

The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science

<http://ann.sagepub.com>

Integrating Tertiary Education in Europe

Heather Field

The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 2003; 585; 182

DOI: 10.1177/0002716202238574

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://ann.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/585/1/182>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[American Academy of Political and Social Science](#)

Additional services and information for *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://ann.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://ann.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations (this article cites 4 articles hosted on the
SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
<http://ann.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/585/1/182>

Integrating Tertiary Education in Europe

By
HEATHER FIELD

There have been recent steps toward the integration of tertiary education in the EU and Europe more widely. The intergovernmental Bologna Agreement has resulted in the adoption of an Anglo-Saxon three-year undergraduate degree and two-year postgraduate degree as a European standard. Course credits are to be common and transferable. In spite of fears of a loss of standards, the new arrangements are being widely adopted. The Maastricht Treaty gave the EU's common institutions specific but limited responsibilities with regard to education. They have established and run schemes to promote the mobility of students, teachers, and workers in their education. These schemes, and the integration of tertiary education, are being extended to Central and Eastern Europe, but not Russia as yet. Major difficulties in educational integration include the existence of conflicting interpretations of history and definitions of an appropriate research process as well as perspectives on the development of culture and identity. Specific regional challenges await the extension of the process to Southeastern Europe.

In North America, there is a considerable range of tertiary institutions in terms of cost and quality of education offered, yet admission tests and the structure of undergraduate and postgraduate degrees are highly standardized. In contrast to this, in Europe and the EU, tertiary institutions and education are mostly funded by the state, but there are considerable variations in the structure of courses and qualifications and in some cases in the content.

Heather Field is a senior lecturer in contemporary European studies at Griffith University in Brisbane, Australia. She has published in areas including EU enlargement, cultural and education policy, and politics, as well as on causes and outcomes of war in former Yugoslavia. She has been a visiting professor at the University of Aalborg in Denmark and has taught at associate professor level at Bond University in Surfers Paradise. Her qualifications include a doctorate in politics from the University of New England and postgraduate degrees from the Australian National University, La Trobe University, and the University of Amsterdam, as well as a first degree from Loughborough University of Technology.

DOI: 10.1177/0002716202238574

The integration of education in the EU and Europe more widely gained momentum with the signing in 1999 of the Bologna declaration by ministers from twenty-nine European countries to eliminate some of the obstacles to increased mobility of students and graduates in obtaining employment. The declaration involves agreed aims to move to a European Higher Education Area over ten years by ironing out some of the least compatible characteristics of national university systems. It represents a further step toward integration of tertiary education following the 1998 Sorbonne declaration. Common cycles have been agreed on as the basis of a common European system of tertiary education, consisting of a first or bachelor's degree of at least three years' duration and of a second postgraduate master's or doctoral degree. France and Italy are already introducing new, shorter degrees in line with the declarations (Jobbins 1999). These moves reflect the situation described by Mitchell (1998, 1-2), that many of the traditional "borders" that have impinged on education are breaking down or being redefined. These changes are part of a wider globalization of education.

In the EU, the greatest progress has been undertaken on an intergovernmental basis rather than being managed by common institutions such as the European Commission. This was first through the Sorbonne Declaration of 25 May 1998, which stressed the key role of universities for the development of a European "cultural dimension" (Einem 2000, 1). Second, the 19 June 1999 Bologna Declaration of European education ministers took matters further by setting out the basis of a common tertiary system consisting of undergraduate and graduate cycles. The Declaration was signed by a gathering of twenty-eight European education ministers and followed more than a year's preparatory work by the ministers for education of the four largest EU member states, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and Italy. It will result in the establishment of a common course credit system based on the present European Credit Transfer Systems one. The declaration is intended to lead to a common European Tertiary Educational Space, which covers all of Europe and not just the territory of the EU. The new arrangements should increase the range of study options available to students and allow for formal recognition for academics and administrators of periods spent in research, teaching, or training in other countries (Einem 2000, 2).

Educational integration is also being furthered by, for example, the European Thematic Network on Political Science and a specific project regarding a core curriculum on European integration studies being undertaken under the direction of Wolfgang Wessels, Jean Monnet Chair at the University of Cologne (Wessels, Linsemann, and Haegele 2000). This will rely on what Wessels, Linsemann, and Haegele (2000, 4) described as the "Anglo-American 3-level model of university studies," which has an undergraduate cycle and a postgraduate one of master's degree and Ph.D. This is the same as that specified as a general model under the Bologna Declaration.

One motivation behind moves toward harmonization of European tertiary education has been the desire to counter the increasing popularity of the United States's tertiary education in both global and European terms and to reduce the extent to which its English-language basis, large home student base, and use of

modern technologies such as the Internet give it an advantage over European and other systems. France in particular has been critical of the United States, with former education minister Claude Allegre accusing it of trying to foist its educational system on Europe, with the possible result of a privatization of tertiary education and a greater uniformity of teaching. He denounced the “hegemonic power” of the United States in *Le Monde* on the basis that it was seeking to establish American universities in Europe and has also proposed that education be included among services to be covered by the World Trade Organization. However, he considered it “absolutely desirable” for French students to undertake some of their study in another country, and his own proposed higher education reforms included new degrees based on three, five, and eight years of postbaccalaureate study on the U.S. and eventual European model (Marshall 2000).

On a critical basis, it might be argued that integration of tertiary education in Europe is part of a wider “McDonaldization” of education as part of globalization. This process has been strongly criticized. It has been feared that trade liberalization in the area could lead to pressures for a removal of state funding of tertiary education (McIlvenny, Lassen, and Raudaskoski 2002, 4). The United Kingdom is put forward as an example of a country within which there has been substantial privatization of tertiary education, with reductions in subsidies and the introduction of loans and fees. However, the vast majority of tertiary education is still provided by institutions that are mainly state funded, although there are many private tertiary institutions, including offshoots of overseas institutions. Even in Finland, there has been some privatization in the sense that two branches of Preston University, a for-profit organization from the U.S. state of Wyoming, have opened there (McIlvenny, Lassen, and Raudaskoski 2002, 6).

The new post-Bologna Agreement arrangements aim to fuse degree structures across Europe into a system that encourages greater student mobility and is understood by employers (Field 2000b). They are intended to promote greater movement of labor in line with general principles and aims of economic integration in Europe and the 1992 Agreement, which removed many of the further barriers to trade in services and so forth by the target date of 1992. The desire to standardize and integrate education arises partly because of the need to have comparability of training and qualifications to allow freeing up of the movement of workers between countries. Different degree structures and educational systems had meant that it was difficult, for example, for doctors and architects to move freely between countries because the requirements for qualification and the training provided differed between EU member states.

The new arrangements are attractive to those EU member states, which have become concerned about the length of their degrees and the problems of maintaining access to their tertiary systems while reducing the level of overcrowding. Overcrowding has become a particular problem in France, where all students who obtain the school-leaving qualification or baccalaureate have the right to take up a place at university. In Germany, the problem has been instead one of long completion periods and high dropout rates among students taking degrees. Ten countries

already comply with the new arrangements in some way, and Austria has indicated that it will join these.

In Italy, the new system was readily embraced, in spite of some opposition from academics who thought that it would lower standards (Bompard 2000). A transition to the new European three-year degree followed by the two-year specialization postgraduate degree on the European model was commenced in 2001-2002.

In France, a new postgraduate degree of *mastaire* is to be introduced and a credit system aimed at increasing student mobility. One conclusion from an inquiry by the National Council for Higher Education and Research is that the new degrees must have "clear European equivalence" (Marshall 2000).

The new shorter degrees have already proven very popular in Germany, taking four years instead of the traditional seven. Some three hundred are already being offered, and this is expected to grow to more than a thousand. The University of Bochum in the Ruhr has gone over totally to the new system. An accreditation agency has been established for quality control of the new degrees. The decision on whether to introduce the new shorter degrees rests with the individual states of *Laender* that control and fund tertiary education in Germany. However, they have a vested interest in changes, which will reduce the dropout and failure rate in tertiary education and the very long periods that students often require to complete their seven-year degrees.

European students have been seeking some involvement in the integration process, and the National Unions of Students in Europe received assistance from French education minister Jack Lang in having its manifesto on education issues raised at a meeting of the EU's council of education ministers. The manifesto deals with issues of student mobility, access, welfare, recognition of qualifications, and quality assurance (Marshall 2000).

The new degree structures will make it easier for students to undertake different parts of their education in different European countries. This can be in terms of a first undergraduate degree in one country and a postgraduate degree in another or parts of the courses for these being undertaken in different countries. They do represent greater standardization and a loss of some of the educational and cultural distinctiveness of individual countries, but in return, there are benefits for individuals and for business and industry. The process is part of both globalization and regionalization in Europe.

Integration and harmonization of tertiary education is taking place to some extent on a Europe-wide rather than just an EU basis. This is because the ten prospective member states in Central and Eastern Europe and the applicant Mediterranean states of Cyprus and Malta are also involved in moves toward standardization and integration of education, as well as some other countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Involvement in such a process will help Central and Eastern Europe universities to upgrade to Western standards, having been held back by membership of the Soviet bloc in most cases up to 1990.

European education ministers have agreed to include the Central and Eastern Europe applicant countries—the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania,

Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia, Romania, and Bulgaria—for membership in the education convergence process. These countries already have the opportunity to participate in the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) educational mobility scheme and to participate in the research and postgraduate training activities of the European University Institute (EUI) in Florence. Croatia, Cyprus, Turkey, Serbia, Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Albania were offered the chance of joining the education convergence process in the near future at the Prague summit of education ministers in May 2001. Serbia's deputy minister of education Srbijanka Turajlic said it would be a powerful psychological boost and would signal the country's return to the wider European fold (Holdsworth 2001).

However, Russia is not at present adopting the new European system but sticking to its five-year degrees. The introduction of the new system will hence create two Europes, with Central and Eastern Europe following the EU, and Russia remaining apart and different in educational terms. This will add to the major division that is eventuating in Europe and that will become very visible once the Central and Eastern European applicant countries join the EU and their easternmost borders become the eastern border of the EU.

The integration of tertiary education on a voluntary intergovernmental basis in the EU and Central and Eastern Europe follows attempts by the EU to facilitate integration through educational initiatives at different levels and support for the movement of students, teachers, young workers, and others. A green paper (Commission of the European Communities 1993) was put forward to stimulate discussion on possible EU action in the area of education. This suggested a number of major areas for prospective action. Schools were considered to be a possible area for the introduction of a "European dimension into education so that young people feel that they are citizens of Europe as well as of their own countries" (Background report 1993, 2). School and student exchanges and language training were seen as a means of achieving this.

Programs such as the ERASMUS tertiary exchange program, the Program for the Promotion of Foreign Languages Knowledge in the EC language training scheme, Community Program in Education and Training for Technology technological training scheme, and the Action Program for the Development of Continuing Vocational Training in the EC vocational training scheme were seen to have already succeeded in demonstrating the benefits of such exchange education and training programs. The Education Information Network in the European Community information network on European Commission (now EU) education was also seen as playing a prospective supporting role.

By 1996, ERASMUS and related schemes had financed the mobility of some 250,000 EU students and young workers since 1987 (Laffan 1996, 97). These mobility schemes can be seen as attempts to bring wider European, or at least EU, influences to bear on the culture and identity of elites, as well as providing them with some positive benefits from political integration. The ERASMUS scheme has been partly aimed at developing a shared sense of identity among students from different member states (Kleinman and Piachaud 1993). More than 200,000 stu-

dents participated in 1999, with Germany supplying the greatest proportion. The scheme assists students to spend up to three months of their degree in another EU country. However, there have been difficulties of imbalance with ERASMUS, with about 10,000 British students each year wanting to study in other EU countries with its assistance, but double that number wishing to come from other EU countries to the United Kingdom.¹

The United Kingdom sought special EU assistance to cope with the excess of students, but this was refused, and EU member states were urged instead to seek a better balance on arrivals and departures under the ERASMUS scheme. This has proven unrealistic for the United Kingdom since many EU students wish to come and undertake part of their tertiary education in English as it will improve their career opportunities. The same level of benefits does not appear to accrue to U.K. students undertaking part of their course in, say, France or Germany and the language of that country. The United Kingdom has also had more experience teaching foreign students and is more flexible to their needs compared to some continental European countries. Safety may also be a concern.

Only 5 percent of Nordic students choose other Nordic states when studying abroad, most choosing to go the United States or United Kingdom. In an attempt to balance the ERASMUS and tertiary student movement books, more tertiary courses are being provided in English there. However, high Scandinavian living costs tend to mean that it is also necessary to subsidize living and study costs to attract students from other countries.

Although ERASMUS and related schemes have had some success in promoting the mobility of students and young people in Europe, they have only met objectives to a limited extent. An initial ERASMUS aim had been to get 10 percent of students participating, but the level achieved has been only about 1 percent. Only about half of the annual 180,000 places in the scheme are taken up at all. Two-thirds of participating students' parents are employed in managerial, professional, or technical jobs, and more than half of participants assess their parents' incomes as about average. More than half the students participating have said that they had faced financial difficulties during their time abroad (European Voice 2000). The scheme aims to cover only a part of the living costs of students.

In addition to these programs, the Jean Monnet scheme of assistance for course initiatives and professorial chairs in European integration has been established to facilitate the standardization and Europeanization of European integration courses and curricula through the interaction of appointees. By 2000, the scheme had resulted in the creation of more than 1,722 new university courses or projects, including 409 professorial chairs (Shore 2000, 28).

A further initiative intended to support study and research on the reality and theory of European integration has been the establishment of the EUI in Florence. It is financed by the higher education ministries of the EU member states, with the four largest member states meeting some 20 percent of the cost each. It is a post-graduate research and teaching institution and has been criticized for its high costs per student and its failure to become a stronger support for academic and research work in its area of operation. In 1997-1998, its high student suicide rate was also

considered problematic, with four of its student body of three hundred taking their own lives. In its early years of operation, much of the research work undertaken had at best a tenuous link with European integration. In 1994, the deputy general secretary of the Alexander von Humboldt foundation, which funds much research in Germany, was critical of the Europeanization of research on the basis that the EUI and other centers were too expensive, much of their work was inefficient, and it only duplicated other research (Gardner 1994). They had not succeeded in becoming leading centers of research into European integration.

The EUI has been widening its admissions arrangements to take in candidates from the applicant countries for EU membership and has signed special agreements with Hungary and Poland to facilitate this. In 2001, the current president, Patrick Masterson, said that the institute had importance as “an independent intellectual resource for Europe” (Worldwatch 2001). In recent years, it has had more success in attracting a number of specialists on European integration to take up fellowships and research chairs there. It now has an academic community numbering about 1,000, some 850 of whom are researchers, doctoral students, or academics. About eighty doctoral theses are submitted and defended there each year, the completion rate for doctoral candidates being 76 percent.

The College of Europe in Bruges is another EU-funded and -run teaching and research institution, with the specific goal that it would provide training for young people who go on to become public servants in the EU’s common institutions. It has been less controversial than the EUI, perhaps because it has had a clearer mission and more readily visible results.

The Maastricht Treaty came into force in 1993, giving the EU’s political institutions new competencies or legal powers in the field of education and allowing the scope of common programs to be expanded. Article 126 of the treaty sets out the aims of community action in the area of education as follows (Background report 1993):

- developing the European dimension in education, particularly through the teaching and dissemination of the languages of the Member States;
- encouraging the mobility of students and teachers, inter alia by encouraging the academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study;
- promoting co-operation between educational establishments;
- developing exchanges of information and experience on issues common to the education systems of the Member States;
- encouraging the development of youth exchanges and of exchanges of socio-educational instructors; and
- encouraging the development of distance education. (P. 1)

Dardanelli (1999) argued that EU national governments should “use their exclusive control over the education systems that socialize Europe’s citizens to raise their political identification with the Union” (p. 12). In support of this, he pointed out that “in the last four years over 80 per cent of Europeans supported an EU dimension of the education curricula” (p. 12). However, Eurobarometer 51 data (European Commission 1999, 54) indicate that of eighteen policy areas, edu-

cation is the one that has the lowest level of support for joint national and EU decision making. Only 29 percent support it becoming a joint area of decision making, and 66 percent want it to remain national. While 84 percent of respondents supported the statement that how the EU works should be taught in schools, and only 6 percent opposed it, less than a third wanted to see a partial transfer of decision making over education to the EU's common political institutions.

The integration of tertiary education on an intergovernmental basis conflicts with the view that a closer management of and involvement in education, including tertiary education, by the European Commission is what is needed to assist integration in Europe. This view is supported by, for example, Corbett (1999), who argued that "it is the commission that has developed the know-how on almost every Bologna issue" and that "the EU, unlike the intergovernmental organizations, has a good record on policy outcomes."

It is probably true that harmonization of tertiary education might be more swiftly and efficiently achieved if it were undertaken by the European Commission than by national authorities and universities acting in concert but retaining their essential independence. However, there is the possibility of such a move representing a threat to academic independence and to the freedom universities have at least in some member states to set course content and choose research areas and issues. Also, as the "guardian" of the EU's treaties with the role of promoter of integration, the commission might be expected to place a high priority on the role of tertiary education as a means of Europeanizing elites (Field 2000a). National priorities may reflect instead concerns about, for example, widening or maintaining access to tertiary education for all social groups or the adequacy of the numbers training for less lucrative professions such as teaching and nursing. Such priorities are important in, for example, Sweden and the United Kingdom (Goddard 2000; De Laine 2000).

The Culture, Youth and Education Committee of the European Parliament has adopted a report that calls for the promotion of "training modules that meet the quality requirements of students and teachers at every university in every member state" (Nuthall, Warden, and Jobbins 2002). However, such Europeanized modules are likely to fail to meet the needs of students and teachers in specific member states. The European University Association supports quality control procedures but has resolutely opposed a centrally imposed quality assurance mechanism that would reduce university autonomy.

The current European Commission, headed by Romano Prodi, has chosen to integrate its responsibilities with regard to education with those for culture, instead of with employment where they might have been used to play a more instrumental role. This might be said to be linked to the situation that the European Commission Treaty (article 149 [4] TEC) forbids attempts by the common political institutions to harmonize national curricula or legal instruments in the field of education, educational policy still being seen as closely linked to national identity (Wessels, Linsemann, and Haegele 2000, 5). There are still many differences within the EU where perspectives and curricula on European integration are concerned (Field 1999, 2001).

One of the difficulties in attempting to unify or integrate education in Europe is that there are different views or perspectives on history, which are very much in conflict with one another. An example of this is provided by conflicts that arose with respect to the planning of a Museum for Europe to be sponsored or at least approved by the European Commission. The Greek government wanted an emphasis in the museum on the European origin of the democratic idea and, by implication, ancient Greece. However, the museum's planners wanted the history emphasized in the museum to commence in the early Middle Ages or Dark Ages with Charlemagne's empire and Latin Christendom (Kaye 2000).

A Holy Roman Empire approach and emphasis on Charlemagne are contrary to the historical instincts of Scandinavians, Greeks, and the British. For example, *An Illustrated History of Denmark* (Deleuran 1993) depicts Charlemagne as the man who persecuted the Saxon neighbors and allies of the Danes. Part 5 of the *History* describes how he beheaded 4,500 Saxon hostages and drove the Saxons from their lands north of the Elbe and replaced them with pagan Aboditrians. Part 6 stresses the earlier history of Denmark as part of the empire of Attila, the ruler of the Huns. Sagas such as that of Sigurd (the German Siegfried) are seen as being set in the context of the empire of the Huns rather than being European as such.

Pavkovic (2000, 126-27) suggested that the heroes of the battle of Chalons-sur-Marne in France, "where Europe was saved from Attila's hordes," could be viewed as the "gloriously fallen" (p. 129) in an attempt to construct a common European myth and identity. However, Deleuran's (1993, part 5) history shows that the battle between the forces of the Roman general Aetius and those of Attila, overlord of the Huns, cannot be seen as a simple tale of European defense against Asiatic hordes. It was a conflict in which there were West Goths, Alans, and Burgundians, among others, on Aetius's side and East Goths, Heruls, Gepids, Huns, and others on that of Attila. Also, Aetius was a personal friend of Attila from his earlier days as a hostage with the Huns, and when the West Goths had the possibility of winning the day by storming Attila's position, he ordered them not to.

Another example of such differences in perspectives is that the five hundredth birthday in 2000 of Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor and ruler of the Netherlands, Spain, Naples, Sicily, and the German Reich, including its then greatest kingdom, Austria, and its Hungarian possessions, was commemorated with the intention of giving people encouragement to "reflect on the foundations of European identity," according to its organizer, Professor Wim Blockmans (*The empire strikes back* 1998). However, Protestant, French, British, and some other Northern European reflections might well be that 1555, when Charles V abdicated and retired to a monastery to mend clocks, would be a more appropriate date to commemorate. It ended some of the pressures for involuntary unity.

In France, in an attempt to more closely fit education to Europeanization and European integration, the traditional history course is being replaced with a compulsory yearlong study of Western civilization from ancient Greece to the Romantics. However, the teaching of history in British schools has been criticized as being too narrowly based. It focuses on the Nazi period in Germany, to a lesser extent Soviet Russia, and early modern British history dealing with rule by the Tudors and

the Stuarts. It has been argued that the emphasis on these areas reflects a preference for “feelgood history,” which can make the British feel good about themselves while neglecting changes since the end of the cold war (Achtung! 2001).

Another area of prospective conflict for a common European curriculum is how far it should eulogize the official founding fathers yet leave out those who have achieved change by challenging this system or whistle blowing. No one could seriously challenge the need to include former League of Nations bureaucrat and visionary on Europe Jean Monnet, former French foreign minister Robert Schuman, or former German chancellor Konrad Adenauer among these founding fathers. Former commission president Jacques Delors must also deserve a place here because of his selfless devotion to integration and the management of the EU.

However, it might be argued that acknowledgment of the founding fathers should extend to those who did what they felt was the right thing and lost or jeopardized their careers as a result. These include whistle blower Paul Van Buitenen, to whom Cris Shore’s (2000) book *Building Europe* is partly dedicated, and Bernard Connolly (1995) who lost his commission position after publishing the relatively technical and innocuous economic text *The Rotten Heart of Europe*. Van Buitenen refused to overlook the financial and other irregularities that led to the resignation of the then European Commission in 1999, and he had serious difficulties created for him as a result.

Efforts are also being made to more closely integrate the European research effort. Proposals for a European Research Area were discussed at the European Council summit in Lisbon in March 2000. One consideration is the perceived need to establish more mobility of researchers. Others include the number of people employed in research in relation to the workforce, the participation of people from foreign countries, the participation of women, and the age of the parties involved. A European Commission paper on a proposed research area was criticized for mentioning universities only once in connection with the proposed area. The president of the research group at the Confederation of Rectors’ Conferences, Luc Weber, also said that networking of institutions was a superior option to that of the commission’s proposed “centers of excellence” (Swain 2000).

There is a major difference between Anglo-Saxon research practice and that of some continental European countries with regard to the admissibility of sources. It is not totally unrelated to the debate over the academic status of cultural studies. In Anglo-Saxon practice, newspapers and indeed any sources are considered appropriate for academic research so long as there is an adequate critical appreciation of the reliability of that source and of any bias in it. Much U.S. research in areas such as international relations is heavily reliant on U.S. and foreign newspapers, or Web versions of newspapers, as a source of data.

The continental European tradition has been, in some countries at least, that using such sources meant that the research was journalism and not academic work. In this view, appropriate sources are government reports, archival material and statistics, books, and journal articles. The danger in such a limited and narrow approach is that research then becomes overreliant on establishment views such as those of government and other academics.

Another difference in approaches relates to the understanding of the creation of identity. In one view, identity is created in a grassroots upwards manner, with popular culture being overwhelmingly important. In the other, the top downward approach, identity is readily created or influenced by the actions of governments and other institutions to influence the masses. Where cultural studies has been accepted as an academic discipline, for example, in the United Kingdom and in Scandinavia, it has encouraged a grassroots perspective to the construction of culture and identity (McNeil 1998; Alasuutari 1999; Gripsrud 1998; Kallionemi 1998).

Cultural studies has not been so readily accepted as a discipline or perspective in Germany or Austria (Horak 1999). It has been accepted more in terms of journalistic discourse, not academic debate or research (Marchant 2000).

A major reason behind the failure of cultural studies to be widely adopted in Germany and Austria appears to be the Frankfurt School's critique of popular culture. Members of the school saw it as a form of mass deception by the culture industry (Shattuc 1995, 86). Horak (1999, 112) saw the Frankfurt School as having stymied the reception of cultural studies in Germany. He saw it as having created the notion of a passive consumer who is helplessly trapped in the entertainment industry's flood of cheap products. However, he noted that critics of the Frankfurt School also have a disdain or fear of popular culture and that such opposition therefore has to be understood in the context of particular intellectual traditions that see, for example, even sociology as *undeutsch* (not in the German tradition) and lacking emotion.

Given the importance of culture and identity for European integration, it is important that a wider perspective is adopted in the teaching of such issues and that the gulf between the two traditions or approaches can be overcome. To some extent, the Scandinavian tradition bridges that divide. For example, in *Signs of Nations*, Hedetoft (1995) stressed both popular grassroots sources of culture and the influence of national governments through, for example, education and the place of music and song within it. Both are seen as having an influence on culture and identity.

Integrating education in Europe will also mean that specific problems will have to be faced and dealt with. In Serbia, for example, students recently drafted a policy paper that highlighted the need to cut down on corruption. This was identified as arising from payment or favors for grades, students sitting exams for others, forging of documents needed for grants or dormitory rights, and staff remaining silent about corruption instead of reporting it (Holdsworth 2002).

Another specific problem facing integration of tertiary education in Europe is in Macedonia, where the EU last year agreed to give an additional €5 million to the Albanian-, Macedonian-, and English-taught University of South East Europe. Germany agreed to give it DM1 million. This institution has been organized in Tetovo under the supervision of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. However, the university had only 850 students, Albanians and Slavs, while the unofficial Albanian-language University of Tetovo within sight of it had 13,000.

The reason for the duplication is an attempt by the international community to provide the Albanian minority in Macedonia with own-language tertiary education, in the face of the refusal of the Macedonian government to grant official status or funding to the University of Tetovo and to bring it into the public system. Nevertheless, the establishment of the new university, a deal brokered by the party representing ethnic Albanians in the governing coalition in Macedonia, has not been considered an adequate substitute by the ethnic Albanian National Liberation Army. The lack of official status and funding for the University of Tetovo was one of the grievances that lay behind the ethnic Albanian insurgency in Macedonia in 2001 (Raxhimi 2001). Since the university's unofficial establishment in 1998, it had won considerable support as an area university for ethnic Albanians, including from the Kosovo Liberation Army (Schwarz 2001).

Integration of tertiary education in Europe is hence proceeding at a number of levels. A common degree framework and course credits and standards are being agreed on and implemented by national governments and institutions. At the level of the EU, schemes to support the mobility of students, teachers, and workers and the completion of part of a course of study in another EU country are being run and financed by the European Commission. The commission also manages the Jean Monnet scheme, which helps to fund the teaching of European integration and the interaction of academics as well as teaching and research institutions, which include the EUI and the College of Europe. These schemes, and entry to the EU's teaching and research institutions, are being extended to applicant countries for EU membership in Central and Eastern Europe. Countries and institutions in Southeastern Europe are being offered the prospect of eventual membership.

The impact of all these changes will be to more closely integrate Europe's elites and to increase their mobility in terms of employment. The benefits for overall populations are less evident, and it may be argued that such funding as is involved would be better targeted at the often poor educational facilities available to low-income groups. These changes will more closely integrate the EU with the United States, Canada, and Western education in general. However, as things stand, they risk widening the cultural and educational gap between Russia and the remainder of Europe.

Note

1. In 1999, slightly more than 10,000 British students participated in the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) program, compared to nearly 12,000 in 1994-1995, and the number was expected to fall to 9,000 for 2000. Elsewhere, use of ERASMUS was expanding, for example, in France where 16,825 French students were assisted by it compared to 10,000 seven years ago; the number of Spanish participants increased from 10,841 in 1996-1997 to 16,297 in 1999-2000. The number of German participants increased to 15,715 in 1999, and that of Italians from just less than 9,000 in 1996-1997 to nearly 12,500 in 1999-2000. While 1,583 British students went to Germany, 3,922 came from there to Britain. A total of 20,436 students came to the United Kingdom. However, the number of applicants from EU countries wanting to study in the United Kingdom had fallen from 30,821 in 1997 to 23,756 in 2000, partly due to the fee situation in the United Kingdom relative to that in Ireland and Greece and the increasing relative cost of the United Kingdom.

References

- Achtung! Too many Nazis. 2001. *The Economist* 3 November, 61.
- Alasuutari, Pertti. 1999. Cultural studies as a construct. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 2 (1): 91-108.
- Bompard, Paul. 2000. Italians embrace credit system. *Times Higher*, 3 November, 12.
- Commission of the European Communities. 1993. *Green paper on the European dimension of education*. Brussels, Belgium: Commission of the European Communities.
- Connolly, Bernard. 1995. *The rotten heart of Europe*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Corbett, Anne. 1999. One step forward . . . *Times Higher*, 24 September, vi.
- Dardanelli, Paolo. 1999. EMU and the legitimacy of the European Union. Paper presented to the 4th UACES Research conference, 8-10 September, Sheffield, UK.
- De Laine, Michael. 2000. Sweden tackles diversity problem. *Times Higher*, 23 June.
- Deleuran, Claus. 1993. *Illustreret Danmarks History* (An illustrated history of Denmark). Copenhagen, Denmark: Ekstra Bladets Forlag.
- Einem, Caspar. 2000. *Der Europaeische Hochschulraum: Gemeinsame Erklarung der Europaeischen Bildungsminister, 19. Juni 1999, Bologna* (The European university space: Collective declaration of the European Education Ministers, 19 June 1999, Bologna). Available from <http://www.bmwf.gv.at/service/board/990729a.htm>.
- The empire strikes back. 1998. *European*, 2 March, 18.
- European Commission. 1993. *Background report: Green paper on the European dimension of education*. London: Jean Monnet House.
- European Commission. 1999. *Eurobarometer 51*. Brussels, Belgium: DG 10. Available from http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/epo/eb/eb51/eb_51_en.pdf.
- European Voice. 2000. Bid to boost take-up of Erasmus. *European Voice*, 3 August, 7.
- Field, Heather. 1999. Teaching the EU in Australia: Justification, aims and content. In *Teaching European studies in Australia: Problems and projects*, edited by Alexander Pavkovic and Catherine Welch, with Carolyn O'Brien. Melbourne: Contemporary European Studies Association of Australia.
- . 2000a. Integrating identity, education and culture: Questions, policies and processes in the European Union. Paper presented to the Nation and Identity Conference, 12-14 July, at Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Canada.
- . 2000b. On the "Europeanization" and "internationalization" of education in Europe: Danish and other perspectives. *ECSA Review* 13 (1): 10-11.
- . 2001. European integration curricula and "Europeanization": Alternative approaches and critical appraisal. Paper presented at the European Community Studies Association seventh biennial international conference, 31 May-2 June, Madison, WI.
- Gardner, Michael. 1994. How can you call yourself a European?. *Times Higher*, 30 December, 5.
- Goddard, Alison. 2000. Class-ridden sector slated. *Times Higher*, 7 April, 3.
- Gripsrud, Jostein. 1998. Cultural studies and intervention in television policy. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1 (1): 85-95.
- Hedetoft, Ulf. 1995. *Signs of nations*. Dartmouth, UK: Aldershot.
- Holdsworth, Nick. 2001. Balkans invited to join the Bologna bandwagon. *Times Higher*, 25 May, 56.
- . 2002. Fighting corruption top of Serb students' hitlist. *Times Higher*, 1 February, 11.
- Horak, Roman. 1999. Cultural studies in Germany (and Austria). *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 2 (1): 109-15.
- Jobbins, David. 1999. Europe aims for greater student mobility. *Times Higher*, 25 June, 64.
- Kallionemi, Kari. 1998. Put the needle on the record and think of England. Ph.D. diss., University of Turku.
- Kaye, Harvey. 2000. Send in the history platoon. *Times Higher*, 31 March, 11.
- Kleinman, Mark, and David Piachaud. 1993. European social policy: Conceptions and choices. *Journal of European Social Policy* 3 (1): 1-19.
- Laffan, Brigid. 1996. The politics of identity and political order in Europe. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34 (1): 81-102.
- Marchant, Oliver. 2000. Cultural studies as "popularized" science. Abstracts from the Workshop on Humanities and Cultural Studies, 29-30 June. Vienna: Internationales Forschungszentrum Kulturwissenschaften.

- Marshall, Jane. 2000. European students secure Lang's backing for a role in making policy. *Times Higher*, 10 November, 13.
- McIlvenny, Paul, Inger Lassen, and Pirkko Raudaskoski. 2002. McUniversity: The end of public education as we know it. *Northern Lights* March: 1-10.
- McNeil, Maureen. 1998. De-centering or re-focusing cultural studies. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1 (1): 57-64.
- Mitchell, David. 1998. New borders for education: Redefining the role and sites of education in the future. Centre for International Studies discussion paper 3/98. Aalborg, Denmark: Aalborg University.
- Nuthall, Keith, Rebecca Warden, and David Jobbins. 2002. EU close to fixing quality standard. *Times Higher*, 11 March, 5.
- Pavkovic, Aleksandar. 2000. Constructing a European identity: Problems of supranationalism. In *Why Europe? Problems of culture and identity*, edited by Joe Andrew, Malcolm Crook, and Michael Waller. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Raxhimi, Altin. 2001. Gaining ground. *Transitions Online*, 7 March, 1-4. Available from <http://www.tol.cz>.
- Schwartz, Johnathan. 2001. Challenges of belonging in diaspora and exile. In *Beyond integration*, edited by Maja Povrzanovic Frykman. Stockholm: Nordic Academic Press.
- Shattuc, Jane. 1995. *Television, tabloids and tears: Fassbinder and popular culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Shore, Cris. 2000. *Building Europe: The cultural politics of European integration*. London: Routledge.
- Swain, Harriet. 2000. Brussels seeks state targets for research staff and output. *Times Higher*, 16 June, 5.
- Wessels, Wolfgang, Ingo Linsemann, and Susanne Haegele. 2000. "A core curriculum on European integration studies": *Basic assumptions and proposals*. Cologne, Germany: University of Cologne.
- Worldwatch. 2001. *Times Higher*, 23 March, 11.