

Welfare state and philanthropy in Higher Education: Theoretical insights under review

Julia-Athena Spinthourakis¹

Georgia Gouga²

Ioannis Kamarianos³

Abstract

The emergence of philanthropy as a regulatory argument will find its place in universities, following Market insights. The fundamental position of this study is that the shift towards philanthropy and charity, or even the substitution of charity for the social state, ultimately concerns the political definition of the social subject itself and the democratic composition of its action. In this context, philanthropy becomes a constitutive reason for action that is implied by the social biopolitics as a process of normalizing the pathology of social exclusion and not as a process of withdrawing it.

Under this assumption, placing the University at the core of action for survival and (lifelong?) growth, the detached philanthropic narrative, implies an answer to the social importance of the University and, by extension, to the politician in the public sphere.

Keywords

Citizenship, higher education, Welfare State, philanthropy, democracy.

Introduction

¹ jspin@upatras.gr / spinkats@gmail.com, Professor of Multilingual Multicultural Education – Curriculum and Instruction, Department of Elementary Education, University of Patras, Greece.

² zetagouga@hol.gr Adjunct Professor of Sociology, Technological Educational Institution of Athens Greece.

³ kamarian@upatras.gr, Associate Professor of Sociology of Education, Department of Elementary Education, University of Patras, Greece.

The inclusion of Greece in transnational structures such as the European Support Facility and the International Monetary Fund significantly altered the overall concept of social actions and imposed the introduction of a new Administrative Logic for the Greek society. New socio-economic data significantly affects the dynamics of the European and Greek Higher Education Area (Stamelos & Kavasakalis, 2015).

Specifically, the impact on education due to the European financial crisis, the European economy restructuring model, and the retreat of the European welfare state are an important common ground for scholars in general and the area of Higher Education specifically (Yang, 2003; Giroux, 2002)⁴.

In this light, detecting the emergence of logic and observation of differentiated practices on the education, and therefore the social, level necessitates social analyses to investigate capable theoretical schemes, in terms of social cohesion.

Therefore, the central hypothesis of this paper is the position that charity, the welfare state, and the emergence of topical forms of social solidarity as organizational reasonable normalization of subjective action under the weight of the social crisis are not instrumental-type options. In other words, as options, they are not simply related to survival under the weight of Market needs but are regulatory policies affecting

⁴ In Greek literature, debates on the crisis of the Greek university originated at some point in the last few decades. Specifically, in 2006, Kladis co-authored the preface of a collective volume entitled: *The reform of the Greek University*, in which he presented the multi-faceted nature of the crisis plaguing the institution. 'Μια κρίση νομιμοποίησης απέναντι στη κοινωνία, μια κρίση ταυτότητας...' [A crisis of legitimacy towards society, a crisis of identity...] (Κλάδης, Κοντιάδης και Πανούσης 2006:11.). It should be noted here that for decades, the debate about Greek Higher Education has been dominated by conditions such as crisis, reform, modernization, change and transition (Kladis, Kontopidis & Panousis, 2006; Damanaki et al., 2006).

institutional dynamics. Thus, they relate to and decisively redefine the social relationship and give meaning to political choice.

In short, the financial crisis and the retreat of the welfare state in Greece, with its consequent impact on education, entail, among other things, a particular re-allocation of the terms relating to the debate on Higher Education. However, the apparent domination of economic liberalism over welfare capitalism, as best illustrated by the debt burden of the European Union, highlighted in the most emphatic way the antitheses preventing the prevailing of the political and the desired shielding of the social (Venier, 2011).

Short-term individual selection contracts and the formation of subjective pathways, such as three-year education or shorter study programs, make short and discrete tool-based subjective strategies the predominant narratives of the social (Balias et al., 2016). More specifically, the breakdown and change of linear narrative as a continuous coherent transition from one educational level to another is a reality. Changes in the European Higher Education Area are especially indicative of this reality.

Under this regulatory framework, the social subject is called upon to identify their own micro-narrative regarding their educational path, depending on their social and fiscal mobility related dependencies and possibilities. Their broader economic capabilities to ensure the best personal economic life prospect will also determine their conception of the socio-political environment (Balias et al., 2016; Hepnet, 2011).

Progressive deregulation policies had and continue to have their basis in the introduction of Market Logic into social function, which directly impacts the reduction of funding and the substantial decline of the state (Kiprianos, et.al., 2011). In the case of Greece, deregulation of Higher Education is not just a matter of policy and convergence

with the rest of the European Higher Education Area, but a matter of fiscal survival. On the other hand, analysts and intellectuals such as Habermas (1984; 2015) would identify the issue of the debt crisis as a European problem concerning the quality and social cohesion of Western societies (Staats 2004).

Methodological and Theoretical Framework

Methodologically, we should point out that, in order to understand the meaning of an action (e.g. an action of Charity or Social Solidarity) an external, third party, description of action is insufficient. Proper understanding depends on the ability to capture the reasons why the action was implemented. Correct interpretation means understanding values, goals, needs, desires and behaviors, while the content of the meanings is not exclusive to their organization.

Thus, within the methodological framework of rejection of registration and adoption of the understanding of the value orientation of the action and in through the lens of intellectuals such as Habermas and Foucault. We consider that the discourse cannot be separated from the overall picture of what the field (society) presents today and which, on first reading, can be defined as a development in or as a pathology of western modernity (Habermas, 1981).

As Habermas notes, the tremors of late modernity have led to individualization, privacy, liquidity, risk, complexity, and multifaceted intelligence as a dominant feature of social, economic and political construction. Seen from the perspective of Foucault's biopolitical interpretation philanthropy, social solidarity, and social welfare are three discrete

reasons for analysis, which administer and normalize action, implying the enforcement and quality of the attempted regulation.

This is not an economic regulation or one that only concerns the sphere of economic decision-making for the production of goods and the manner in which subjects are involved in the sphere of production. Rather, it concerns understanding of social relations and the social field as a whole. We should still, however, stress that, despite the apparent novelty of the stand-alone cases that dominate that the debate on social welfare, charity, social solidarity (and their forms) is not new. On the contrary, these debates have existed from the moment of understanding and questioning institutionalized inequality and/or exclusion.

Ultimately in this framework of the concurrently old and new, of complexity and the multi-faceted, of deregulation and regulation alike, we must also establish modern negotiation and understanding.

Philanthropy, Value of the Market and the Higher Education Area

We consider the study of the area of Greek Higher Education under the burden of the impact of the debt crisis to be important because, through its study, it is possible to explore theoretical issues of sociology of education and educational policy.

Charity, as a regulatory reason, will find its place in universities, following Market implications. We will then try to highlight the regulatory features introduced by the Reason of Philanthropy with its modern understanding and with a grant or even the

scholarship of study. Using the field of Higher Education Institutions as an example, we can add to sponsorship next to charity.

More importantly, as the social state retreats, new organizational forms emerge. The UN text regarding both the need for structures and action, and the need for State institutions to collaborate with Market forces and Society of Citizens at national and supranational levels is indicative of relevant developments. It states, characteristically, that: “.... lives have been saved or changed for the better.... targeted interventions have succeeded in reducing child mortality.... The scale and complexity of tackling this greatest social challenge of our time requires that national governments, the international community, business and civil society each commit their share of resources, skills and know-how to achieving sustainable solutions.” (U.N. *The Millennium Development Goals Report* 2011. p.4).

As the excerpt indicates, and we have already pointed out, in a complex international context of major socio-political and economic changes, the state appears incapable of capturing and satisfying the requirements for change. Ultimately, the retreat of the welfare state will provide room for new structures and actions. Particularly, as the European social state retreats in its social role, new multipolar environments and partnerships are created, acquiring institutional makeups within the health and education services.

The decline of the welfare state is a major problem not only for Greek scholars but also the wider European and international communities (Giroux, 2002; Balias et al., 2016). Since the 1970s, international literature and the international socio-economic landscape

have been dominated by a key debate on renegotiating the state's role in national social policy in critical areas such as health and education.

The crisis of the late 1970s led researchers to study the forms of government that would prevail, as the British government pursued policies that were the precursor to the current course of relevant European policies (Clark 1996). Thus, in the following decades on the institutional level, this debate in the European area proceeds with the retreat of the state. For example, in 1992, the European Commission introduced multi-service provision in an attempt to address the causes of social exclusion, highlighting the need for service provision, the responsibility for which would not fall on the state (Sakelaropoulos 2001; 2011)

The retreat of the welfare state, and the demotivation of the institutional functions as state actions, effectively allowed the decline of the social conception of the newly defined social field. Deregulation and privatization were significant procedures in and typical routes to this redefinition. The public sphere was overwhelmed by narratives negatively referencing state intervention and positively describing volunteering and self-conceptualization, which focuses on redefining it with the ever-changing needs of the market incorporated into flexible grids. Institutionalism is challenged and eventually weakened by constant differentiation, uncertainty and ambiguity. Personalization, in the form of consumer practice, becomes the predominant reason for action. At the end of linearity, the social subject plans its micro-narrative under the weight of the economic determinism of risk. Ensuring the enjoyment of public and social goods is an individualized demand. Where such collateral is not achieved, charity is proposed as a survival solution and a cessation of extreme miscarriage.

A typical example of this may be found in the pharmaceutical industry. Such actions are implemented within a framework of corporate social responsibility and may be characterized as being charitable, especial in the field of Corporate Philanthropy. An equivalent action of impoverished populations is analyzed in Leisinger and Schmitt's study of Corporate Philanthropy⁵, where they write: "...A good example of this is supporting the elimination of neglected tropical diseases such as leprosy, by donating medicines for its cure and working with partner organizations involved in the fight against the disease. Most patients affected by such diseases are living in absolute poverty with a purchasing power of USD 2 or less a day—hardly a conventional customer base for the high-value, innovative medicines of a multinational, research-based pharmaceutical company" (Leisinger & Schmitt 2016 p. 5 & 22-23).⁶

This treatment action of an impoverished population was not unexpected, as Parton (1996) records. The development of the welfare state at the beginning of the twentieth century has legitimized and systematized a series of institutional functions, among which the linking of state actions and a wide variety of private, voluntary and charitable organizations (p.5).

In particular, the shift towards philanthropy and charity or, even more so, the substitution of charity for the social state, ultimately concerns the identification of the social subject itself. Thus, while the right to the social as the core of social policy was a

⁵ Klaus M. Leisinger is Chairman of the *Novartis Foundation for Sustainable Development* (www.novartisfoundation.org) and Professor of Sociology at the University of Basel (subject areas: business ethics, corporate responsibility, development policy) & Karin Schmitt is in charge of Foundation Affairs and Special Projects of the Novartis Foundation for Sustainable Development (www.novartisfoundation.org).

⁶ See: Küng H. / Leisinger K.M. / Wieland J. (Eds.) (2010). *Manifesto Global Economic Ethic. Consequences and Challenges for Global Businesses*. dtv, München 2010; see also: www.weltethos.org.

privileged field of the state, it is consciously assigned to charity. Globalization and the imperatives of transnational forms have allowed this shift and the emergence of these forms of charity which make social policy through the accumulation and discretionary redistribution of wealth. According to Nickel and Eikenberry (2010 pp. 269-279), this has the effect of concealing the regulatory importance of the Market's rationale and its implications. In their view, philanthropic governance capacity raises serious questions about who is responsible for human well-being in an era of global governance.

At the same time, the modern social state becomes less able to meet social needs, whose satisfaction requires flexibility. On the other hand, at the level of social welfare functions, and more specifically in the fields of Health and Education, this is transformed into a professionalization of the field of public servants (educators, medical staff, social workers) dominated by the organizational features of bureaucratization (Gouga-Kamarianos, 2006). Overall, faith in science interferes with management and faith in continuous economic growth, and job security and faith in rationale interfere with bureaucratic rationality, ultimately producing organizational culture.

At the same time, however, the core of the post-war European welfare state (which was only adopted in Greece in the 1980s) guarantees all employees, regardless of income, the right to healthcare, social welfare, and unemployment benefits. These rights are exercised based on the principle of social solidarity, and aim at social cohesion. This exercise is not plagued by bonus rationales concerning selective social categories facing the ultimate misery. Through this understanding of relationships and, essentially, the biopolitical construction of the social, tackling the pathology of social exclusion is differentiated by the detached and fragmentary recollection of poverty and marginalization.

But the crisis of the late 1970s had already begun the new characteristic processes of degradation of the data (Clark, 1996). Continuously reducing costs, and shaping a negative climate on State interference was a common aspect of the public sphere in the 1980s. In essence, differentiation lies in the transition from the State to an independent place where semi-private, private and voluntary actions and conventions will be implemented. This field and related actions are commensurate with the ever-changing market needs generated and produced in flexible grids. Thus, new features, such as differentiation, uncertainty, ambiguity and, above all continuous change and transition emerge and are consolidated in the field. Market personalization is the major change denoted in the welfare sector (Clark, 1996).

Large, linear narratives come to an end. Short-term individual selection contracts and the formation of subjective pathways, such as in three-year education or shorter study programs, make short and detached subjective strategies the predominant narratives of the social (Kiprianos et al., 2011; Lyotard, 1979). Micro-narratives encompass the break with the past. Linearity and the given are replaced by the determinism of volatility. The break of the micro-narrative, the retreat of the Social State, the change of welfare capitalism towards a liberal capitalist conception of the Agora, the removal of security, and, most importantly, the consciousness of the risk of societies marked the transition to postmodernity.

The development of the welfare state at the beginning of the twentieth century legitimized and systematized a series of institutional functions, including the linking of state actions and a wide variety of similar actions by private, voluntary and charitable organizations.

Market Reason will interdict the social state with the development of Corporate Philanthropy. The organizational structure addresses the roots of a problem rather than its symptoms, thus differentiating itself from charity (Leisinger & Schmitt, 2016). Strategic corporate philanthropy see particularly marked development after 2000 (Saiia, Carroll & Buchholtz, 2003).

Leisinger & Schmitt (2016) define strategic corporate philanthropy as “one way to demonstrate what values the company stands for: making a difference and being part of the ‘solution’ even where turnover and profit are not increased. In the absence of an actively pursued business case, corporate philanthropy depends predominantly on the social values, sensitivity and awareness of a firm’s top management. It is part of management’s value framework, company culture and core values. The values of decision-makers in companies are fundamental elements guiding corporate preferences: those managers who as private individuals value benevolence and welfare enhancement of the needy are likely to apply their intrinsic concern for others in the corporate context and support the company’s engagement in corporate philanthropy. While the primary purpose of corporate philanthropy is altruistic, it can generate positive ‘moral capital’ among communities and stakeholders beyond the company’s direct business relationships. When such events occur, a company needs moral capital to mitigate negative perceptions; but this has to have been created before the mishap eventuates.” (Leisinger & Schmitt, 2016 p.22-23).

It is therefore the means by which businesses and the (overall) market will spread their value framework and strengthen the legitimacy of the social importance of their action. Of course, within the Market context, the social subject does not have many choices regarding the orientation and implications of its action. Ultimately, the subject becomes

a customer/consumer, as corporate philanthropy empowers dynamic management to expand on the basis of value, rules and regulations on the social level, highlighting issues of efficiency and effectiveness.⁷

Thus, in the example of the pharmaceutical company's philanthropic activity reported by Leisinger and Schmitt, which we noted previously, through its strategic charitable action against Leprosis, the company's dynamic management also manages to "engage in strategic social investment in low-income markets by providing essential healthcare education, training medical auxiliaries and other health staff and thus increasing the demand for essential drugs. At the same time the company can improve access to affordable medicines through differential pricing schemes and other special arrangements. All these actions are helpful for patients with low purchasing power and, at the same time, strengthen or develop the corporate brand" (Leisinger & Schmitt, 2016 p.5 & 22-23).⁸

Of course, the notion of charity values varies according to the perspective adopted by company management. Thus, according to Shareholder Value Perspective "[t]he core of this value proposition is that companies ought to become engaged in (strategic) corporate philanthropy activities and strategic social investments only where shareholder value is increased". (Leisinger & Schmitt, 2016 p.8).

⁷ Chen, Patton and Roberts (2008) found cases where companies with a poor record of integrity in their normal business activities were more likely to make charitable contributions and conclude that corporate philanthropy may be more of a legitimization tool than a measure of corporate responsibility; (Leisinger & Schmitt 2016 p. 5 & 22-23).

⁸ See: Novartis' Arogya Parivar <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZVShahuX5Bc> . Retrieved Dec. 12th 2016.

According the Stakeholder Value Perspective, companies should engage in corporate philanthropy in order to satisfy the requests and expectations of stakeholders (e.g. civil society organizations, neighboring communities, employees and other specific constituencies). The underlying rationale is that the company receives benefits such as higher customer loyalty; deeper employee commitment and motivation due to the greater pride they take in the organization; and improved public image as a responsible member of society and ‘good’ corporate citizen. ‘Giving back’ to the various constituencies that grant the company its societal license to operate preserves and enhances the value of corporate assets, providing some ‘insurance’ for difficult times”. (Freeman, Harrison & Wicks 2007).

In contrast to “short-term financial gain perspective , stakeholder value is difficult to quantify. No accepted standards, accounting metrics or performance benchmarks exist for measuring social returns to stakeholders. A second factor making ‘stakeholder performance’ difficult to gauge is that most companies do not invest in differentiating stakeholder analysis enabling program or project priorities to reflect the diversity of stakeholder interests. Furthermore, stakeholder value accrues over the long term; it does not appear in a quid pro quo fashion in the next quarterly results”. (Leisinger & Schmitt, 2016 p.8).

The Intrinsic Value Perspective “holds that companies ought to engage in corporate philanthropy to be ‘part of the solution’ to social, ecological and other problems on a needs-oriented basis, without expectation of reward” (Leisinger & Schmitt, 2016 pp. 8-9).

As the definition of charity (philanthropy) evolves, we believe it is important to seek out the original meaning and definition of the concept in ancient Greek though, which is rather far removed from its contemporary meaning.

In the works of tragedy, such as those of Sophocles or Euripides, philanthropy is defined as an act of activation and trust in the subject's ability to participate, act and make revolutionary changes in the power of imputation, claiming his rights as they result from the recognition of equality and from the love and respect of man. A typical example of this may be found in the tragedy 'Prometheus Bound'. Therein Prometheus expresses his "love for man", not by offering him alms but by giving him the "seed of fire", which is to say the ability to stand on his feet.

It is also characteristic of journalist-historian and researcher of philanthropy Eduardo Galeano's 2004 work "Louder than Bombs" according to which "Unlike solidarity, which is horizontal and takes place between equal, charity is over-under, humiliating for those who receive it and never provoke indirect power relations." Consequently, and as we initially put it in the light of biopolitics, the analysis of the empowerment relationship also demonstrates the importance of normalizing the philanthropic discourse at the social and thus educational levels. Charitable action in international education is intense and important.

A characteristic example of this may be found in the charitable work of Warren Buffet, an accomplished and significant stock investor and commentator on the impact of modern capitalistic financial development, who, in the summer of 2006, announced his intention to donate \$31billion to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. This

constituted one of the largest donations in history which, to put it in context, doubled the Gates Foundation's worth.

This donation also gives us another glimpse into the importance of the Gates Foundation's contribution on a global scale. It is the largest charity in history by far, valued in 2008 at \$31.5 billion, with an annual budget of more than \$3.5 billion. As Saltman (2010, pp.33) writes "[t]he Gates Foundation has been largely lauded in mass media as it funds health projects and champions reforms of public education. What has gone largely unnoticed by mass media and most scholars is that the Gates Foundation is the largest player in a fundamental transformation of educational philanthropy: it is setting the agenda for modelling public education in the United States on venture capital". According to Giroux (2002), the dystopian culture of neo-liberalism lies at the core of charitable action.

Thus, charity, as a university sponsorship, as a personalized scholarly grant, or as a student scholarship, implies the relationship not on the basis of gaining the public good but rather as a process of normalizing educational inequality and exclusion. This result is generated by the fact that contemporary charitable action, from its inception, leads to the institutional weakening, the enhancement of individual gain of educational resources, and the acceptance of the risk inherent in short-lived micro-narratives in the field of Higher Education.

The ongoing severe fiscal crisis, the lack of vital resources, the need to cover survival issues and the demands of management resulted in an attempt to transition the field of Greek Higher Education into more flexible, semi-governmental institutional structures under law N.40009/11. This was attempted through the adoption of Forms of public and

private cooperation, while study design choices were linked to the legal text, with the deterministic necessity of institutional and subjective survival (Balias et al., 2016).

This development is the continuation of a course whose consistent evolution has been observed for decades. Similarly, in all the different social fields, we see Similar Market intervention options, undermining subjects' autonomy in the implementation of their actions have been observed in all the individual social fields.

In this context, philanthropy becomes a constituent reason for action that is implied by social biopolitics as a normalization process for the pathology of social exclusion and not as a process of its refutation. In essence, this is a process, or possibly more aptly a reason, for the conceptualization of action at the core of which lies the prevention of the absorption of social and public resources, such as the healthcare system, social security, and, fundamentally, education.

Subjects seek identities and roles under the disorienting effect of economic determinism and institutionally detached narratives.

In Lieu of a Conclusion: The Significance of the Emergence of Social Solidarity and the Social Significance of Higher Education for Western Modernity

The discussion of the retreat of the social state, the significance of organizational discourse, and the regulation of the philanthropic value framework (as we have methodologically and theoretically identified them here) lead us to the inescapable observation that Market and Social State do not necessarily work either in parallel or in opposition.

It is once again important to note that the social dynamic does not allow for purity and, consequently, the existence of one, singular reason explaining social subjects actions.

The study's primary position was the hypothesis that charity and the social state are not instrumental survival logics under the weight of the Market's normalizing power but, rather, the regard and decisively redefine the quality of western democracies.

The domination of one of the Reasons of operation and construction of the social, and by extension educational, concerns and aim at not just the economic sphere but the control and regulation of the management of personal capital. This can then be extended to public and social wealth, resources and goods⁹. This definition is sufficient to provide us with an understanding of the consequences domination of one Reason may have, not only on qualitative participation and gaining public and social goods but also on social structure and, ultimately, social cohesion.

Children, for example, who have only attended compulsory education have made use of a specific measure of public wealth. On the contrary, youth attending higher education absorb a greater proportion of said wealth. An equivalent rationale supports the engagement in and gaining of the public and social good that is healthcare. Involvement in and gaining of public and social wealth on the one hand and regulating gain of the good on the other are, therefore, particularly important. For example, the less public and social wealth absorbed by a given individual, the more likely they are to slip into poverty. This begets the question: What, then, are the organizational and regulatory criteria which must be set by each Reason?

⁹ as the goods to which all members of society theoretically have access to and which are provided by organized society.

The importance of understanding and determining the answer to this query will also define the debate on the causes and conditions of social exclusion and social inequalities.

It should be noted here that those who suffer from social exclusion when absorbing public and social wealth are concurrently excluded to a much greater extent from the most important asset of public wealth: that of equal participation in politics.

In modernity, however, it is a fact that the notion of public and social wealth has been established as an interdependent right that defines all the goods to which all members of a society (where the public gain of the good is enshrined in the constitutional charter) have access. It is precisely this undoing of the symbolic rationality of modernity and the dominance of the detached narrative that is the alarming feature differentiating the present situation from the past, determining postmodernism.

On a secondary level in this study we have attempted to answer the question: Can charity be linked to inequality and hence to undoing the public gain of the resource? In particular, how do the two organizational reasons also work against the perception of social exclusion?

A major position of the study is that certain goods such as Higher Education must be public and be provided to all people, which, coupled with the knowledge that their public character is rescinded by economic or other distress, leads to the safeguarding of their social character. This means that production and presentation of these goods to individuals is organized and funded by organized society.

Therefore, providing educational money and poverty alleviation cannot, for example, eliminate social exclusion, since it does not actually allow the social subject to participate in the social and public goods and ultimately does not allow freedom of their constitutional rights. Under this assumption, putting the University at the core of action for survival and (lifelong?) Growth, the detached philanthropic narrative, implies a response to the social importance of the University and, by extension, to the politician in the public sphere.

Ultimately, the answers to the above questions arise in everyday life in the auditorium, as the social reconsiders itself in the necessity of social cohesion and solidarity of a democratic contribution of citizens, rejecting and refuting any attempt made, deterministic or disconnected narratives of other organizational prefabs. New organizational Reasons, such as the social economy and the prospects of sustainable development in the higher education area, prove their importance. The principles of the social economy as organizational reason become particularly important for the social significance of the field of Higher Education Area. Indicatively:

Priority of individual and social purposes in relation to capital, which takes the form of an autonomous, transparent, democratic participative administration, a) Promoting internal solidarity and solidarity with the local community, and b) Independence from public authorities.

The Greek perspective is established by Law No. 4019/2011, where the Social Economy is defined as "all the economic, business, productive and social activities undertaken by legal entities or associations of persons whose statutory purpose is the pursuit of collective benefits and the service of general social interests".

The emergence and urgency of new forms of social solidarity, in linking it with the historical precedent and a continuous narrative generates a system of ideas for understanding the function of what Habermas (1984), refers to as a biosphere, but also in ways of resolving colonization. From this point of view, the institution is strengthened, while the critique of funding is dealt with, as it does not work to colonize, since it guarantees the gain of higher education as the public and social good, which in turn ceases to be a demand for individualized strategic and customer logic.

According to the above, value orientation leads to a collective, participatory and above all democratic daily practice, with a "social footprint", where the social footprint is to meet human needs. It is organized on a democratic basis and involves undertaking social commitments such as environmental protection and gender equality with respect to the sustainability of the community in which they operate.

References

Altbach P., Gumport, G. & Berdahl, R.O. (2011). *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*. Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Balias St. & Kamarianos I. (Eds.). (2016). *University, economy and democracy. transformations and challenges. The case of Greece*. Lambert Academic Publisher.

Ball, S. (2008). *The education debate*. London: Policy Press.

Venieris D. (2002). *European Social map. Social Policy and the Council of Europe*. Athens: Ellinika Grammata. (in Greek).

Venieris D.. (2011). “European Union and the Council of Europe : European Social Policy and European Social Rights ” In Sakelaropoulos Th. (2011). *Social Policy of European Union*. Athens: Dionikos. (In Greek).

Chen, J.C., Patten, D.M. & Roberts, R.W. (2008). Corporate Charitable contributions: A Corporate Social Performance or Legitimacy Strategy? *Journal of Business Ethics*. 82: 131-144.

Clark, J. (1996). After social work; In Parton, N. (Ed.), *Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work*, London: Routledge.

Crutchfield L.R., Kania J.V. & Kramer M.R. (2011). *Do More than Give. The Six Practices of Donors who change the World*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Gouga G. Kamarianos I. (2006). “Management and Education”, *Social Science Tribune*. 45, pp. 159-184. (In Greek).

Gouga G. Kamarianos I. (2011). “Sociological Theory, Social policy and The Greek Debt Crisis “ Proceedings of the International Conference: *The Role of Social Policy Today*.. November 9-11. Athens : Greek Society of Social Policy. (Retrieved 17 /5/2012 από:http://www.eekp.gr/media/files/conf_4_sessions/fakelos4/arxeio4.3.pdf (In Greek).

Damanaki M., Koulaidis V., Varoufakis G., Kalogirou, G. & Papadakis, N. (2006). *University in Transition*. Athens: Metehmio. (In Greek).

Freeman R.E., Harrison J. & Wicks A. (2007). *Managing for Stakeholders*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Zaharia, S. & Gibert, E. (2005). The Entrepreneurial University in the Knowledge Society. *Higher Education in Europe*, 30(1): 31 – 40.

Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*. 72(4): 425-464.

Godfrey, P.C. (2005). The relationship between Corporate Philanthropy and Shareholder Wealth: A Risk Management Perspective. *Academy of Management Review*. 30(4): 777-798.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Reason and the rationalisation of society* (v.1 & v. 2), Oxford: Polity Press.

Habermas, J. (1989a). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Oxford: Polity Press.

Habermas J. (2015). *The Lure of technocracy*. Cambridge and Maiden MA: Polity Press.

HEPNET. (2011). Study of the Greek Higher Education. [on line] Available: <http://hepnet.upatras.gr/> [Retrieved 24/7/2015].

Jongbloed B., Enders, J. & Salerno, C. (2008). Higher education and its communities: Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda. *Higher Education*, 56(3), 303 – 324.

Kladis D., X. Kontiades & Panousis G., (eds). (2006) *Reregulation of the Greek University*. Athens: Papazisis.

Kiprianos P., Kamarianos, I., Stamelos, G & Balias, St. (2011). Market and the higher european educational policies: when the markets fail-the case of Greece. *Revista Educação Skepsis*, 2(I) <http://academiaskepsis.org/revistaEducacao.html>.

Küng H., Leisinger K.M., Wieland J. (Eds.) (2010). *Manifesto Global Economic Ethic. Consequences and Challenges for Global Businesses*. München: dtv.

Leisinger K.M. & Schmitt K. (2016). *Corporate Responsibility and Corporate Philanthropy*. This article is a contribution to the UN Development Cooperation Forum http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/newfuncnt/pdf/leisingerschmitt_corporate_responsibility_and_corporate_philanthropy.pdf (Retrieved: Jan. 10th 2017).

Nickel P. M & Eikenberry A M. (2010). Philanthropy in an Era of Global Governance. In Taylor R. (Ed.), *Third Sector Research(ed.)* London: Springer. pp 269-279.

Parton, N. (Ed.) (1996). *Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work*, London: Routledge.

Petmesidou, M. (1996). Social protection in Greece: A Brief Glimpse of a Welfare State. *Social Policy and Administration*, 30(4): 324-347.

The Guardian. (29/1/2011). *Student Protesters target NUS president, Tuition Fees*.

Sakelaropoulos Th. (2011). *Hypernational Social Policies*. Athens: Kritiki. (In Greek).

Sakelaropoulos Th. (2011). *Social Policy of the European Union*. Athens: Dionikos.(In Greek).

Scott, S. (1999). The Academic as Service Provider: is the customer 'always right'? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 21(2): 193 – 202.

Scott, P. (1995). *The Meaning of Mass Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Scott, P. (2000). *Higher Education Re-formed*. London: Falmer Press.

Saiia D.H., Carroll A.B. & Buchholtz A.K. (2003). Philanthropy as Strategy. When corporate charity “Begins at Home”. *Business & Society*. 42(2).

Saltman K.J. (2010). “The Trojan School how venture philanthropy is corporatizing K-12. In Saltman K. (Ed.), *The gift of Education: public education and venture philanthropy*. pp.33-61).

Skamnakis Chr. (2011). “Social Inequality, Poverty and the strategic of social Inclusion”. In Sakelaropoulos Th. (2011). *Social Policy of the European Union*. Athens: Dionikos, pp.303-341. (In Greek).

Staats J.L. (2004). Habermas and Democratic Theory: The Threat to Democracy of Unchecked Corporate Power. *Political Research Quarterly*. 57(4): 585-594.

Stamelos G. & Kavasakalis, A. (2015). Higher Education Governance across Nations: The Case of Greece. In Joshi K.M., S. Paivandi (Eds.). *Global Higher Education: Issues in Governance*. Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation: 34-62.

Stamelos G. (2013). The commoditization of Higher Education and Gatts [on line]. Available: [www. Hepnet. upatras.gr / n 7](http://www.Hepnet.upatras.gr/n7). [Retrieved 21/12/2016]. (In Greek).

U.N. The Millennium Development Goals Report 2011. p.4). http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/11_MDG%20Report_EN.pdf. Retrieved Jan.10th, 2017.

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