

## **Governance in Greek higher education from a comparative perspective**

Kiprianos Pandelis

University of Patras

Politis-Stergiou Vangelis

Technological Institution of West Greece

### **Abstract**

After the 1980s, significant changes were noted in the governance of H.E. in many western countries. From a shared model which was predominant internationally but with national particularities, we moved to a managerial model which is characterized by the withdrawal of the state, a greater opening up to the market and a reduction in the participation of the academic community. In Greek H.E. the development is somewhat different. In the 1980s the model of shared governance was introduced. In recent years, more and more of the main principles of the managerial model are being adopted. These policies, put to the test during the years of the crisis, it seems they failed. They have extremely significant consequences, which weigh down as much the operation of H.E. as the behaviours of the members of the university community, staff and graduates.

### **Keywords**

Governance of higher education, shared model, managerial model, comparative approach, academic community

## **Introduction**

After the 1980s, significant changes were noted in the organization and governance of H.E. in many western countries. Generally speaking, from a shared model which was predominant internationally but with national particularities, we moved to a managerial model which is characterized by the withdrawal of the state, a greater opening up to the market and a reduction in the participation of the academic community. In Greek H.E. the development is somewhat different. In the 1980s when all the more countries were adopting elements of the managerial model, in Greece the model of shared governance was introduced. However, over time, and especially in recent years, more and more of the main principles of the managerial model are being adopted.

Our objective in the present text is, based on texts from international bodies and the relevant debates in Greece, to provide a picture of this development and to evaluate the results so far of the changes at the level of organization and governance of H.E. To do this we believe that it is vital to view these changes through the comparative prism of two data. These are reforms in H.E. internationally and the changes at the level of governance. The comparative point of view will allow us to understand the relevant developments in Greece as well as to better assess the results of these developments.

## **Framework of the debate**

From Immanuel Kant and on, debate on the University endeavors to illuminate the objective of the institution and its relationship with power, political power nowadays and religious power in the past. In the aftermath of World War Two, a new dimension,

partly connected to the first was added to this problematic, that of the view of formal education and particularly of the university, as a public good.

A fundamental principle of the Kantian perception of the university and knowledge is the existence of a new school, seen until then as inferior, which would have a dual role. On the one hand it would compose the discourse of the other sciences and, on the other, keep a check on the value of their discourse as well as the discourse of power, without being accountable to the latter. In other words this school, of Philosophy, is assigned the objective of the quest for truth through the cultivation of moral Discourse (Kant 107-109).

The Kantian view will undergo change as far as the central position of discourse is concerned, with the German Idealists at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, who were behind the establishment of the first modern university, of Berlin (1810), but it will not change in terms of its rationale. The central category in their discourse is the term culture. As Bill Readings notes: ‘The process of hermeneutic reworking is called culture, and it has a double articulation. On the one hand, culture names an *identity*. It is the unity of all knowledges that are the object of study; it is the object of *Wissenschaft* (scientific – philosophical study). On the other hand, culture names a *process of development*, of the cultivation of character –*Bildung*. In the modern University, the two branches of this process are research and teaching, and the particularity of Idealists was to insist that the specificity of the University comes from the fact that it is the place where the two are inseparable. The high school practices teaching without research; the academy practices research without teaching. The University is the center of the educational system, because it is where teaching and research are combined, so that in

Schelling's words, the 'nurseries of science' must also be 'institutions of general culture' (Readings 1996: 64).

For many researchers these two considerations compose the framework that should define even today the objective and the position of the University in today's societies, as well too as its relationship with every kind of power, either political or economic. This position is concentrated in the freedom of teaching and research as Wilhelm von Humboldt codified it and which defines the relationship of the institution with political power within the framework of the Nation-state.

The Kantian as much as the Humboldtian perception continue today to inspire the views of important scholars on the University. The demand is for the autonomy of the University and its non-subjection to reasoning which cancels out its objective. This doesn't necessarily mean that it should be an institution cut off from the environment, both social and political, an ivory tower. In contrast, it ought to diffuse these knowledge, truths and values across all society, to make it a shareholder and to infuse it so that society itself acts based on these principles.

After the Second World War, a new dimension was added to the picture of the University. It originates mainly in the Economic Sciences and is linked to the concept of public good, which was chiefly worked on by Paul Samuelson. According to R.G. Holcombe "Economists define a public good as a good having one of the characteristics of no excludability and jointness in consumption. No excludability means that it is difficult to keep people from consuming the good once it has been produced, and jointness in consumption means that once it is produced for one person, additional consumers can consume at no additional cost. Goods that are joint in consumption are

also called collective-consumption goods or non-rival consumption goods, and the terms are used interchangeably here.

The most precise technical definition of a public good, and the definition that is most often referred to by economics, is Samuelson's definition, which says that a public good is a good that, once produced for some consumers, can be consumed by additional consumers at no additional cost. This is the "jointness in consumption" referred to above" (Holcombe 1997: 2).

We can of course ask ourselves whether these two preconditions are valid in education and if the exclusive body responsible for the provision of public goods is the public authorities. We know from the Sociology of Education that not everyone has equal access to education, in other words, the right to it. The second problem is with the body responsible for the production and management of the public good. Can the public authorities, a priori, produce and distribute public goods better? Can private bodies respond to this mission? The debate is composite and goes beyond the scope of the present text. In any case the discussions on H.E. can't ignore either the issue of autonomy or the view of education as a public good.

### **Contemporary transformations in Higher Education**

Over the years the universities have become all the more composite institutions, a fact which changes as much the relationships within them, as their relationships with the external environment. As far as inside the universities is concerned, they are becoming more massified. In a matter of a few decades, the number of students multiplied and the

number of teaching staff increased (Friedberg, Musselin 1989: 38). This resulted in a significant percentage of young people, in western countries many more than half of them, registering in higher education.

Equally important is the change in the relationships between higher education and the external environment, mainly the market. From the Middle Ages until the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the universities were, on the whole, economically independent. The authorities that established them provided them with land, property or assets, which they managed themselves (Gerbod: 84). Beyond the assets and other resources, governance of the university is also crucial, since they are self-governing. Corporatist associations initially, of teachers or learners, managed to govern themselves as collectives. From this viewpoint, the role of the rector is significant as he has first say on issues of governance, representation and organization of studies.

Things changed at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century with the appearance of two main models of the university: the French, which focused on the professional nature of studies, and the German (humboldtian) which intended to dominate and to constitute the dominant standard reference model. Since then and until the 1970s, the universities were founded on two principles: public funding and their autonomy.

The issue of the relationships between the State and the public bodies on the one hand and the university on the other becomes more composite from the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and even more so in recent decades with the stronger link of the latter with the market. From then on one of the most fundamental questions that is raised continually concerns the relationship between them and consequently, the objectives of the University and the content of the produced knowledge.

At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Thorstein Veblen poses the question of the relationships between the University and the market. He claims that the University depends more and more on businessmen and functions as a business (1918:65). The debate on the matter in the Western countries settled down in the post war period due to the generous funding of higher education by the public authorities. As Burton Clark notes: «The decade of 1958-1968, a period of relatively stable prices, saw a *sevenfold* increase in federal funds for basic university research (from \$178 million to \$1,251 million. The 1950s and especially the 1960s were a golden age for American academic science” (1995: 130).

The question reappears in the 1970s when many states, starting with the USA and Great Britain, because of the economic crisis but also for ideological reasons, have a precedent for reducing public spending. Since public funding is reduced almost constantly, the higher education institutions are turning to the private sector (OECD 2014: 232). The turn constitutes a significant moment in the history of higher education, which is starting to change the balance between autonomy/funding

Derek Bok puts the change down to the economic crisis in 1973 and the consequent need of the American universities to find other financial sources. “This change in priorities led the government to consider new ways of linking university research to the needs of business. In 1980, Congress passed the Bay-Dole Act, which made it much easier for the universities to own and license patents on discoveries made through research paid for with public funds. Federal and state legislation offered subsidies for a variety of university-cooperative ventures to help translate the fruits of academic science into new products and processes. Tax breaks encouraged industry to invest

more in university-based science” (Bok 2003: 11-12). In the years that followed other countries too, like France, since 1999, have adopted a similar policy.

Its massification as much as the change in its relationships with the external environment have made higher education an all the more composite institution. In 1964 Clark Kerr had already claimed that the university had radically changed and been transformed into something new, more composite which he called Multiversity: “The multiversity is an inconsistent institution. It is not one community, but several – the community of the undergraduate and the community of the graduate; the community of the humanist, the community of the social scientist, and the community of the scientist; the communities of the professional schools; the community of all the non-academic personnel; the community of the administrators. Its edges are fuzzy-it reaches out to alumni, legislators, farmers, businessmen, who are all related to one or more of these internal communities” (Kerr 1964:18-9). Three decades later Burton Clark too would make a similar claim. “In short, diversity, not uniformity, is the master trend. The need to concentrate and hence differentially distribute financial resources and personnel and equipment and students grows ever stronger as higher education systems grow in population size and in coverage of cognitive territories. The institutional division of labour can no more be stopped, let alone reversed, than the division of labour in society. Hence the thought that all institutions of higher education can be equal becomes a species of utopianism. If differentiation is not effected among institutions, it will take place within them, producing ever more polyglot universities that call for heroic internal management to simply maintain peaceful relations among disparate factions and somehow insert a capacity for spontaneous change” (Clark 1995: 246).



**On governance: From the shared to a new managerial model**

From their very beginnings, the universities were self-governed. The constituents of the university participated in governance which means governance was shared. According to Gary Olson “Shared governance is not a simple matter of committee consensus, or the faculty's engaging administrators to take on the dirty work, or any number of other common misconceptions. Shared governance is much more complex; it is a delicate balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and decision-making processes, on the one hand, and administrative accountability on the other” (Olson 2009).

Undoubtedly, in the past governance wasn't exactly shared. Universities and professors were dependent on various things (the church, political power, groups). On the other hand, power within the university was never equally distributed. The professors, especially in the Germanic universities, had more power than the other groups and played a decisive role in decision making. However, amongst the professors too, some had and continue to have more power than others (Ringer 1979).

Despite this, the universities were self-governing and governance was exercised collectively. This trend was strengthened in the 1960s and 1970s. In the USA in 1964 The American Association of University Professors adopted and published the “Statement on government of colleges and universities”.<sup>1</sup> “Describing the essential relationship” argues Robert Birnbaum, “between trustees, presidents and faculty as based on ‘mutual understanding’ ‘joint effort’ and ‘inescapable interdependence’, the

---

<sup>1</sup> The American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges “commended” it to their member organizations.

Joint Statement laid out two basic principles of what has come to be known as ‘shared governance’:

(1). Important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) difference in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by the reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand (...) (Birnbaum 2003: 3).

The picture is similar in the European universities. In France the student uprising in 1968 changed the University. It brought students and teachers closer together and had a catalytic effect on the pedagogic relationship since more weight was assigned to the student in the exchange too. With E. Faure’s law in 1969 students participated actively at all levels of governance. (Prost 1997: 150-152). As far as the British universities are concerned, Moodie and Eustace wrote in 1974: “it is indisputable that the century has witnessed a substantial move towards internal academic self-governance in all major areas of decision making” (cited by Lapworth 2004: 300).

The things then changed. The change is gradual and after the 1980s, accelerates. This is reflected, among other things, at a linguistic level. “The term ‘management’, notes G. Lockwood, “was not part of the cultural vocabulary of the university in 1945 except to describe a process or method of organization alien to a public institution as opposed to a business firm. The university was governed and administered but not managed. The history of the internal organization and culture of the university since the war is reflected in the gradual acceptance of the applicability of the term ‘management’ to the processes of decision-implementation within the university. Broadly, ‘administration’

was the characteristic term until the early 1970s, with ‘governance’ having a phase of dominance in the late 1960s and again in the 1990s. ‘Management’ began to feature in the literature and conference papers in the 1960s. Its acceptability and usage within the university came in the 1970s, firstly as a reaction to the student-led wave of concentration upon the politics of governance as the focus of internal organization in the late 1960s, secondly under the impact upon universities of the oil-inflation-inspired world economic crises of the mid-1970s” (Lockwood 2011: 124). Finally, the term ‘management’ began to be widely used after 1985 in parallel with the acceptance and use of the term managerialism (Lockwood 2011:125). The change in language touches the people of the university too. In the past we talked more about an academic community, its members, its constituents. Today we talk about stakeholders or consumers (Bolland 2005: 2009).

The changes in the terminology express the changing ideological framework. Does all this have any effect on the governance of higher education? In his well-known study, Burton Clark distinguishes four types of university in terms of possession of power and the exercise of governance: the continental mode (a combination of Faculty guild and State bureaucracy) the British mode (a combination of Faculty guilds with a modest amount of influence from institutional trustees and administrators), the American Mode (“like the British has combined beloved faculty forms with institutional leadership and administration but in comparison with the British faculty rule has been weaker and the influence of trustees and administrators stronger” and the Japanese mode (a mixture of the American and continental mode) (Clark 1983: 125-130).

Since the publication of Clark’s typology, much has changed. Tertiary education has been further massified, public funding has been reduced. Its reduction led the

universities into economic straights and pushed them to seek funds from other sources. “According to McPerson et al.”, writes J. Duderstadt, referring to the American Universities, “from 1990 to 2009 states have reduced their funding per enrolled student by an average of 35%, totaling more than \$15 billion each year nationally (Duderstadt 2014: 8). To address the problem and its consequences concerning notably the future of the American research universities the National Academy of Science and Engineering and the Institute of Medicine have after a request made by Congress in 2010, formed a committee made up of distinguished researchers. In 2012 the committee reached 10 recommendations. The second refers to funding. “The states should strive to restore appropriations for higher education to levels that allow public research universities to operate at world-class levels, while providing them with greater autonomy to enable them to compete strategically and respond with ability to new opportunities” (Duderstadt 2014: 8).

The changes are more dramatic in the countries in continental Europe and generally in those with characteristics of the type Clark called continental. In many of these countries, especially in the south, and amongst them Greece, tertiary education was heavily dependent on the State and had a comparatively small link with the market. As a consequence, opening up to the market is more painful since traditions and beliefs are put to the test and relationships change which has an impact as much on the possession of power as on governance and the practised policies (Kiprianos et al. 2011).

Did these changes lead to a new type of university governance? Experts from seven countries, six European and the USA who met in 1998 in Switzerland answered in the affirmative. It is a new type of governance called new managerialism. The meeting’s coordinator, D. Braun distinguished, based on three criteria (belief system, substantive

rationality and procedural rationality) three types of governance up to the 1980s. These were the collegium model of the British universities, the market model of the USA and the oligarchic-bureaucratic model, which characterizes European countries such as France, Germany, Switzerland and Holland.

In the 1990s, Braun claims, things change with the transition to a new managerialism type of governance which crystallizes into two particular types: one, a more efficiency oriented model and a second client/market oriented. The first mainly characterizes countries which previously had the oligarchic-bureaucratic model. The second, the USA, Great Britain as well as Holland. The transition to the first type comes about mainly through the search for efficiency at a time of austerity. The countries which are part of the second type are motivated by radical utilitarian beliefs which are part of a wider neo-liberal strategy.

How do the two types differ? The second is distinguished by its greater procedural freedom in decision making, it has less real autonomy from the markets and finally strengthens the utilitarian value system. In short, the countries of the first type come closer to those of the second but there are still differences in the relationship with the state and the market and the value system. For Braun, this explains why the changes are comparatively limited and less painful in the USA and a lot more painful in other countries, particularly Great Britain which moved from one type, the collective, to another, oriented to the client and the market (Braun, 1999: 239-261).

## **Governance in Greek HE**

Up until 1982 governance in Greek HE brings to mind Clark's continental type and Braun's corresponding oligarchic-bureaucratic type. They are dependent on political power and within them a numerically small group of full professors make the decisions. Along general lines, however, the oligarchic professors in Greece have less power than their opposite numbers in countries with the same type of governance, like Germany, France and Italy, and are more dependent on central power. For this reason in the past in almost every signifying political event, some professors are sacked and others hired.

An important moment for Greece came in 1982 with the voting in of law 1268 by the PASOK government. It aimed at the massification of H.E. (Kiprianos, 1995), the reduction of its dependence on central power with the establishment of an executive, 'intermediary' body, the NCHE (National Council for Higher Education) and the redistribution of the power relationships within it with the adoption of institutions like the Department and the Sector in which all categories of staff, mainly teaching and students, participated.

How is this particular law assessed as far as the issue of governance of the University is concerned? After 2000 three important texts make reference to the issue.

The first, the Eurydice network, responsible for the European education network, evaluates law 1268 in positive terms. "On the whole, under the reforms introduced to date, Greece has managed to apply the principle that the university decides and the State supervises. Under the new legislative framework that has been introduced, the role of the Ministry is restricted to monitoring the legality of the procedures of the AEIs with respect to the recruitment of teaching staff, while planning with regard to the

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

The second text is the introductory report of law 3549, voted on in 2007, which brought about changes, which were significant for the structure and the governance of H. E. The existing legal framework is criticised on two main grounds: its inefficiency and lack of transparency on all levels. “A basic concern and widespread belief is that Greek Higher Education is going through a deep and lasting crisis. The system of Higher Education is characterized by centralization, introversion and lack of transparency. Within the folds of the H.E.I phenomena such as a want of democracy in the choice and promotion of their administrative staff, abuse of the concept of asylum and various dysfunctions are observed”. (...) “Law 1268/1982 contains numerous imperfections and a number of clauses which remain impossible to implement in practice. Its arrangements have been an object of criticism from the academic community itself, and as a result today the alteration of fundamental clauses and its conformity to international and European data in the space of Higher Education, is considered absolutely essential”.

Four years later, in 2011, the OECD report ‘Education Policy Advice for Greece’ was published. The report is quite different from the aforementioned report of 2000. The following four issues are considered to be the main problems:

- The lack of capacity for effective institutional governance and management;
- Inefficient allocation of human and financial resources;

- Limited capacity to steer the system to achieve essential efficiencies and improved performance and to sustain the momentum of reform over changes in governments; and
- Limited non-public funding and cost-sharing to complement governmental subsidy. (OECD, 2011: 76).

The OECD makes recommendations, such as the fragmentation of a number of institutions, the existence of small-sized Departments and the overlap of cognitive subject areas by the universities and TEI. The report focuses mainly on two aspects: governance and the allocation of resources.

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

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

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

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

For governance, OECD suggests the institution of a Council, which will have jurisdiction in all areas except the academic, which will be taken on by the rector, who is appointed however by the former. “Governing boards (Councils) must be of sufficient



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

Shortly after the OECD report in 2011 law 4009 “Structure, function, quality assurance of studies and internationalization of higher education institutions” was voted on in the Greek parliament. The law adopts many of the elements of the OECD report but with some differentiations. The majority on the Council is held by the internal members, the Rector is not appointed by the Council but elected from a list of three candidates that the Council has chosen and approved.

How could these changes be perceived? They reflect those we drew attention to in other western countries. The declared objective is efficiency in the face of the debt crisis. With differences, however. If we look at Greek higher education over time, we would say that it comprises a characteristic case of the oligarchic-bureaucratic model. This model weakens after 1982 with law 1268. After 2007 attempts are made to rebuild

the relationships between the state and H.E. The basic tools for this are the four-year agreements between the two sides based on particular objectives. The idea of the four-year agreements is reproduced in law 4009/2011, but is not implemented. On the contrary, at a time of debt crisis, two other matters are of interest. One is the turn to a new mixed model with elements from both of D. Braun's types. It aims at efficiency within the framework of the reduction of state funding and, at the same time, seeks clients, students first and foremost.

Apart from the principles, the new model of governance of the Greek H.E., as introduced by law 4009/2011, differs as much from OECD's recommendations as from certain principles of the Bologna Process. Private interests, such as other public authorities, or employers' associations are not represented.

On the other hand, some steps are being taken in the direction of the withdrawal of the state. Arrangements are being introduced that give H.E. institutions the chance to make contracts for the hiring of transport for the transportation of students, cleaning contracts and contracts for the security and maintenance of their facilities as well all other matters that relate to the particular needs of each institution (article 5). The same reasoning is behind the policy regarding the salaries for all categories of staff. Since they are paid directly by the state, the objective is the reduction in the cost of salaries.

For the legitimization of these choices, the political authorities need the support of the most influential professors. That is why they had interest to increase their weight within their institutions. Hence we are being driven towards a model where the state, through a part of the established professors controls the operation of the university. This, however, is contrary to the idea that the university should be self-governing. In contrast, it leads

to a perception that makes a distinction between efficiency and democracy. According to this reasoning, democracy is inefficient and has to be limited so that the universities can respond to the challenges of the times (Kladis, 2012).

### ***Concluding remarks***

The policies on Greek H.E. originate in three discourses. One which is seated in the dominance of the space of the Market. The second is circumstantial and is linked to the transformations in the University, its massification and the difficulties in its public funding. The third refers to the current debt crisis in Greece and the problems this produces.

These policies were put to the test during the years of the crisis, and it seems they failed. They had extremely significant consequences, which weigh down as much the operation of H.E. as the behaviours of the members of the university community, staff and graduates.

The first consequence concerns the two previously cited principles of the University, in other words its relationship with power and its consideration as a public good. We saw that structural reform in conjunction with ideological concerns lead to a perception that sees it as a business, and sees students as clients. This perception leads to a managerial model of governance, which aims at efficiency ignoring its two main founding principles, as a public good and as a space for the promotion of critical thought, in brief as a space for democracy and the formation of active citizens.

On the other hand, these policies have consequences on the funding of the HEIs and the staff. The withdrawal of the state and the reduction in public funding took on new dimensions during the crisis. Public funding was dramatically reduced without being replaced by private funding and enormous dysfunctions were created. This is vividly reflected in the decrease in funding itself, the decrease in the number of staff and the decrease in their salaries.

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

Ultimately, the crisis affects graduates. In the space of a few years unemployment took on huge proportions especially among the young including graduates. The policies for overcoming the crisis which have been followed since 2009 until today began with the acceptance that one of the fundamental reasons for the crisis was the inflated public sector. For this reason appointments were 'frozen'. Thus, the public sector which traditionally constituted the basic graduate employer ceased to make appointments. The

private sector in turn didn't compensate for the withdrawal of the public sector. On the contrary, it was further weakened during the crisis and didn't manage to absorb even the relatively small number of graduates it had absorbed in the past.

The private sector's inability to absorb graduates bears witness to the difficulty in the relationship between education and the economy in Greece. It is also difficult however to put it down to the quality of training of the graduates and the quality of the Greek HEIs. On the contrary, during the crisis more and more young graduates sought work abroad. In summary, the current developments in Greece raise questions and lead us to rethink the role of the University more generally.

## References

### Books

Birnbaum, Robert. (2003). *The end of shared governance: looking ahead or looking back*. ERIC.

Bok, Derek. (2003). *Universities in the Marketplace. The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Clark, Burton R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, Berkeley.

Clark, Burton. R. (1995), *Places of Inquiry. Research and Advanced Education in Modern Universities*. Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, Berkeley.

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

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

Friedberg, Erhard and Musselin Christine. (1989). *En quête d'universités. Etude comparée des universités en France et en RFA*. Paris : L'Harmattan

Kant, Immanuel. (2004). *Der Streit des Facultaten*. Athens: Savalas editions (translated into Greek by Th. Giouras).

Kerr, Clark. (1964). *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

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

OECD. (2014). *Education at a Glance. OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD.

Prost, Antoine. (1997). *Education, société et politiques. Une histoire de l'enseignement en France de 1945 à nos jours*. Paris : Seuil.

Readings, Bill. (1996). *The University in Ruins*, Cambridge. Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press.

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

Veblen, Thorstein. (1918). *The Higher Learning In America: A Memorandum. On the Conduct of Universities By Business Men*. New York: B. W. Huebsch.

### **Chapters in books**

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

Duderstadt, James J. (2014). «Research Universities to Fulfill their Global Promise», in Weber L. E. and Duderstadt J.J. (eds), *Preparing Universities for an Era of Change*. Paris: Economica, 3-13.

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

Lockwood, G. (2011). «Management and resources », στο Ruegg, Walter, (general editor), *A History of the University in Europe, vol. IV*, Ruegg Walter, (editor) *Universities since 1945 (1800-1945)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 124-160.

### Papers in Reviews

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

Holcombe Randall G. (1997). 'A Theory of the Theory of Public Goods'. *Review of Austrian Economics*, 10 no1, 1-22.

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

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

Olson, Gary A. (2009). Exactly What is 'Shared Governance'? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 23. <http://chronicle.com/article/Exactly-What-Is-Shared/47065/> .

### Electronic sources

Kiprianos, Pantelis, Kamarianos, Ioannis, Stamelos, Georgios. and Balias, Sthathis. (2011). Market and the Higher European educational policies: when the markets fail-the case of Greece. *Revista Educação Skepsis*, n. 2, São Paulo, Ιούλιος: skepsis.org: 61-89, [on line] Available: <http://academiaskepsis.org/revistaEducacao.html>.

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