People's Congress, promulgated on Feb 12, 1980, and effective as of Jan 1, 1981.

Deng, Xiaoping, 1983. "Education should be oriented to modernization, to the world and to the future." (famous "three orientation"). Autographed for Jingshan School by Deng, Xiaoping On October 1, 1983.

Education Law of the People's Republic of China (1995) adopted at the third Session of the eighth National People's Congress, promulgated on March 18, 1995, and effective as of Sep 1995.

The Guidelines for the Education Reform and Development in China (1993) jointly promulgated by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and the State Council in February 13 1993. ("Zhongguo Jiaoyu Gaige he Fazhan Gangyao", Zhonghua Renmin Gongheguo Guowuyuan Gongbao, Vol. 4, pp. 159—160.)

Jiang Zemin, 1992. Speed up the Pace of Reform, Opening, and Modernization, and Win Greater Victories in the Cause of Socialism with Chinese Characteristics: Report to the 14th CPC National Congress in Beijing. 12 October 1992.

Jiang Zemin, 1997. "Hold High the Great Banner of Deng Xiaoping Theory for an All-round Advancement of the Cause of Building Socialism with Chinese Characteristics to the 21st Century". Report to the 15th CPC National Congress in Beijing. 12 September 1997.

Jiang Zemin, 1998. On May 4 1998, while attending celebrations for the 100th anniversary of the founding of Beijing University, President Jiang Zemin delivered an important speech, iterating the necessity for the CPC and the whole society of China to set store by the major role played by knowledge innovation as well as talent cultivation in pressing ahead with economic development and social progress in a time featured by giant strides made by science and technology as well as the advent of knowledge-based economy, consequently propelling the entire Chinese people to reach a consensus on the need of rejuvenating the nation through science and education and take real actions in that regard.

Jiang Zemin, 2002. "Build a well-off society in an all-round way and create a new situation in building socialism with Chinese characteristics". Report to the 16th CPC National Congress in Beijing. 8 November 2002.

Law of Compulsory Education of the People's Republic of China (1986) adopted at the Fourth Session of the Sixth National People's Congress, promulgated by Order No. 38 of the President of the PRC on April 12, 1986, and effective as of July 1.

Law of Teachers of the People's Republic of China (1993) adopted at the Fourth Session of the eighth National People's Congress, promulgated on Oct 31, 1993, and effective as of Jan 1 1994.

Law of Higher education of the People's Republic of China (1998), adopted at the Fourth Session of the ninth National People's Congress, promulgated on Aug 29, 1998, and effective as of Jan 1 1999.

Li Lanqing, 1998. On January 17, 1998 the National Experience Exposure Workshop on Higher Education Management System Reform was convened in Yangzhou. Vice Premier Li Lanqing pointed out on the workshop that great efforts should be channeled into accelerating the transformation of higher education management system guided by the principle of "educational restructuring through joint development, cooperation and merger", with the aim of bringing about a system meeting the requirements brought forward by the socialist market economy, by progress scored in science and by technology and social development. On May 2, the President Forum of Higher Education Oriented towards 21st Century was held in Beijing. In his speech delivered

at the forum, Vice Premier Li Lanqing pointed out that propelling technical and educational development had stood out as a task of top priority for the Chinese Government.

Ministry of Education, 1999. Programme of Educational Revitalization for the Twenty-first Century (Beijing).

MOE Internet, read at 10.06.2004 website. In 1997, The State Education Commission convened its workshop of examining the reform programs to be implemented in curriculum construction of higher normal education oriented towards 21st century, with major attention paid to exploring ways of developing and reforming higher normal education as well as effecting transformation in course and curriculum construction. http://www.edu.cn/20010101/21830.shtml.

MOE, 1998. Ministry of Education of China Action Plan for Vitalizing Education for the 21st Century, People's Republic of China. Beijing, China: MOE. http://www.chinaembassy.ie/eng/23741.html

Notice of Teaching Reforms in Courses of Ideology and Morality and Political Theories in Universities (*Guanyu Gaige Xuexiao Sixiang Pingde he Zhengzhi Lilun Kecheng Jiaoxue de Tongzhi).* Issued by the CPC Central Committee on 1 August 1985.

Points Regarding How to Expedite Reforms and Vigorously Develop Ordinary Higher Education (1992). Issued by the State Education Commission in December 1992.

The Private Education Law (2002). Adopted at the 31st Session of the ninth National People's Congress, promulgated on December 28, 2002, was to be put into effect since September 1 of 2003.

The Reform Plan of Teaching Contents and Curriculum of Higher Education Facing the 21st Century (1994). Launched by the former SedC (State Education Commission) in 1994.

Suggestions on the Improvement and Enhancement of Graduate Education (1995). Promulgated by the pro-State Education Commission in 1995.

The Regulations on Running Schools by Non-Governmental Sectors (1997). Promulgated by the State Council On July 31, 1997, was to be put into effect since October 1 of 1997.

Statute for Teacher's Eligibility (1996). Adopted at the 19th Session of the eighth National People's Congress, promulgated on May 15, 1996.

The World Factbook (2004). Website, read at 10.06.2004 see http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html.

Zhu Rongji, 1998. On March 19, 1998 when attending the press conference for the 1st Session of the 9th National People's Congress, Premier Zhu Rongji pointed out that the rejuvenation of China through science and education stood out as the major task to be fulfilled by the government, and additionally announced that the State Science and Technology and Education Directorate would be set up by the Central Government. On July 3, 1998 while delivering a speech on a briefing to teachers and students of colleges and universities at the Great Hall of the People, Premier Zhu Rongji pointed out that the state would take all possible measures within its ability to increase its investment in education and the central expenditure for education would be increased by a percentage point each year.

2. EU Documents

Agenda 2000

Bologna Declaration (1999). The European Higher Education Area. Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education. Convened in Bologna on the 19th of June 1999.

CHEPS (December 2001). Improving human potential and the socio-economic knowledge base, project proposal, higher education institutions responses to Europeanisation, internationalization and globalization.

COM (91) 349. Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community. Communications from the Commission (final) 1st November 1991.

COM (93) 183. (Ruberti-Report) Guidelines for Community Action in the field of Education and Training. Communications from the Commission (final). 5th May 1993.

COM (93) 457. Green Paper on the European Dimension of Education. Communications from the Commission (final). 29th September 1993.

COM (93) 700. White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment in the European Community. Communications from the Commission (final).

COM (94) 596. On Recognition of Qualifications for Academic and Professional Purposes. Communications from the Commission (final). 13th December 1994.

COM (96) 462. Education, Training and Research: the Obstacles to Transnational Mobility. Communications from the Commission (final).

COM (97) 563. Towards a Europe of Knowledge. Communications from the Commission (final). 12th November 1997.

COMETT (OJ 1986 L222/17—21, and OJ 1989 L 13/57—63)

Commission (2000f). Final Commission Report on the Implementation of the Socrates Programme 1995-1999 (Brussels: Commission).

Commission (2000g). Education, Training and Youth. A new Generation of Programmes (2000-2006). Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci, Youth and Tempus III (Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities).

Commission (2001f). Socrates European Community Action Programme in the Field of Education: Transition Socrates I—Socrates II, in: http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/socrates/transition.html (06/02/2001).

Commission of the European Communities (1999). On the Initial Implementation Phase of the Socrates Programme: 1995—1997. Brussels.

Commission of the European Communities (2000). Better but not yet the Best. Enterprise Policy Action to Improve Europe's Competitiveness, Commission Staff Working Paper, Brussels, 9 November 2000.

Commission of the European Communities (2000). A Memorandum on Lifelong Learning, Brussels, 30 October 2000.

Commission of the European Communities (2003). The Role of the Universities in the Europe of Knowledge. COM (2003) 58 Final. Brussels, 05.02.2003.

Council Decision 99/311/EC of 29 April 1999 adopting the third phase of the trans-European co-operation scheme for higher education (Tempus III) (2000—2006) (Official Journal L 120 of 08.05.1999).

Council of the European Union and European Parliament (1995): 'Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 1995 establishing the Community action programme "Socrates" (819/95/EC)', in: Official Journal of the European Communities, L 87 (20/04/95).

Council of the European Union and European Parliament (1999b): 'Common Position (EC) No 6/1999 of the European Parliament and of the Council with a view of the adoption of a Decision establishing the second phase of the Community action programme in the field of education "Socrates"', in: Official Journal of the European Communities, C 49 (22/02/99).

Council of the European Union and European Parliament (2000a): 'Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 January 2000 establishing the second phase of the Community action programme in the field of education "Socrates" (253/2000/EC)', in: Official Journal of the European Communities, L 28 (03/02/00).

Council of the European Union (2001) Common Position adopted by the Council with a view to the adaptation of a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the Sixth Framework Programme of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities, contributing to the creation of the European Research Area and to innovation (2002-2006). 15483/01. Brussels.

Council Recommendation (EC) No 561/98 of 24 September 1998 on European cooperation in quality assurance in higher education.

Decision No 253/2000/EC of 24 January 2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the second phase of the Community programme in the field of education "SOCRATES" (Official Journal L 28 of 03.02.2000).

The ERASMUS. OJ 1987 L 166/20—24 and OJ 1989 L 395/23—27.

European Commission (1994). Cooperation in Education in the European Union: 1976—1994. Education, Training, Youth: Studies No.5. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

European Commission (1996b). SOCRATES: Manual of Good Practice on Erasmus under the Socrates Programme. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

European Commission (1997c). Report: Accomplishing Europe Through Education and Training. Study Group on Education and Training, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

European Commission (2000a). Towards a European research area. COM (2000) 6. Brussels.

European Commission (2002). A Project for the European Union. COM (2002) 247 final. Brussels.

European Roundtable of Industrialists (1995). Education for Europeans. Towards the Learning Society, Brussels.

European Union Online, ECTs-European Credit Transfer System, Erasmus, read at 10 Dec. 2001 http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/socrates/ects.html; see also Chapter 7: ECTS- A Common Language of Academic Recognition Within the EU, Laurea Polytechnic, 14 Aug. 2001 http://www.evamk.fi/opintoopas/index_new.asp?gid=3.

Jean Monnet. OJ 1989 C 308/13—14.

Lingua. OJ 1989 L 239/24—32.

Lisbon 2000. The Lisbon strategy for economic, social and environmental renewal, in 24 March 2000, Lisbon.

PE DOC A4-36/95. Report on the Joint Text Approved by the Conciliation Committee for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council Establishing the Community Action Programme "Socrates". European Parliament Working Documents. 24th February 1995.

The Report, 1996. The English version is available on the Net under the title: "Accomplishing Europe Through Education and Training". The address is the following: http//www.europa.eu.int/en/com/dg22/reflex/en/en1.doc

Schuman declaration (1950). On the 9th of May 1950 in Paris, Robert Schuman presented his proposal on the creation of an organised Europe, indispensable to the maintenance of peaceful relations.

Single European Act (SEA). Feb. 17, 1986, 1987 O.J. (L 169); 25 I.L.M. 506.

Socrates, Leonardo, the EC-US, EC-Canada, EC-Japan programmes, etc. In http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/programmes_en.html

The Sorbonne Declaration (1998). Joint Declaration on Harmonization of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System, Paris, the Sorbonne, May 25, 1998.

Tempus. OJ 1990 L 131/21—26; OJ 1993 L 112/34—39; OJ 1996 L 306/36—39.

Treaty Establishing the European Coal and Steel Community, April 18, 1951, 261 U.N.T.S. 140 (ECSC Treaty or Treaty of Paris). This treaty expires by its own terms on 23 July 2002.

Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community, March 25, 1957, 298 U.N.T.S. 3, 4 Eur. Y.B. 412 (EEC Treaty or Treaty of Rome).

Treaty Establishing the European Atomic Energy Community, March 25, 1957, 298 U.N.T.S. 259, 5 Eur. Y.B. 454 (Euratom Treaty).

Treaty on European Union (TEU), Feb. 7, 1992, 1992 O.J. (C 191), 31 I.L.M. 253 (the Union Treaty or the Maastricht Treaty).

Treaty of Amsterdam Amending the Treaty on European Union, the Treaties Establishing the European Communities and Certain Related Acts, Oct. 2, 1997, 1997 O.J. (C 340); 37 I.L.M. 56 (Treaty of Amsterdam).

Treaty of Nice Amending the Treaty on European Union, the Treaties Establishing the European Communities and Certain Related Acts, Feb. 26, 2001, 2001 O.J. (C 80) (Treaty of Nice).

White Paper on growth, competitiveness, and employment: The challenges and ways forward into the 21st century, COM (93) 700 final, Brussels, 5 December 1993.

White Paper on Education and Training: Teaching and Learning Towards the Learning Society. 1995. Commission of the European Communities (CEC, 1995), Office for Official Publications. Brussels.

3. Scientific Books and Articles

Adam, Stephen. 1996. European Credit Transfer System for Academic Recognition: Purposes/Principles—Development—Achievement/Potential, paper read at the Conference on Synergies between Academic and Professional Recognition, Gotland (Sweden), 21—23 October 1996 (unpublished).

Alic, J. A. 1997. Knowledge, Skill, and Education in the new Global Economy. Futures, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 5—16.

Allaway, William H. 1991. The Future of International Educational Exchange, American Behavioral Scientist 35.1 (Sept/Oct. 1991).

Altbach. P. G. 1991. Impact and Adjustment: Foreign Students in a Comparative Perspective. Higher Education 21(3), 305—324.

Altbach Philip G. 2002. Perspectives on Internationalizing Higher Education. International Higher Education, Spring 2002.

Altbach Philip G. 2004. Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. Tertiary Education and Management (No. 1, 2004).

Aninat, E. 141/1/2001. China, Globalization and the IMF. http://www.imf.org/eternal/up/speeches 2001/011401 htm. 3/24/01.

Avis, J., Bloomer, M., Esland, G. and Hdlkinson, P. 1996. Knowledge and Nationhood: Education Politics and Work (London: Cassell).

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. First edition, 1983. Revised Edition ed. London and New York: Verso, 1991.

Asian Times. 1999. August 2—8, 1999.

Bai, Liming. 1998. The metamorphosis of China's higher education in the 1990s, in: K. Sullivan (Ed.) Education and Change in the Pacific Rim: meeting the challenges (Wallingford, Oxford-shire, UK Triangle Journals).

Ball, Stephen J. 1998. Big Policies/Small World: An Introduction to International Perspectives in Education Policy. Comparative Education Vol. 34, Issue 2.

Barclays Bank. 2002. Competing with the world: best practice in regional economic development. Institute of Welsh Affairs/Barclays Bank, London.

Barry, J. Hake. 1999. Lifelong Learning Policies in the European Union: Developments and Issues. Compare, Vol. 29, No. 1, 1999, 53-69.

Becker, Gary S. 1964 and 1993. Human Capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education", New York: Columbia University Press (for New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, NBER), 1964. 3d edition. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1993.

Bell, G. H. 1989. Developing a European Dimension of the Teacher Training Curriculum. European Journal of Teacher Education 12 (3), 229—237.

Bell, G. H. 1991. Developing a European Dimension in Primary Schools. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Bennett, C.J. 1991. Review Article: What is Policy Convergence and What Causes it? British Journal of Political Science, Vol. 21: 215—233.

Berdahl, Robert. 1991. Higher Education and Governmental Relations in Western Europe. Educational Record Vol. 72, (Fall, 1991) p. 54.

Beukel, E. 1992. Uddanelsepolitik I EF. Nye mönstre I Europaeisk integration. (Education Policy in the EC. New Patterns in European Integration) Odense: Odense universitetsforlag.

Beukel, E. 1994. Reconstructing Integration Theory: The Case of Educational Policy in the EC. Cooperation and Conflict 29 (1), 33—54.

Beukel, E. 2001. Educational Policy: Institutionalization and multi-level governance, in S.S. Andersen and K.A. Eliassen (eds.) Making Policy in Europe. London: SAGE.

Bourdieu, P. 1986. The forms of capital, in J.E. Richardson (ed.) Handbook of Theory for Research in the Sociology of Education, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Bowen, Howard. 1980. Investment in Learning. The Individual and Social Value of American Higher Education. Jossey-Bass Publishers. San Francisco.

Bray, M. 2000. Financing higher education: Patterns, trends and options. Prospects, xxx, 3, pp. 331—348.

Carnoy, M. 1999. Globalization and Educational Reforms: What Planners Need to Know, Fundamentals of Educational Planning, No. 63, UNESCO-IIEP, Paris.

Castells, Manuel. 1991. Universities as dynamic systems of contradictory functions. In Muller, Cloete & Badat (ed.) (2001). Challenges of Globalisation. South African debates with Manuel Castells. Centre for Higher Education Transformation. Maskew Miller Longman Ltd. Cape Town.

Castells, Manuel. 1996. The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture. Oxford: Blackwell, Vol. I "The rise of the network society" (1996)

CERI. 1995. Decision-Making in 14 OECD Education Systems (Paris: OECD).

CEY Editorial Board 1998. China education yearbook 1998. Beijing: People's Education Press.

Chan, D. and Mok, K. H. 2001. Educational reforms and coping strategies under the tidal wave of mercerization: A comparative study of Hong Kong and the Mainland. Comparative Education, 37, 1, pp. 21—41.

Charles D. and P. Bennworth. 2002. Evaluating the regional contribution of an HEI, Higher Education Funding Council for England, Bristol.

Charles Darwin. 1859. On The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. First Edition, by Charles Darwin 1859.

Chelimsky, E. 1995. The political environment of evaluation and what it means for the development of the field. American Evaluation Association Presidential Address, Vancouver, November 1995. Evaluation Practice. 16(3), 215—225.

Chen, David. 2001. Restructuring through Amalgamation in China, International Higher Education Fall 2001: 15.

Chen, David Y. 2002. The Amalgamation of Chinese Higher Education Institutions. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10 (20). Retrieved December 19, 2002, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n20.html

Cheng, K. M. 1995. Education-Decentralization and the Market, in L. Wong and S. MacPherson, (Eds.), Social Change and Social Policy in Contemporary China Aldershot: Avebury.

Cheng, Kaiming. 1998. Reforms in the administration and financing of higher education, in: M. Agelasto & B. Adamson (eds) Higher Education in Post-Mao China (Hong Kong, Hong Kong University Press).

Cheung, K. W. and Iu, P. T. 1995. Power Negotiation between the Centre and Locale: Development of Higher Education Policy in Guangdong in the 1980s, in J. Cheng and S. MacPherson, (Eds.), Development in Southern China: A Report on the Pearl River Delta Including the Special Economic Zone, Hong Kong: Longman.

Cheung, A. 2000. Globalization, governance and Asian values: Can there be a universal administrative paradigm? Paper presented to the International Conference on Governance, January 2000, City University of Hong Kong.

China Education and Research Network Internet 2001. http://www.chinaembassy.at/ger/14440.html

Chinese website, http://www.edu.cn. Read at 10.9.1999.

Chinese website, read at 10.09.2000 http://www.edu.cn.

Chinese website, http://www.chinahouston.org/news/2001102200131.html

Chinese Education Statistical Yearbook, 1999. Read at 10.7. 2004.

Christiansen, F. 1996. Devolution in Chinese Higher Education Policy in the 1990s: Common Establishment and the '211' Programme, Leeds East Asia Papers, No. 36, Department of East Asian Studies, University of Leeds.

Clark, Burton R. (ed.) 1984. Perspectives on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press.

Cleverley, J. 1985. The schooling of China. Winchester, MA: George Allen & Unwin.

Coleman, J.S. 1988. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital, American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 94, Supplement, pp. 95-120.

Coleman, J.S. 1990. Foundations of Social Theory, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

CRE Info 1994. The Association of European Universities Newsletter. Number 6, October, 1994 p. 3

CSSB. China State Statistics Bureau, 1996. The Abstracts of China Statistics Yearbook 1996. Beijing: China Statistics Press.

Current Issues in Chinese Higher Education. 2001. Publisher: OECD. 2001.

Dale, R. 1999. Specifying Globalization Effects on National Policy: A Focus on the Mechanisms. Journal of Education Policy, 14, 1, pp. 1—17.

De Wit, H. and J.C. Verhoeven. 2001. The Higher Education Policy of the European Union: With or Against the Member States? In J. Huisman, P. Maassen and G. Neave (eds.) Higher Education and the Nation State. The International Dimension of Higher Education. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Droogleever Fortuijin, E. 1988. Education, Societal Inequality and Social Change: an Analytical Framework for the Study of the Relation between Education and Society in Processes of Social Change, CESO. The Hague.

Du, R. 1992. Chinese Higher Education: The Decade of Reform and Development (1978-1988) New York: St. Martin's Press.

Dudley, J. 1998. Globalization and Education Policy in Australia, In Currie, J. and Newson, J. (eds.), Universities and Globalization. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 21—43.

Easton, David. 1965. A Framework for Political Analysis (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965), p. 96.

Ebuchi, K. (Ed.) 1989. Foreign Students and Internationalization of Higher Education, Hiroshima University, Research Institute for Higher Education.

Edwards, R. 1970. The Dimensions of Comparison, and of Comparative Education. Comparative Education Review 14, no. 3 (1970): 239—54.

Edwards, R. and Usher, R. 2000. Globalization and Pedagogy. London: Routledge.

Egeberg, M. 2001. How Federal? The Organizational Dimension of Integration in the EU (and elsewhere), Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 8, No. 5: 728—746.

Elliott, David. 1998. Internationalizing British Higher Education: Policy Perspectives. In Scott, Peter (1998) (ed.). The Globalization of Higher Education. The Society for research into Higher Education & Open University Press. Bury St. Edmunds.

EU "Education, Training and Youth". http://europa.eu.int/pol/educ/overview_en.htm

European Union website, read at 3 Dec. 2001 http://europa.eu.int/abe-en.htm

Field, J. 1997. The Learning Society and the European Union: A Critical Assessment of Supranational Education Policy Formation, Journal of Studies in International Education, Vol. 1, No. 2: 73—92.

Florax, R. 1992a. University – a Regional Booster? Economic Impacts of Academic Knowledge Infrastructure, Ashgate Publishing.

Florax, R. 1992b. Public Expenditure on Higher Education, London: Taylor Francis.

Fukuyama, F. 1992. The End of History and the Last Man. New York: Free Press.

Gardner, John. 2000. Paper of Jamil Salmi, June 2000. Read at 2.12.2003. http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/LAC/lacinfoclient.nsf/0/2d9645fd1eaab499852569ed005ccbc3/$FILE/62.pdf

Goodman, David. and Gerald, Segal. eds. 1994. China Deconstructs: Politics, Trade, and Regionalism. London and New York: Routledge.

Gu, Mingyuan. 2000. What is Facing Chinese Higher Education in the New Century? Paris: OECD, Current Issues in Chinese Higher Education, 2000, pp. 13—20.

Gravaris, D. 1991. Employment Policies and the Role of the State to the Labour Market, in Topos, no. 3, pp. 3—36.

Guangming Daily 1999b. October 21. 1999.

Hallak, J. 1998. Education and Globalization, IIEP Contributions No. 26, UNESCO-IIEP.

Hallak, J. 2000. Globalization and its Impact on Education. In: Mebrahtu, T., Crossley, M. and Johnson, D. eds. Globalization, Educational Transformation and Societies in Transition. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp. 21—40.

Hans de Wit. 2002. Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishers. pp. 270.

Hans, N. 1949. Comparative Education: A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions. London: Routledge & Kegan.

Hanson, E. M. 1998. Strategies of Educational Decentralization: Key Questions and Core Issues. Journal of Educational Administration, 36, 2, pp. 11—128.

Harvey, D. 1990. The Condition of Post-Modernity (Oxford: Blackwell).

Harris, P. 1990. Foundation of Public Administration: A Comparative Approach, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Haug, Guy. 1999. Trends and Issues in Learning Structures in Higher Education in Europe. Final version—revised after the Bologna meeting of 18-19 June 1999. Confederation of European Rectors' Conferences (http://www.rks.dk/trends3.htm, accessed 30.5.2000).

Hawkins, J. N. 1983. Education and Social Change in the People's Republic of China. New York: Praeger.

Hawkins, J. N. 2000. Centralization, Decentralization, Recentralization: Educational Reform in China. Journal of Educational Administration. 38, 5 (2000) pp. 442—454.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (ed) 1984. Contemporary Chinese Education. London/Sydney: Croom Helm.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (ed) 1987. Chinese Educators on Chinese Education (special issue). Canadian and International Education 16 (1).

Hayhoe, Ruth. 1989. China's Universities and the Open Door. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (ed) 1992. Education & Modernization: The Chinese Experience. New York: Pergamon.

Hayhoe, R. 1993. An Asian Multiversity? Comparative Reflections on the Transition to Mass Higher Education, Comparative Education Review, 39(3), 17—32.

Hayhoe, Ruth. (ed) 1993. Knowledge Across Cultures—Universities East and West. Wuhan: Hubei Education Press/Toronto: OISE Press.

Hayhoe, R. 1996. China's Universities 1895—1995: A Century of Cultural Conflict. New York/London: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Hayward, Fred M. 2000. Globalisation and Internationalisation: Thoughts about the Institutional Context in U.S. Higher Education. Paper presented in the International Forum of Change Projects 19th—21st August 2000, San Lamer, Durban. http://www.chet.org.za/publications/San%20Lameer%20Participant%20Papers.doc

Held, David; McGrew, Anthony; Goldblatt, David & Perraton, Jonathan. 1999. Global Transformations. Politics, economics and culture. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Hellgren, P. 1994. European Curriculum and Autonomy in the Class. European Journal of Teacher Education 17 (3), 143—160.

Helmut, de Rudder, 2000. On the Europeanization of Higher Education in Europe, International Higher Education (Spring 2000).

Henze. J. 1992. The Formal Education System and Modernization: An Analysis of Developments Since 1978. In Education and Modernization: The Chinese Experience. Edited by Ruth Hayhoe. 1992, 103—139. Pergamon Press.

Hill, S. and A. Webb, 2001. A More Prosperous Wales. Beavn Foundation papers, No. 1, Tredgar.

Hill, S. 2004, The Economic Impact of Higher Education in Wales, report commissioned by Higher Education Wales and the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales, August.

Hopper, Earl. 1971. A Typology for the Classification of Educational Systems. In Readings in the Theory of Educational Systems. Earl Hopper (ed.), pp. 91—110. London. Hutchinson University Library. Also see Karabel, Jerome and A. H. Halsey (eds.). 1977. Power and Ideology in Education. NY: Oxford University Press. 153—166.

Hèritier, A. 2001. Differential Europe: National Administrative Responses to Community Policy, in M.G. Cowles, J. Caporaso and T. Risse (eds.) Transforming Europe. Europeanization and Domestic Change. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Höstmark Tarrou, A-L. 1993. The Goals of Enhancing National and International Cultures. Challenges to Teacher Education? European Journal of Teacher Education 16 (2), 95—112.

James, E. 1987. The Public / Private Division of Responsibility for Education, An International Comparison, Economics of Education Review, Vol. 6. No. 1, pp. 1—14.

Ji, 1997. The Current Reforms in Chinese Higher Education. Conference on Comparative Research on Chinese and American Education. October 29—31, 1997. http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/eps/programs/chinese_am_ed.html

Jian, Ji. 1998. Moving the Reform of the Higher Education Administrative System into Greater Depths Enthusiastically and Steadily. Chinese Education & Society. 31(6). Retrieved November 28, 2003. http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=1566936&db=aph

Johnstone, D. B. website. Read at 10.08.2004. Some Principles of Tuition, Fees, and Student Financial Assistance Applicable to Chinese Higher Education. http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/FAS/Johnston/CHINA.HTM

Johnstone D. Bruce. 2002. Chinese Higher Education in the Context of the Worldwide University Change Agenda. This paper is adapted from an address to the Chinese and Foreign University Presidents Forum held in Beijing, PRC, July 2002. http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/inthigheredfinance/publications_chinapaper.htm

Kandel, I.L. 1933. Comparative Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kaplan, B. and Maxwell, J.A. 1994. Qualitative Research Methods for Evaluating Computer Information Systems, in Evaluating Health Care Information Systems: Methods and Applications, J.G. Anderson, C.E. Aydin and S.J. Jay (eds.), Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 1994, pp. 45—68.

Karlsen, G.E. 1994. EU, EØS og Utdanning. (The EU, EEA and Education) Oslo: TANO.

Kathryn, Mohrman. 2003. Center and Periphery: Changes in the Relationship between Chinese Universities and the Central Government, International Higher Education, http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News33/text013.htm, Fall, 2003.

Kearns, D. T., & Doyle, P. D. 1991. Winning the brain race. San Francisco: ICS Press.

Kennedy, M. M. 1979. Generalizing from Single Case Studies. Evaluation Quarterly 3, 661—679.

Kingdon, J. W. 1995. Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies, 2nd ed (New York: HarperCollins).

Kirk, Jerome and Miller, Marc L. 1986. Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. Qualitative Research Methods Series Vol. 1, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kjellberg, F. and M. Reitan. 1995. Studiet av offentlig politikk—en innføring. Oslo: TANO.

Knight, Jane. 1997. Internationalization of higher education: A conceptual framework. In Jane Knight and Hans deWit (Eds.), Internationalization of higher education in Asia Pacific countries. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Knight, Jane, 1993. Internationalization: Management Strategies and Issues, in International Education Magazine, Vol.9, No.1, 1993, pp. 6, 21, 22.

Knill, C. 2001. The Europeanisation of National Administrations. Patterns of Institutional Change and Persistence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kwong, J. 1996. The New Educational Mandate in China: Running Schools, Running Business. International Journal of Educational Development, 16, 2, pp. 185—194.

Kwong, J. 1997. The Reemergence of Private Schools in Socialist China. Comparative Education Review, 41, 3, pp. 244—259.

Kwong, J. 2000. Introduction. International Journal of Educational Development, 20 March 2000.

Laffan, B., R. O'Donnell and M. Smith 2000. Europe's Experimental Union. Rethinking integration. London: Routledge.

Lan, Xue. 2000. Reinvigorating China through Science and Education: A Chinese Strategy for a Knowledge-Based Economy. In: http://www.worldbank.org/research/abcde/eu_2000/pdffiles/xue.pdf

Lasswell, Harold D. 1958. Politics—Who Gets What, When, How (New York, NY: Meridian Press, 1958).

Law, W. W. 2001. Globalization, Localization and Education Reform in a New Democracy: The Taiwan Experience. In: Mok, K.H. and Welch, A. (eds.) Globalization and Educational Restructuring in the Asia Pacific Region. Basingstoke: Palgrave. 2001.

Lee, H. H. 2000. Higher Education in Hong Kong and Singapore: An Optimistic or Pessimistic Future? Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research and Education (AARE), 4—7 December 2000, The University of Sydney.

Lehtisalo L. & Raivola R. 1986. Koulutuspolitiikka ja Koulutussuunnittelu. Juva: WSOY. (Education Politics and Education Plan)

Levin, J. S. 2001. Public Policy, Community Colleges, and the Path to Globalization, Higher Education, 42 (2), 237—261.

Liang, Y. 1993. Zhujiang Sanjiaozhou Gaodeng Jiaoyu de Hongguan Fenci ji Fazhan Duice (Macro Analysis and Development Strategies of Higher Education in the Pearl River Delta), in Huang Jiajiang et al., (Eds.), Gaige Dacao Zhong de Zhujiang Sanjiaozhou Jiaoyu (Education in the Pearl River Delta amidst Tides of Reform), Guangdong: Gaodeng Jiaoyu Chubanshe.

Li, Deshan. 1998. Education—the Important Motive Force of the Present Development of Economy. Journal of Tianjin Business Institute, 4, 67—70. (In Chinese)

Li, Lanqing. 2000. Working Report on Implementing the Strategy of Rejuvenating the Nation through Science and Technology Delivered at the Seventeenth Session of Standing Committee of the Ninth National People's Congress on August 24, 2000.

Li, Peilin. 1997. Institutional Innovation and Interest Allocation under China's Reform. In: Lu, X. Y. and Li P. L. (eds.) Report of the Social Development in New China, Shenyang: Liaoning Renmin Chubanshe. (In Chinese)

Lindblom, Charles E. 1980. Politics and Markets (Urbana: Illinois, 1980).

Llobera J.R. 1993. The Role of State and Nation in Europe. In Garcia S. (ed.). European Identity and the Search for Legitimacy. London: Pinter Publishers, 64—80.

Malhotra, Kamal. 1997. Globalization and Its Implications for Action Aid. Paper prepared for the Focus on the Global South Meeting, Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute, Bangkok, November. (http://www.focus.org)

Marginson, S. 2002. Nation-Building Universities in a Global Environment: The Case of Australia, Higher Education, 43 (3), 409—428.

Martin, L.L. and B.A. Simmons. 1998. Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions, International Organization, Vol. 52, No. 4: 729—757.

Meijer, K. 1991. Reforms in vocational education and training in Italy, Spain and Portugal: similar objectives, different strategies, European Journal of Education, 26 (1).

Meyer, J. W. et al. 1979. The world educational revolution, 1950—1970. In J. W.

Min, Weifang. 1991. Higher Education Finance in China: Current Constraints and Strategies for the 1990s. Higher Education, 21, 151—161, 1991.

Min, Weifang. 2001. Current Trends in Higher Education Development in China. International Higher Education. Winter 2001.

Min, Weifang. 2002. Economic Transition and Higher Education Reform in China. Prepared for the Higher Education Seminar at the Center on Chinese Higher Education at Columbia University, January 24, 2002 New York, USA. http://www.teacherscollege.edu/centers/coce/pdf_files/EconTransitionandHEReform.pdf

MOE 2000. Higher Education. Read at 10.09.2000 http://www.moe.edu.cn

Mok, K. H. 1996. Mercerization and Decentralization: Development of Education and Paradigm Shift in Social Policy. Hong Kong Public Administration, 5, 1, pp. 35—56.

Mok, K. H. 1997. Mercerization and Quasi-mercerization: Educational Development in post-Mao China. International Review of Education, 5 1, pp. 33—56.

Mok, K. H. 1999. Education and the Market Place in Hong Kong and Mainland China. Higher Education, 37, pp. 133—158.

Mok, K. H. 2000. Impact of Globalization: A Study of Quality Assurance Systems of Higher Education in Hong Kong and Singapore. Comparative Education Review 44, 2, pp. 148—174.

Mok, K. H. 2000b. Marketizing Higher Education in post-Mao China. International Journal of Educational Development, 20, pp. 109—126.

Mok, K. H. 2001. Globalization, Mercerization and Higher Education: Trends and Developments in East Asia. Paper presented at the International Conference on Mercerization and Higher Education in East Asia, 7-8 April 2001, Shanghai.

Mok, K. H. 2001b. Education Policy Reform. In: Wong, L. and Flynn, N. eds. The Market in Chinese Social Policy, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Mok, Ka-Ho & Chan, D. 1998. Privatization or Quasi-mercerization? In: M. Agelasto & B. Adamson (Eds) Higher Education in Post-Mao (Hong Kong, Hong Kong University Press).

Mok, K. H. and Chan, D. 2001. Educational Development and the Socialist Market in Guangdong. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 21, 1, pp. 1—18.

Mok, K. H. and Lo, H. C. 2001. Mercerization and the Changing Governance in Higher Education: A Comparative Studies of Hong Kong and Taiwan. Paper presented at the International Conference on Mercerization and Higher Education in East Asia, 7—8 April 2001, Shanghai.

Mok, K.H. and Ngok, K.L. 2001. Decentralization and Changing Higher Education Governance in China. Paper presented to the Comparative Education Society of Asia Year 2001 Conference, 13—15 November 2001, Taipei, Taiwan.

Neave, G. 1984. Education and the EEC. European Institute of Education and Social Policy. Chester: Trentham Books.

Neave, G. 1990. On Preparing for Markets: Trends in Higher Education in Western Europe 1988-1990. European Journal of Education 25 (2), 105—122.

Neave, G. 2001. Anything Goes: Or, How the Accommodation of Europe's Universities to European Integration integrates an inspiring number of Contradictions, Keynote speech, 23rd Annual EAIR forum, 2001, University of Porto, Portugal.

Nòvoa, A. 2001. The Restructuring of the European Educational Space. Changing Relationships between States, Citizens, and Educational Communities. http://wiscinfo.doit.wisc.edu/eucenter/Conferences/Restrict_itin/novoa2.htm

OECD. 1996b. Internationalisation of Higher Education (Paris: OECD).

OECD. 2000. Knowledge Management in the Learning Society (Paris: OECD, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, 2000).

OECD. 2004. Internationalisation and Trade in Higher Education, Opportunities and Challenges, OECD, 2004 pg 11, 12, 19, 165, 178.

Ohmae, K. 1990. The Borderless World: Power and Strategy in the Interlinked Economy. New York: Harper Perennial.

Olsen, 1994. Institutional Perspectives on Governance, in Systemrationalitat und Partialintresse: Festschrift fur renate Mayntz, Ulrich Derlien, Baden-Baden.

Olsen, J.P. 2002. The Many Faces of Europeanization, ARENA working paper, No. 2 http://www.sv.uio.no/arena/publications/wp02_2.htm

Peters, M. 1999. The "Post-Historical" University, ACCESS (Critical Perspectives on Cultural and Policy Studies in Education), 18(2): 120—135.

Peng, Pei-yun. 1986. Speech at a Symposium on Marxist Ideo-political Education, Teaching and Research, 3: 1—6.

Pepper, S. 1996. Radicalism and Education Reform in 20th-century China. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Plafker, T. 1999. China Increases University Enrollments, Hoping Student Spending Will Revive Economy, The Chronicle of Higher Education, September 3, 1999.

Pyrgiotakis I. & Papadakis N. 2002. The Weak Consensus: EU's Discourse and Policy on Education, in Sakis Karagiorgas Foundation, Ideological and intellectual tendencies in modern Greece (Athens, Sakis Karagiorgas Foundation, pp. 209—243).

Raivola, R. 1990. Eurooppa yhdentyy—yhdentyykö koulutus. (Europe Unites – Does Education Unite?) Aikuiskasvatus 21 (4), 202—210.

Raivola, R. 1993. Eurooppa-ulottuvuus koulutuksessa. (The European Dimension in Education) Aikuiskasvatus 24 (1), 4—10.

Raivola, R. 1994. Adult Education in the New Europe. In M. Parjanen (ed.): Outside the Golden Gate. Prospects and Comparisons in Finnish Adult Higher Education. University of Tampere, Institute for Extension Studies A 3194. 18—42.

Raivola, R. 1995. Euroopan unionin koulutusdirektiivit. (The Directives on Education of the European Union) Kasvatus 26 (5), 433—442.

Ramirez, F. O., & Boli, J. 1987. Global patterns of educational institutionalization. In G. W. Thomas et al. (Eds.), Institutional structure: Constituting the state, society, and the individual. Newbury Park: SAGE.

Riddel, A. R. 1996. Globalization: Emasculation or opportunity for Educational Planning?, World Development, Vol. 24, pp. 1357—72.

Roderick, G., Stephens, M. (eds.). 1979. Higher Education for All? London, Falmer.

Rokkan, S. 1987. Stat, nasjon, klasse. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Rometsch, D. and W. Wessels (eds.) 1996. The European Union and Member States. Towards Institutional Fusion? Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ruberti, A. 2001. The Role and Position of Research and Doctoral Training in the European Union, in J. Huisman, P. Maassen and G. Neave (eds.) Higher Education and the Nation State. The International Dimension of Higher Education. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Ryan, L. 2001. Lessons from victims of globalization: Thailand, Indonesia and Malaysia in 'Human Resources and gender issues in poverty eradication' (Eds. Ghosh, Gabbay and Siddique Atlantic Publishers and Distributors New Delhi, pp. 206—222.

Ryba, R. 1992. Toward a European Dimension in Education: Intention and Reality in European Community Policy and Practice. Comparative Education Review 36 (1), 10—24.

Ryba, R. 1995. Is Progress Towards Development of the European Dimension in Education Satisfactory? Oxford Studies in Comparative Education 5 (2), 63—75.

Sadler, M. 1902. The Unrest in Secondary Education in Germany and Elsewhere. Board of Education Special Report on Education Subjects. London: His Majesty's Stationary Office.

Sandiford, P. 1918. Comparative Education: Studies of the Educational Systems of Six Modern Nations. London: Dent.

Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Schultz, Theodore W. 1961. Investment in Human Capital, American Economic Review, 51 (March 1961): 1—17.

Scott, Peter. 1998. Massification, Internationalization and Globalization. In Scott, Peter (1998) (ed.). The Globalization of Higher Education. The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press. Bury St. Edmunds.

Scott, Peter. (Ed.). 1998. The globalization of higher education. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Sheehan John. 1987. Reform of Higher Education Finance: What are the Practical Issues When Implementing Change? Washington, D.C.: The World Bank. Available at: http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/educ/backgrnd/sheehan1.html

Smith, A. 1980. From "Europhoria" to Pragmatism: Towards a New Start for Higher Education Cooperation in Europe? European Journal of Education 15 (1), 77—95.

Stiglitz, J. 1999. Public Policy for a knowledge Economy: Remarks at the Department for Trade and Industry and Centre for Economic Policy Research. Available at: http://www.worldbank.org/html/extme/jssp012799a.htm

Southern Daily. May 23, 1999.

Spence, J.D. 1991. The Search for Modern China. New York/London: W.W. Norton & Company.

Tait. A. 1996. The Open and Distance Learning Policy in the European Union in 1985—1995. Higher Education Policy 9 (3), 221—238.

Teichler, U. & Maiworm, F. 1997. The Erasmus Experience: Major findings of the Erasmus Evaluation Research Project. European Commission. Education, Training and Youth. Brussels.

Thomas, Volker. 1998. Living in Europe, Working for Europe, European Education 30.3 (fall 1998): 6—11.)

Taylor, S., Rizvi, F., Lingard, B. and Henry, M. 1997. Educational Policy and the Politics of Change. London: Routledge.

Turner, Ralph H. 1960. Contest and Sponsored Mobility and the School System. Amer. Sociol. R., 1960, 855—867.

Ulich, R. 1961. The Education of Nations: A Comparison in Historical Perspective. Cambridge: Harvard University.

Usher, R. & Bryant, I. 1989. Adult Education as Theory, Practice and Research: the Captive Triangle. London: Rougtledge.

Walker, R. 1980. The Conduct of Educational Case Studies: Ethics, Theory and Procedures. In W. B. Dockerell & D. Hamilton (Eds.) Rethinking Educational Research. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 30—63.

Wang, Yingjie. 1997. Educational Development and Policy Changes in China. Education in and on China and Chinese, 1997, 19—33, edited by Pertti Nikkilä. 3—5 October 1997 at the Helsinki University Lahti Research and training Centre arranged by the Nordic Association for China Studies (NACS).

Waters, M. 2001. Globalization. London: Routledge.

Wei, Xin. 1999. On Contributions of Scale Expansion of Higher Education to Short-run Economic Growth. Available at: http://www.hedu.pku.edu.cn/kuozhao/kzhkt.htm

Weisbrot, M. 2001. Globalisation: A primer' Http://www.cepr.net/GlobalPrimer.htm 3/24/01.

Welch, A. 1998. The Cult of Efficiency in Education: Comparative Reflections on the Reality and the Rhetoric. Comparative Education, 24, 2, pp. 157—175.

Wende, M.C. van der. 1999c. The Bologna Declaration: Enhancing the Transparency and Competitiveness of European Higher Education. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Global Alliance for Transnational Education, GATE, Melbourne, Australia, and 29 September—1 October 1999.

Whitty, G. 1997. Mercerization, the State and the Re-formation of the Teaching Profession. In: Halsey, A. H. et al. (eds.) Education: Culture, Economy and Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 299—310.

Wiseman, J. 1998. Global nation? Australia and the politics of globalisation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK. 1998.

Wistrich, Ernest. 1994. The United States of Europe. London, New York: Routledge, 1994. p. 80.

Wong, L. 1994. Privatization of Social Welfare in Post-Mao China, Asian Survey, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 307—325.

Wong, K. K. 1994a. Bureaucracy and school effectiveness. International Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 6. Educational Administration.

Woodhall, M. 1995. Financial Diversification in Higher Education: A Review of International Experience and Implications for African Universities, Higher Education Policy, 8 (1), 16—23.

World Bank, 1994. Higher Education: Lessons of Experience. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

World Bank, 1997. China: Higher education reform. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

World Bank, 1988. Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Policies for Adjustment, Revitalisation and Expansion, Washington.

Xu, Hui. 1990. Gaodeng Jiaoyu Fazhan de Xinjieduan (The New Stage of China's Higher Educational Development), Hangzhou: Hangzhou University Press.

Yang, Fengzhen. 2002. Education in China. Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 34, No. 2, 2002.

Yang, Rui. 2002. Ideo-Political Education in China's Universities: A Study of the Challenges since the 1990s. http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap/yan02312.htm

Yin Qiping and White, G. 1994. The Mercerization of Chinese Higher Education: A Critical Assessment, Comparative Education, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 217—237.

Zhao, 2002. A Remarkable Move of Restructuring: Chinese Higher Education, Education Policy Analysis Archives 5 Feb. 1998, 6 Mar. 2002 http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v6n5.html

Zhong Guo Jiao Yu Bai Nian Da Shi. 1952. [China's Education One Hundred Years Events (1952)]. China Education and Research Network (CERNET). Retrieved 19 September 19, 2003, from http://www.edu.cn/20010903/3000035.shtml.

Zhou, Ji. 2004. Providing education for over a billion people, read at 06.08.2004. In: http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=27733&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

Zhu, Qingfang. 2000. Mass Consumption and Consumer Market in 1999. In: Ru Xin et al. The Analysis and Forecast of Social Development in China Year 2000. Beijing: Chinese Academy of Social.