



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Masters Theses

Graduate College

8-1997

From Socrates to Leonardo: Integrating Education in the European Union

Kara P. Wegener
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Higher Education Commons, and the International and Comparative Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Wegener, Kara P., "From Socrates to Leonardo: Integrating Education in the European Union" (1997).
Masters Theses. 3470.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/3470

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



FROM SOCRATES TO LEONARDO: INTEGRATING EDUCATION
IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

by

Kara P. Wegener

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts
Department of Political Science

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1997

Copyright by
Kara P. Wegener
1997

FROM SOCRATES TO LEONARDO: INTEGRATING EDUCATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Kara P. Wegener, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 1997

This thesis examines French education policy in response to European Union (EU) initiatives since the 1970's. It demonstrates that policy-making at the EU and national level have both supported decentralization, i.e. supranational and national policies encourage more regional development and local decision-making. A new model, termed "Europeanization," accounts for the new regionalism and multi-level governance in the EU. The three hypotheses tested in this thesis claim that if French higher education is becoming europeanized, then the number of actors involved in policy-making will increase, funding for higher education will become more diversified, and participation rates of regional universities will grow.

The evidence derived from a longitudinal case study of France suggests that French higher education since the 1980's involves an increased number of actors, an expansion of regional funding, and growing regional and local participation in EU programs. From a theoretical perspective, this thesis builds on intergration theories like transactionalism and neo-functionalism, but shifts the focus to more regional autonomy and local decision-making in the process of integrating education policies in Europe.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are a number of people I must thank for their dedication and commitment to helping me finish this project. First, my chairman, Dr. Gunther Hega: his insight and knowledge of this area exceeded all of my expectations and greatly enhanced both the quality and content of this thesis. Secondly, I extend thanks to my committee members, Dr. Jim Butterfield and Neil Pinney, who read endless drafts and offered comments that refined my thesis.

My family and friends also provided continuous encouragement of my work, of whom I but mention a few. I am grateful to Bernie and Linda Wegener, who provided me with office space, a sense of humor, and support throughout the project. I would also like to thank my friends who helped me persist and kept me sane. Finally, to Dr. William Morrison, a great teacher and friend, who inspired me throughout, and whom I will always remember.

Kara P. Wegener

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Higher Education and European Integration.....	1
Research Objective	1
Education and the EU	2
Theories of Integration.....	4
General Characteristics of EU Education Initiatives	13
National Education Systems: Two Perspectives.....	14
Elitism and Centralization: The French System	14
Federalism: The German System.....	18
National Education Systems and EU Integration: A Literature Review	20
Method	24
A Case Study of France	24
Proposition of the Thesis	25
Hypotheses	26
Organization of the Study	28

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

II. INTEGRATING EUROPEAN EDUCATION.....	30
An Integrated Education Policy for Europe	30
Introduction.....	30
European Integration and Policy	31
National Education Initiatives	32
EU Involvement: 1970-1980	36
EU Initiatives and National Problems	38
The Social Charter and Action Program for Education	40
Application of the Social Charter	42
Higher Education in the 1990's: New Directions	43
Two Dimensions of Higher Education in the 1990's	44
EU Principles: Co-ordination, Co-operation and Diversity	47
The EU's Decision to Participate in Education	48
Main EU Initiatives: ERASMUS/SOCRATES, LEONARDO and LINGUA.....	49
ERASMUS/SOCRATES	50
LINGUA	58
LEONARDO	63
Commonalities Among EU Programs	67

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Conclusion	68
III. FRANCE AND THE THE EU	70
Decentralization and Regionalization	70
Introduction.....	70
Recent Trends in National Policy: Decentralization.....	71
The French Education System	73
Universities, Grandes Ecoles and IUTs	73
National Goals for Higher Education	77
Political Parties and Education	79
Regionalism in France: A New Shift?	82
Regional Governance.....	85
Regionalism and Higher Education	86
National Legislation, Regionalism and Education Policy	87
EU Programs and French Participation.....	91
The French Response.....	92
Decentralization and the French Commitment	99
Decentralization: How Far?	102
Conclusion	104

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

IV. CONCLUSION.....	106
National Education Policy and EU Programs.....	106
Introduction.....	106
A History of EU Education Initiatives.....	107
French Reforms.....	107
The Europeanization of French Higher Education	109
National Identity and EU Education	112
Protecting Diverse Systems	112
EU Involvement in Education.....	113
Regionalism and the EU	115
The Maastricht Treaty.....	115
Regionalism and the Future	118
BIBLIOGRAPHY	121

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Overview of Main EU Education Programs	51
2.	ERASMUS Students 1988-89 and 1989-90 by Country of Home Institution Compared to the Proportion of the 18-25 Age Cohort and of all Higher Education Students in EU Member States; Ratio of Students Received to Sent 1988-89 and 1989-90	94
3.	France's Regional Participation in ERASMUS, 1994-95.....	95
4.	Germany's Regional Participation in ERASMUS, 1994-95.....	96

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Higher Education and European Integration

Research Objective

In 1957, six European nations signed the treaty creating the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). This cooperative pact was originally conceived as an economic undertaking to help rebuild the European economies after World War II. It has evolved into the European Union (EU), integrating not just coal and steel, but an increasing number of policy areas. The EU is recognized as the most advanced regional organization in terms of politics and economics (Hoffman, 1982, Dinan, 1994 and Lawrence, 1996). Throughout its evolution, the EU has addressed a broad spectrum of economic and social issues. One of the many new policy areas on the EU's agenda is education.

Education policy has only since the 1980's been considered an important policy area by the EU. The EU's education initiatives were at first quite specific and over time have become much broader in scope. Early initiatives were limited to vocational education through article 128 in the Treaty of Rome. This article was later interpreted by EU institutions to include general education for various higher

education institutions. Currently, the EU has programs in education for primary school-aged children to university students, ranging from language exchanges to vocational training programs. To political scientists, these programs provide a means for examining the process of EU integration. This thesis first examines the original objectives of these programs. The second part of this analysis examines to what degree the EU has accomplished its objectives in three education programs. The research objective is to examine how integration theories describe both EU education initiatives and French national education policy since the 1980's.

Education and the EU

Links between youth, education, and integration can be examined from both a historical and theoretical perspective. During the 1950's and 1960's, the EU had an opportunity to influence education policy, but failed to seize upon it. In the first post-war decade, a European youth movement strongly favored integration. Ten years later, students demonstrated for education reforms throughout Western Europe. In 1964, students at the University of Paris protested for the first time against the high student to teacher ratio (Halls, 1965). Four years later, French students again demanded that their government make fundamental changes in the higher education system. A similar scenario occurred in Germany during the Easter Marches of the 1950's when young people demonstrated for peace and European integration. Following these demonstrations in the 1960's, German students called for reforms in

higher education. Considering student activism in Western Europe in the 1950's and 1960's and their support for EU integration, the EU may have presented reforms that appealed to student protesters. Though students favored EU integration, they continued to look toward the national rather than the supranational or EU institutions for education reforms because national governments allocated funds for higher education and remained the sole policymakers.

From a more theoretical perspective, there also exists a relationship between education and national identity. Since the nineteenth century, national governments have utilized education for nation building and national identity. Prior to the eighteenth century, education was in the hands of the Catholic and Protestant churches, both transnational authorities. After religious authorities lost their control over schools, schooling became the responsibility of national governments. Since the shift of power from the church to the state occurred, legislative authority for education policy has continued to be of utmost importance to nation-states because of its effectiveness in building national identity. Knowing this, it seems that the EU should have developed an interest in education policy, particularly to build a "European" identity. Only during the 1980's did EU policymakers concern themselves with education's integrating effect on a heterogeneous population.

Historical events and theoretical implications surrounding education presented prime opportunities for the EU in education policy-making. The implications of a unified education policy are seen to have positive effects on both the EU and its members (Lowe, 1992). The creation of a "European" identity is unlikely without

paying careful attention to integrating national education policies and programs. The EU's process of integration has already begun in many other policy sectors. How, though, has this occurred? Traditionally, there have been two major theories that try to explain the process of EU integration. How well do these integration theories explain the policy-making process for the EU's education initiatives?

Theories of Integration

Since its creation in the 1950's, the EU has integrated primarily economic and trade policies, plus a number of other policy areas. There are two main theories associated with integration, transactionalism and neo-functionalism. More recently, a third approach is emerging, Europeanization. This approach builds primarily on neo-functionalism, but adds an element of complexity. Transactionalism, neo-functionalism, and Europeanization attempt to describe the evolution of the EU and provide an analytical framework to study integration. Most European scholars have explained the EU's integration process as neo-functionalism, but have recently changed their perspective. This section outlines the components of each of these approaches beginning with transactionalism and examines the current theoretical debate of the EU integrative process.

Transactionalism focuses on existing relationships and intrinsic qualities in a community that fosters interaction between members. It assumes that community members share some basic commonalities and interests with each other. By contrast, neo-functionalism is based on economic rather than social interactions. Industrial

companies, rather than people, coordinate activities between each other, and gradually incorporate not just one industry, but a variety of industries and services needed to, for example, manufacture a product. The following paragraphs define the specific elements of these theories, emphasizing the differences between a community-based (transactionalism) and an economically-focused process of integration (neo-functionalism) followed by the new concept of Europeanization.

Karl Deutsch explained integration as a rigid and structured process known as transactionalism. It focuses on existing relationships in a community and builds upon them. Rather than emphasizing diversity, it stresses the similarities found between community members. Once commonalities exist, it is possible for members to broaden their interactions between each other in a number of areas. The EU does not seem to fit this model because of the vast differences found among the 15 member states. In the EU's case, "streamlining" poses a threat to national identity and difficulties in implementation. To further distinguish this theory from others, Deutsch's system is far more regulated as compared to neo-functionalism, which is somewhat flexible and encourages integration in a less structured environment.

Deutsch's theory of transactionalism, constructed in the 1950's, concerns the development of a regional community. Under this theory, integration consists of the formation of a community by people with common attributes (Puchala, 1994). For example, those with the same religion, culture, language or other common attributes form a community. These basic attributes cannot be created by an outside force, but are inherent in members of a given population. They can be quantitatively measured

through the number of intra-interactions that occur between community members. Through these interactions of members, this theory argues, a feeling of “we-ness” develops and induces attitudinal changes.

The first and most basic requirement for a transactional community is a security community. Community members expect that conflicts be resolved peacefully in order to live harmoniously with each other. Once peace is preserved within the community, members may further integrate other aspects of communal life, but only one step at a time. Deutsch describes this process as a “piecemeal” process, which takes place incrementally (Puchala, 1994). The main assumption surrounding this theory is that creating a community with common interests is possible, but a latent community must exist prior to integration. Though transactionalism begins with one common element, other sectors must become involved in order to further integrate.

In contrast to Deutsch’s approach stands Ernst Haas’ theory of neo-functionalism. Haas’ understanding of integration is not demonstrated by interactions between community members, but by integrating numerous sectors through international mergers. Transactionalism begins with a security arrangement, whereas neo-functionalism is initiated through an economic arrangement, initially developed under a supranational framework with the consent of its members. The results of neo-functionalism are deeper and more complete integration (Puchala, 1994). This occurs because of “spillover” from one sector to another. Once one sector is affected by a particular policy, it “spills over” into or affects other areas

unintended by policy-makers. One of the founders of the EU, former French foreign minister Jean Monnet, envisioned that spillover was the most logical and likely manner in which integration could occur, but he probably never imagined it would result in the EU's broad pursuits in both economic and political areas (Puchala, 1994).

Spillover, according to Haas' model, is composed of three general features. First, each sector is specialized and independent within the community. For example, business and industry have distinct features as compared to other sectors. Second, elites and other groups pressure national governments with specific issues. These issues eventually become not just national, but international problems. Finally, choices are limited: either a country limits its own sovereignty by submitting to an international power or it fails to proceed with the initial integration it began (Puchala, 1994). Later chapters demonstrate that a spillover process occurred within European education. Early initiatives began with programs in vocational education and now include universities as well as primary and secondary schools.

Several conditions are needed for spillover to occur. The EU is the clearest example of spillover according to Haas' model (Puchala, 1994). First and most important is societal pluralism where numerous groups, interest groups and lobbyists compete with each other resulting in the politicization of issues. This in turn places issues on political agendas, forcing governments to make decisions about controversial issues. In some cases, this leads conflicting groups to compromises and solutions that may be most conducive to both sides. Following the compromises are other aspects for integration: the nature and goals of the selected sectors; the

bureaucratic links between international and national systems and their influence in each system; decision-making styles in national and international decision-making processes; and the general dedication to integration by national elites. Though these aspects are secondary to societal pluralism, they all contribute to the process of integration.

The spillover process occurs because of two separate factors, both related to the politicization of numerous issues in plural societies. First is the phenomenon of interdependence found in highly industrialized societies. Companies obtain resources from a number of countries to create their product. Once a certain sector is internationalized, the effects are felt by a number of other sectors. For example, steel and coal were first internationalized under the ECSC. This agreement resulted in discussions related to mining, transport, and labor, all of which were affected by this new agreement. Once a wide variety of sectors were integrated, elites began to pressure the government to change national policy. These new policies were felt by other industrial sectors and resulted in the internationalization of the steel industry. This gave national governments possible options they could pursue; either enforce new policies through international organizations or prevent failures from occurring in the initial sector's integration process through national intervention. In the example of the ECSC, measures to ensure the success of the steel industry were taken. National governments would decide if there were greater advantages in more integration before immediately giving the international organization more authority over policy. What at first seemed to be only a common market in the coal and steel

industry gradually spread to other sectors such as agriculture and nuclear energy. This process demonstrates the interdependence found among highly industrialized societies, particularly those in Western Europe.

A second explanation of why spillover can occur pertains to the limited scope of a certain policy area. If the implemented policy becomes too limited for one sector, then the national actors involved may request more regulation from either the supranational power or international organization. For example, member states attempted to promote free trade in pharmaceutical products. Once this began, national governments realized that the European authorities would need to regulate various aspects pertaining to pharmaceuticals, ranging from the education pharmacists received to national drug standards. International interactions appeared to be easy, but once they began, national governments recognized the limitations and asked for more assistance from European authorities including more regulation over the pharmaceutical industry affected by free trade.

Most scholars of European integration have until recently described integration as a result of spillover or neo-functionalism. Community members were engaged in transnational relations, but undertook few policy initiatives aside from functional or specific cooperation in trade, business, and economics (O'Neill, 1996). As one of Haas' criteria, societal pluralism produced more extensive integration. Groups involved in the coal and steel industry began cooperating at the national level, then at the transnational level. This uncoordinated behavior by the steel industry provided the initial framework of the EU. Once these informal transactions occurred

regularly in the coal and steel industry, formalized policy was enacted. Policy was created out of informal negotiations and interactions that the coal and steel industry had already initiated. These informal transnational relations led to more formalized policies and procedures that later resulted in integrating other areas, such as atomic energy under the European Atomic Energy Commission. European arrangements are the result of the ECSC, which initiated integration and eventually led to spillover in other policy areas (O'Neill, 1996).

Though neo-functionalism spillover is a convincing model of integration when looking at the progression the EU has followed from one sector to another, it has limitations. Spillover assumes that integration occurs linearly over time. It also does not account for the new regional focus in European and national politics. A new approach, "Europeanization" revises spillover by adding new dimensions. Unlike neo-functionalism, Europeanization focuses less on the supra-national level and incorporates the national, regional, and local levels into policy analysis (Ladrech, 1994 and Marks et al, 1996). This approach legitimizes national and regional policies, which are often ignored by neo-functionalists. Spillover predetermines outcomes and predicts that other sectors will eventually become integrated. The new approach focuses more on member states' "adaptation to cross-national inputs, a bottom-up approach" that considers regional responses to policies (Ladrech, 1994, 86). Europeanization also allows for more flexibility in the policy-making process. Spillover is a far more limited and one-dimensional view compared to Europeanization. Finally, Europeanization accounts for the interdependence and

interaction between national institutions that have evolved since the EU's formation. This implies that transnational relations are not unilateral as suggested by neo-functionalists, but rather are intertwined and linked with a number of different levels, depending on the policy area. The new approach emphasizes cross-relations between actors at the supranational, national, regional, and local level.

Europeanization's multi-level focus is reinforced through the three pillars of European governance outlined in the Maastricht Treaty in 1992: European institutions, the National Council, and the combination of both. The third article of the Maastricht Treaty further divides the three pillars, emphasizing regional government. The subsidiarity principle in article 3b calls for decisions to be made at the "lowest appropriate level [of government]" (Jones and Keating, 1995, 294). Member states' citizens and local decision makers are more closely linked to regional issues than EU policy-makers. Subsidiarity encourages local citizens to solve their own problems. It stresses regional independence with national and supranational governments able to assist if necessary. The EU is only to intervene if the region and the member state cannot meet policy demands or if the EU is better qualified to accomplish the policy objectives (Newman, 1996). This principle has enhanced the legitimacy of EU decisions and has provided a general structure for policy-making (Holland, 1993). Europeanization accounts for the Maastricht Treaty's three pillars and the subsidiarity principle. Decision-making is shared by the regions, member states, and EU "rather than monopolized by state executives" (Marks et al, 1996, 346). Though national governments remain important, they do not play a

predominant role in policy-making (Ladrech, 1994 and Marks et al, 1996). This analysis examines if and how Europeanization has affected education policy in the EU, particularly national and subnational governments' influence in education.

The term Europeanization suggests that this concept applies solely to EU integration. Indeed, unlike the Deutsch or Haas model, Europeanization takes into consideration the increase in regional authority in the European Union. Though the concept so far lacks a causal element, it is useful in describing new developments in EU integration and has predictive power regarding the path that European integration may follow in the future. In addition, Europeanization accounts for the growing complexity of the EU's integrative process through its regional focus. Further, I argue, that after some conceptual clarification this new approach may also be usefully applied to other integration processes.

These three contrasting views of integration provide the theoretical framework for the main questions in this analysis. Deutsch's theory of transactionalism formalizes practices within a community and provides a structured system. Haas' theory of neo-functionalism builds on functional ties that already exist and ultimately lead to integration in other sectors. Instead of unifying members, like in Deutsch's model, neo-functionalism reduces the discrepancies shared by members. Europeanization offers a new explanation for relations between the supra-national, national, and regional governments. Unlike other approaches, the concept of Europeanization focuses on numerous levels of government, overlooked by earlier models. It also reinforces recent academic debates of the new role the regions have

played in EU integration. Transactionalism, neo-functionalism, and Europeanization provide the analytical basis for the main research questions asked and will resurface in the following sections when examining EU and national education.

General Characteristics of EU Education Initiatives

Over the last decade, EU education initiatives have encouraged regional participation from the member states. In the 1980's, the EU began promulgating education policy for member states. The "philosophy" surrounding EU education policy has been that of co-operation between the member states' education systems, initiated by the individual academic departments and regions ("Guide to European...", 1994). Programs have opted to encourage relationships between member states' institutions, rather than imposing specific criteria and structures on countries. The results have shown that these programs have been successful because of the increase in the number of applicants and money invested into these programs (Wielemans, 1991). Precise statistical figures will be examined in a later chapter. The programs examined are: ERASMUS/SOCRATES for university exchanges; LINGUA for language exchanges in all age groups; and LEONARDO for students in vocational and technical schools to study abroad. The specific objectives and goals of each program will be explained in chapter two.

Despite the advancements made in education policy, including a number of new initiatives in both general and vocational education, education continues to remain low on the EU's political agenda. There have been several budgetary

increases since the 1980's, but they were not significant enough to lead to drastic changes in education policy. The total EU budget in 1991 was 55.6 billion Ecu (Eurostat, 1992). Only 8% of the total budget was designated for social policy without any specific reference to education. The EU's largest expenditure item is agriculture and fisheries at 63.5% (Eurostat, 1992). Under the limited funding for social policy, ERASMUS was forced to operate with a low budget. During the program's first year, 3,000 students received ERASMUS study grants under an 11.2 million Ecu budget (Wielemans, 1991). In the fourth year, the program received 52.5 million Ecu to offer 20,000 to 25,000 student grants (Wielemans, 1991). The increased budget does signify a commitment by policy-makers to education, but compared to other areas within the EU's budget, education remains less of a concern.

National Education Systems: Two Perspectives

Theoretical debates in the integration literature are also prevalent to current reforms in national education systems. The next section outlines the centralized education system of France and contrasts it with the federal system of Germany. My argument is that regions have gained importance in European integration and also in education systems like France.

Elitism and Centralization: The French System

France has traditionally had one of the most centralized education systems in the world (Clark, 1987). Under the Second Empire from 1852-1870, Prost gives a

perfect example of the centralized system: “The caricature of this rule of uniformity is furnished by the legendary minister...who, pulling out his watch, announced with satisfaction: ‘at this time, in such a class, every child in the Empire is explaining such a page of Virgil’ ” (Baumgartner, 1989, 29). Nearly all activities related to education in France were controlled by the French National Ministry of Education. In recent years, the French government has made significant attempts to decentralize a number of educational functions, but education still remains under tight authority in the main Ministry office in Paris.

Though nearly all major decisions pertaining to education are centralized, little consensus exists among critics as to how best to describe French education policy-making (Baumgartner, 1989). General policy-making in France has been characterized by diverse concepts such as “neo-corporatist, pluralist, crisis-ridden, heroic, statist and protest-driven” (Baumgartner, 1989, 24). For example, agriculture policy is heavily influenced by interest groups, classifying this area as neo-corporatist (Baumgartner, 1989, 25). In some areas, the civil service plays a major role in policy-making while in others it has no influence at all. The case of education is quite different. Interest groups play little to no role in forming education policy, but unions and public protest particularly from university students force the national government to react and reevaluate initiated policies. For this reason, it is difficult to neatly categorize French policy-making as either neo-corporatist or pluralist except when looking at a specific policy area.

Education policy-making is also conducted quite differently from general French policy-making. The French Ministry of National Education oversees all public schools from nursery to post-graduate institutions (Baumgartner, 1989). There is only a small proportion of schools that the Defense or Agriculture Ministries oversee, otherwise the Ministry of National Education has full control over all schools and to some extent even private schools. Curricula standards are set by the Ministry in Paris and teachers are employed directly by the Ministry. Diplomas from both universities and high schools are strictly regulated by the Parisian bureaucrats, and the same standards are developed throughout all public and private schools. In some instances, private high school students' final examinations, the "baccalauréat" or bac, are corrected by a public school teacher. Textbooks are also closely monitored. The Ministry regulates textbooks used in schools by issuing an approved list for all teachers and administrators. Only recently have local authorities become able to make curriculum adjustments. For example, students in regions not conducive to sailing or skiing conditions were able to select another sport for their physical education requirements (Baumgartner, 1989).

Along with a centralized bureaucracy, teacher unions in France play an influential role. The Fédération de l'Education Nationale (National Education Federation or FEN) encompasses 49 unions and represents half of all French teachers. It is the fourth largest union in France and the largest union federation representing civil servants (Baumgartner, 1989). The FEN acts as an umbrella organization for the unions of elementary teachers, secondary school teachers, vocational school teachers,

physical education teachers, university professors, and administrative personnel involved in education. It has secondary influence to the Ministry, but is highly influential in various French educational organizations and in changing education policy (Baumgartner, 1989).

The main participants of educational policy-making are at the national level. The specialized members include ministerial officials, union and professional association leaders, and several members of Parliament or of the major political parties who concentrate on education. Aside from national actors, education policy is further divided either into specific issues or disciplines. These activities are generally not publicized by the media, therefore the public is unaware of their accomplishments throughout the year (Baumgartner, 1989).

Since most educational activities are authorized by the state, the basic structure of the French education system is rigid and inflexible. Nearly all French children today follow the same educational path. Approximately 96% of three- year olds and all four-to-five-year olds attend “écoles maternelles” or nursery schools, which are free and not compulsory (Anderson-Levitt, Sirota, Mazurier, 1991). At six, children begin elementary school, “école élémentaire,” which is compulsory. After five years of elementary school, they continue their studies at the “collège” or middle school for four years. Following this is high school or the “lycée.” Upon completion, students have to pass the “baccalauréat” or the bac that allows them to attend the university. In the past, only an elite of students would pass this exam and only the very best of these would prepare to attend France’s ivy league schools, the “Grandes

Ecoles” (Anderson-Levitt, Sirota, Mazurier, 1991). Since the 1960’s mass expansion of higher education, entrance into the Grandes Ecole has become even more competitive as have certain disciplines within French universities.

France, because of its highly centralized system, has had to make adjustments in its education structure, related to financial difficulties first encountered in the 1980’s and in response to new EU education initiatives. This will be examined in detail in a later chapter. France, compared to other EU members, has still a centralized system, but has begun granting more regional power in higher education than existed in previous years.

Federalism: The German System

The federal structure of the German education system presents a clear contrast to the French education system. German schools are divided into three levels: the primary, secondary, and tertiary level. Upon completion of four years of primary school (not counting 3 years of kindergarten), children reach the secondary level (Peisert and Framhein, 1978). At the secondary level, German students select academic “tracks” to follow throughout high school. The first of these three options is the main school or “Hauptschule” (Teichler, 1985). Students who choose this option finish nine years of full-time schooling and proceed with part-time vocational training and apprenticeships. The second option is the “Realschule,” the intermediate level leading to a more prestigious vocational school training. It typically requires six years of education before acceptance into either a specialized type of high school or

more selective vocational schools (Peisert and Framhein, 1978). Third and most selective is the “gymnasium,” which prepares students for a university education in a particular field of study.

Before students from the gymnasium enter the university, they are required to pass a national examination, the “Abitur.” This grants students the legal right to enter a German university (Dalton, 1993). Once the exam is passed, a student can enroll in almost any academic discipline he chooses within the university (Teichler, 1985). The Abitur is symbolic of academic maturity and readiness for the university, not just advancement to the next level. It is also representative of a students’ successful acquisition of knowledge in a number of disciplines and her ability to learn on her own (Teichler, 1985). The Abitur, according to Teichler, is the major link between the secondary and tertiary level (1985).

German universities’ traditions and philosophies are linked with the name Wilhelm von Humboldt. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the University of Berlin was established under the guidance of von Humboldt. He institutionalized a number of principles still found in German universities today (Peisert and Framhein, 1978). These include: the state universities maintain complete internal autonomy; the administrative structure consists of a chair or “Ordinarus” who heads an academic department; the “emphasis [is] on research free of immediate social concerns;” and a sharp differentiation exists between higher education and primary, secondary, and professional skills (Peisert and Framhein, 1978, 3).

The French and German education systems differ in their education philosophies, structure, and allocation of governmental decision-making power. France maintains tight national control over local authorities in higher education while Germany has chosen to diversify higher education through regional decentralization. Integration and policy-making in both systems will develop differently because of profound distinctions between the two systems. Discrepancies found between the two systems have serious implications for EU integration. These will be examined in later chapters.

National Education Systems and EU Integration: A Literature Review

Reviewing the current literature on EU education policy, one finds that scholars offer opposing normative prescriptions rather than theoretical models to describe current EU programs. The two conflicting views of what education should emphasize center around a diversified versus a uniform education policy. Critics usually present different perspectives of what the EU should pursue in the field of education and put little emphasis on what has been accomplished so far. With the exception of EU official documents and speeches, most scholars have tried to predict what future policy will look like rather than analyzing recent trends and changes. This literature points out both the difficulties in either a more unified or diversified approach, both with serious implications for member states. John Lowe's approach favors unifying European education (1994). Ladislav Cerych advocates a diverse

education policy, similar to the EU's current approach to education (1991). The first approach seems highly unfeasible considering the history of the EU, while the other model seems most likely and plausible for policy-makers to pursue. Both authors point out the advantages of their own approach and why it is the best solution for EU integration.

Lowe calls for deeper integration and argues that if Europeans want more integration, they must take more steps to ensure integration (1994). He, along with others, classifies this type of integration as "deeper integration" or "integration that moves beyond the removal of border barriers" (Lawrence, 1996). According to Lowe, deeper integration can help national governments define the concept of "Europeanness," a term that emphasizes a common European heritage within all 15 member states. Education and vocational training programs could foster deeper integration because of education's ability to discover commonalities between diverse nations (Lowe, 1996).

Deeper integration implies, for instance that members mutually recognize the laws and regulations made in another state. In the EU, the principle of mutual recognition was established through a landmark court case, *Cassis de Dijon* in 1979 where Germans refused to sell Cassis, a French alcoholic beverage because it contained a lower alcohol content (17%) than German standard (32%) (Lawrence, 1996). The Germans argued that this lower standard would cause a higher tolerance toward alcohol compared to the German 32% threshold. The German government also claimed that in addition to consumer protection, fair trade was at stake because

when consumers purchase lower alcohol content beverages, a lower tax is paid, giving the French product a competitive advantage. The European Court ruled in favor of the French because the German alcohol standard was an “illegal nontariff barrier” (Alter and Neunier-Aitsahalia, 1994, 538). This case set the precedent for mutual recognition to be applied to a broad range of issues, including university degrees and diplomas.

Reviewing Lowe’s approach in the context of theories of integration, he advocates deeper integration through unification. He criticizes the reluctance of the EU to move beyond current education programs to a more unified education system for all member states. This type of approach neglects a number of central issues, including national identity and sovereignty. Considering that recent education policy trends have adhered to co-operation and regions are increasingly participating in higher education, Lowe’s unified approach is not likely to be adopted by the EU. Creating the feeling of “we-ness” that Lowe and Deutsch emphasize may neither be easy nor possible for member states because of the vast cultural, religious, and ethnic differences found within Europe’s borders. Though a unified education system may result in deeper integration, the practicalities of developing such a system seem implausible.

Cerych explains the problems in education from a broader perspective with both a systems and institutional focus (1991). He recognizes the limitations to creating a uniform system of education like the one Lowe advocates and argues that uniform rules are unlikely, but the EU can enforce certain binding decisions based on

mutual recognition. These decisions include the treatment of students who participate in exchanges, access to these programs, and student program fees. More than likely, the regulation of these items will encourage student participation in EU programs. This ensures protection for students, cooperation with member states and the EU, and high rates of participation. The European Community Course Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and the mutual recognition of degrees will facilitate other changes in higher education. Enforcement of equivalencies, particularly with degrees, will be based upon mutual trust. Accreditation of degrees varies from country to country, but member states involved in these exchanges expect that the host country will accept the standards of other national degrees. The EU's ambition is that countries will accept degree standards between the member states. The mutual recognition of degrees can help facilitate a new array of exchanges and professional opportunities that were discouraged in the past.

Considering these two perspectives from Lowe and Cerych, what pattern are EU policies and initiatives moving towards: diversity or unification? Diversity seems to be the more likely outcome. It adheres to co-operation and protects the national education systems as they are currently structured. The EU has encouraged a number of actors to participate in education ranging from the local level to the national and supranational levels reinforcing the notion of Europeanization. These authors advocate a strategy for European education, but it is not informed by theoretical models that describe integration and education. This thesis demonstrates the EU's

adherence to diversity, but adds a theoretical perspective absent in recent EU education debates.

Method

A Case Study of France

This thesis provides a longitudinal case study of the French higher education system and its integration into an emerging EU policy framework. Three hypotheses will be tested over time to illustrate France's new regional focus. According to most political scientists, France represents a strong state with most decisions made by the central government (Budd, 1997). Since the 1980's, France has pursued a policy of regionalization and decentralization in education policy. Its centralized structure is unlike that of its neighbors, in regard to both the organization of national government and education. Equally important is the way France makes policy in the field of education. The French government has traditionally maintained authority over regional policy and universities. It has only recently pursued a policy of decentralization and regionalization. France has also been a prominent player in EU policy-making and for this reason is likely to have significant influence in education integration. Included in the case study is a description of past and current EU and French education policy. This will be supplemented with data pertaining to university enrollments and the degree and success of French participation in EU education programs. Participation rates and budgets of the EU programs will also be included

in the analysis to test the Europeanization thesis. Data will illustrate current trends in France vis-a-vis EU education policies.

Literature reviewed for the French case will be both primary and secondary literature. The first type will consist of a selection of EU documents, including the Treaty of Rome 1957, the Single European Act 1986, and a number of white papers and memorandums from the EU. The secondary literature chosen includes articles and analyses from scholars of French and EU education initiatives. This scholarly literature will allow a thorough content analysis necessary to determine the relationship between the French education system and EU initiatives.

Proposition of the Thesis

The EU's process of integration shows elements of spillover, but Europeanization best accounts for the interaction of various levels of government in policy-making. Education in Europe has historically moved from the churches' authority to a nationally driven policy. Currently the focus is now divided between three levels: the supra-national, national and regional level. It is difficult to say whether one level dominates the others, rather they all have a specific role to play in the policy-making process. Considering these factors, European integration is not adhering to a neo-functionalist model, but rather incorporates a number of actors into the policy-making process. The main proposition of this thesis is that the concept of Europeanization with its focus on multi-level governance is a better model to describe the process of EU integration and its effects on the French higher education system..

A simple model of integration is thus no longer accurate, since the integration process includes multiple levels of government. This can be tested through three specific hypotheses.

Hypotheses

In order to assess whether Europeanization is taking place in the integration of education policy, this thesis will test three hypotheses as illustrated by the French case.

First, if French higher education is becoming increasingly europeanized, then the number of actors involved in policy-making will increase. Prior to the 1980's decentralization reforms, most national decisions, including education, were made by the central government elites in Paris. Higher education underwent major changes in the 1980's, granting the regions and universities more autonomy and decision-making power. These reforms have increased the number of actors involved in education policy-making and changed the role of both the national and subnational government.

With the mass expansion of higher education in European countries in the 1960's, financial resources for universities became much more limited, attempting to accommodate more students. The second hypothesis examines funding sources and suggests that if a europeanization of French higher education is taking place, then funding for higher education will become more diversified. Prior to education reforms, 90% of all funding for French higher education was from the national

government. Subnational governments are increasingly contributing to education through both private and public funds.

Finally, Paris continues to be the main university center in France. Regional universities have had to compete with the academic expertise located in Paris and have had difficulties attracting those experts to their smaller and less prestigious universities. EU education initiatives have given provincial universities the opportunity to compete and develop programs unique to their universities. With both national and supranational support for the regions through legislation and funding, it is likely that the French regions will demonstrate strong regional participation rates in EU initiatives. The third hypothesis concerns regional participation rates. If there is a Europeanization of French higher education, then regional participation rates of universities with fewer students and less regional investments should be almost as high as those of larger university regions, such as Paris.

If the evidence found supports these three hypotheses, then the proposition that EU integration proceeds as described by the concept of Europeanization is confirmed. The next chapters will provide evidence of a greater number of actors involved in French higher education, the diversification of funding for higher education, and provincial universities' participation rates in EU programs.

The supranational level and the national level have both encouraged regional development. Education is one policy area that has demonstrated a new trend toward regional development at the EU and national level. This focus on subnational governments adds a new dimension to the integrative process compared to previous

theories, by Karl Deutsch and Ernst Haas. Regions and local governments may in fact play a greater role in EU integration than previously assumed by scholars and theorists.

In order to test these hypotheses, research will be conducted on two different levels. At the supranational level, four EU initiatives and general trends in EU policy-making will be analyzed. At the national level, the French case will outline national education reforms, participation within EU education programs, and the effects of these programs on the French education system. While examining the two levels, the supra-national and the national, parallels between the two will be drawn to demonstrate how both are related to each other.

Organization of the Study

Education policy in the EU has so far encompassed a number of levels of government, ranging from the local level to the supra-national level. This indicates that past theories of integration no longer fully describe European integration. Europeanization is a new approach that accounts for the new regional focus in EU and national policy-making in the field of education. Chapter II discusses national motivations for an integrated education system and how the EU became involved in education policy. The second part of chapter II describes four EU programs and their effect on regionalism. Chapter III offers a longitudinal study of French higher education and its response to EU initiatives. Chapter IV draws conclusions from the

analysis of the EU and the French case and examines the relationship between the two actors. It also discusses the results of the three hypotheses.

New actors in education add a dimension of complexity to integration and may further deepen relations among member states. Though an integrated education policy was originally initiated at the national level, the EU has had far greater success and influence on member states since the late 1980's. Significant changes have occurred even in highly centralized countries, like France, where nearly all education-related decisions were passed down to local authorities and strictly overseen by the national government. New levels of government involved in education policy may enhance acceptance for EU policies, broaden relations between member states, and improve economic conditions for young people in EU countries.

CHAPTER II

INTEGRATING EUROPEAN EDUCATION

An Integrated Education Policy for Europe

Introduction

The integration of education policy in Europe has a long and complex history. It has taken nearly forty years to evolve into the current EU initiatives such as SOCTATES/ERASMUS, LINGUA, and LEONARDO. This chapter illustrates the changes in education under a European framework that have evolved since the 1940's. The idea of an integrated European education policy was first initiated by individual nations, not the EU. The two sections of this chapter examine the difficulties in initiating European education and how the process has evolved. Part one outlines the history of European education integration as it began at the end of World War II, highlighting both the advances and regression faced in education. The second part of the chapter focuses on main EU initiatives since the 1980's: ERASMUS/SOCRATES, LINGUA, and LEONARDO. Both sections exemplify the difficulties the EU has had with initiating education programs.

European Integration and Policy

Immediately following World War II, Winston Churchill in his Zürich speech of 1946 recognized the need to maintain peace and economic stability in Europe. He called for the creation of “something like the United States of Europe” (Tapia and Nagelschmitz, 1993). Following Churchill’s speech, a number of regional and international organizations were created. The first of these was the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. This became the first international European institution and later changed its name to OECD, or Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In 1949, the Western allies entered into a pact designed to prevent another military conflict under the name Western European Union (WEU). Immediately following the WEU was the creation of a collective defense agreement, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949. One year later, the first efforts towards creating a political and economic union were developed by Robert Schuman, the French Foreign Minister. Schuman invited West Germany and other European states to discuss cooperative efforts in the coal and steel industry as a means of economic integration. The French motivation was to protect Western Europe from renewed German dominance by creating a supranational framework for political and economic integration (Tapia and Nagelschmitz, 1993). These were the first steps that led to the creation of a united Europe and eventually the numerous policies surrounding the current European Union.

National Education Initiatives

During the Second World War, the UK was flooded with European exiles. Many of these were students enrolled in the British education system. This situation provided an impetus for European cooperation in education. R.A. Butler, President of the Board of Education in England, proposed that once the war was won, the occupied countries' Ministers of Education should meet to discuss education rehabilitation, brought to his attention through the numbers of exiles in the UK (Haigh, 1970). The Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, (C.A.M.E.) was established in 1942, prior to the end of the war, and devised an agenda, set-up commissions, and met at various times during a three year period. C.A.M.E. originally operated under the British Council, an organization designed to spread British culture throughout the world. Because of the war, the Council was forced to halt its original objectives and became the host to foreigners who had fled from foreign occupation at home (Haigh, 1970). Though C.A.M.E.'s underlying intentions may have been propaganda for the war and to provide another mechanism to unify the allies, nevertheless it facilitated the first discussions on international education, particularly in a European context. In 1945, C.A.M.E. disbanded all activities despite its vast membership from Europe, the United States, and China, and education policy was pushed aside by more urgent demands of reconstruction.

In 1948, a new effort for educational integration was devised under the Brussels Treaty, signed by Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the

United Kingdom. Though this treaty addressed primarily political and military issues in these countries, it reintroduced the idea of European education as part of an official document. Article three of the treaty reads: “The High Contracting Parties will make every effort in common to lead their peoples towards a better understanding of the principles which form the basis of their common civilization and to promote cultural exchanges by conventions between themselves” (Haigh, 1970, 23). These five governments began exploring ways to “co-operate” in education, which made them the “pioneers in collective cultural co-operation,” a theme that resurfaces in the EU’s 1980 initiatives (Haigh, 1970, 24).

In 1955, the Brussels Treaty Organization expanded and asked Germany and Italy to join. At this time, a Conference of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors of European Universities was organized under the auspices of the WEU. At this conference, participants asked the WEU to set up a Universities Committee to continue discussions on higher education (Haigh, 1970). The committee met regularly and provided a cultural forum to the signatories of the Brussels Treaty. These efforts demonstrate the strong interest in education and European governments’ commitment to developing educational cooperation.

Another initiative, sparked by national interest rather than European interest, came from Dr. Reinink, the Dutch Director-General of the Netherlands Ministry of Education. He asked experts and the five signatories of the Brussels Treaty to meet at The Hague in 1955. This meeting led to a series of follow-up discussions with university representatives, and eventually the first Conference of European Ministers

of Education convened in 1959 again at the Hague. Dr. Cals, the Minister of Education of the Netherlands, invited the Ministers of Education from all the six members of the WEU. It is important to remember that this conference was not conducted under an EU framework, but originally by initiation of the Dutch Minister of Education. Other organizations, such as the Council of Europe and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco) tried to fill the educational void that the EU neglected to address. Despite the lack of support from the EU, the Ministers continued to meet. Remarkably, thirteen years passed before the Ministers met again on education in 1972. Haigh speculates that perhaps the Ministers saw Unesco as the best means of continuing co-operation, or maybe they did not see the need for collaboration in the absence of crisis. Nevertheless, education remained a low priority on the European agenda despite previous efforts made by the British to initiate cooperation.

The first Conference of European Ministers of Education at the Hague resulted in a formalized policy covering at least one sector of education, universities (Haigh, 1970). For the first time, a formalized governmental program of European cooperation was adopted in higher education. Four significant resolutions made at this conference pertained to holding future meetings, establishing a European consultative committee for university problems under the Council of Europe, beginning to co-operate in primary, secondary, and technical education (which had been first emphasized by the French government) and finally coordinating educational and scientific activities between nation-states. This meeting, originally planned

informally and on the basis of the Dutch national educational objectives, became a major high point for European education policy because of the commitment from the actors involved. This informal conference led to the beginnings of a more concrete education policy that C.A.M.E. had abandoned (Haigh, 1970).

Following the signing of the Treaty of Rome in 1957, several committees were created for culture and education. The Fouchet Committee, named after the former French Education Minister, addressed political integration in terms of defense, cultural, educational, and scientific cooperation (Dinan, 1994). Reporting to this committee, the Pescatore Sub-committee, named after Pierre Pescatore, a judge at the European Court of Justice, specifically addressed cultural cooperation among the member states (Haigh, 1970 and Reuter Textline, 1991). Included in this sub-committee was the formation of a Committee of Ministers of Education who were elected officials from the national education systems themselves. During the early 1960's, work in both committees was halted because of the United Kingdom's forceful efforts to join the European Community and lack of interest from the Six to pursue political integration. According to Anthony Haigh, the initial work of these committees presented a great opportunity for the creation of a European Ministry of Education that could have continued the work of these committees in education policy (1970).

The first Conference of Ministers in 1959 and the Treaty of Rome began the long process of integrating education policy across national borders in Europe. The former had been initiated at the national level and the latter at the supranational level

within two years of each other. Strong commitments towards education reinforced each other though occurred at two different levels. The ministers of education, along with national governments, began seeing the benefits of cooperative approaches in education. Efforts continued under the Council of Europe, a European organization mainly focused on human rights, through a cultural committee that held six conferences in a ten year period (Haigh, 1970). Despite these attempts by organizations and national Education Ministers, the EU did not propose formal education initiatives until the 1980's (Neave, 1984). It only superficially addressed education through the Treaty of Rome.

EU Involvement: 1970-1980

In the 1950's and 1960's, education slowly gained national and supranational governments' attention. In the 1960's, higher education enrollments increased and students were spending less time in school to gain the expertise they needed for professional life (Neave, 1985). Mass education became a widespread phenomenon throughout Europe. Despite great expansion, higher education reforms were not able to meet the new demands taking place. More facilities were built without any increase in financial resources to staff and to maintain them. The oil shock of 1973, which left many European countries in economic turmoil for years to follow, complicated the situation further. The 1970's experienced the consequences of mass education and economic recession. Although educational growth rates were stunted in the 70's, educational reforms continued (Neave, 1984). Major revisions were made

by national governments in the area of university structure and the national administration's involvement in policy-making. This was an effort to cope with mass expansion and economic constraints in higher education.

For the first time in 1971, the Council of the Ministers of Education met under the EU's auspices (Neave, 1984). The ministers recognized the need to establish a co-operative approach to education policy and further develop articles 11 and 128 in the Treaty of Rome on vocational training (Neave, 1984). This was only one of the new developments in education. Several months later, the Council of Ministers of the six EU member states met and adopted a number of guidelines on education. Most important was the new interpretation of the treaty to include general university curricula in a European context. Education was finally acknowledged in the EU and placed on the political agenda (Neave, 1984).

Following these developments, and despite intensified discussions of education in the early 1970's, the Heads of State did not address education in their October 1972 meeting (Neave, 1984). Social policy, however was addressed, including a social action program, a fund for regional development, and the first environmental protection program. Hence, EU policy-making included a social dimension, but no real education dimension.

Following the signing of the social action program in 1974, the EU finally prioritized education on its political agenda (Hantrais, 1995). It had taken three years for education to make it on the agenda since the Ministers of Education had first met. Two years later, a Council Resolution was passed in the field of education (Hantrais,

1995). It defined the objectives of an education program, outlined the implementation devices and created a mechanism to monitor implementation (Neave, 1984). Education policy would center on the following issues: teaching migrant children, increasing co-operation among member-states through study abroad exchanges for administrators, teachers and students, and finally extending contacts between universities across national borders (Neave 1984).

Prior to the Heads of State meeting, the EU Commission requested Professor Henri Janne, former Belgian Minister of Education, to review areas in education most conducive to a future education action program. The Janne Report asserted that, first, “an irreversible recognition of an education dimension of Europe had begun and that this initial movement led to an education policy at European Community level;” second, that the Treaty of Rome could be interpreted to deal with not only vocational training, but general education as had already been done at the first Council of Ministers meeting (Neave, 1984, 8). Other areas mentioned in the Report were foreign language teaching, mutual recognition of school diplomas and degrees, and the development of permanent education or continuing education for professionals to update their acquired skills.

EU Initiatives and National Problems

In 1975, many EU member states tried to react to problems incurred with the mass expansion of higher education. Neave categorizes this as a process of consolidation from 1975 to 1985 (1985). The areas where consolidation was most

evident were governmental measures including legislation, fiscal measures, and regulation of student access in graduate programs and research policy. In all of these sectors, governments centralized authority in the area of higher education. This became even more evident with specific legislation, as in France with the French Higher Education Guideline of 1984 and in the Federal Republic of Germany with the *Hochschulrahmengesetz*, a university framework law passed in 1976. Sweden and Greece also followed suit with new legislative measures. A certain amount of continuity existed between these new education laws. First, all had the intention of either “alter[ing] the public life or the external environment of higher education” in order to develop deeper relations between higher education and the public (Neave, 1985, 113). Second, legislation modified the internal structure of the university or its “private life” (Neave, 1985, 113). Both efforts hoped to legitimize the university while appeasing public criticism of higher education practices.

National governments were facing difficult fiscal problems. They had built new facilities, but realized that they had no means to pay for their maintenance. The oil crisis of 1973 added to the economic burden. New approaches for financing higher education were devised, including “diversification of funding sources.” This has had particular relevance since the 1980’s and for regional development (Neave, 1985, 115). There are two motivations behind this idea: first, the area of research and the importance of increasing ‘knowledge transfer,’ and second, the view that universities should be more involved with providing a ‘community service’ to the public (Neave, 1985, 115). These two motivations stressed the democratization of

higher education and sought to link universities with their communities. In France and Germany, industry was asked to play a greater role in funding universities, as were local communities. Under this strategy, governments hoped that community-university relations would improve and more importantly, that fiscal pressures would be removed from national policy-makers.

Fiscal concerns dominated national reforms in the 1970's and 1980's. Countries searched for alternative funding sources to support increased university enrollments. The national level continued to advance reforms while the EU made little progress in education. Efforts, though, at both the national and supranational level were economically motivated as outlined in national legislation and the EU's resolution and charter.

The Social Charter and Action Program for Education

The consolidation efforts in European education systems were significant, but a specific event in 1976 also had great ramifications on higher education. A European Council Resolution was passed that year, devising an action program for education (Neave, 1984). Priorities included

improved facilities for education and training, closer relations and closer co-operation between member states in education, training and higher education, improved possibilities for the recognition of qualifications and periods of study, the exchange of information and free movement of teachers, students and researchers. (Hantrais, 1996, 39)

Further, the program addressed “unemployment amongst young people, the educational needs of the children of migrants, the preparation of young people for work and the smooth transition from education to working life, equal opportunities in access to all forms of education, the combating of illiteracy and teaching of Community languages” (Hantrais, 1996, 40). The European Social Fund, which is both supported and run by the European Commission, provided the necessary funds for those under twenty-five years of age to become employable (Neave, 1990).

EU measures were specifically taken to combat a number of economic troubles faced by member states. Education was viewed as a way to improve worker’s skills and give them new skills to combat unemployment. As a consequence of its newly skilled workforce, the EU would become more competitive around the world. The most pressing problem in the 1970’s was the high rate of unemployment that has risen even higher today.

Though the Treaty of Rome had outlined certain aspects for vocational training, the Social Charter of 1986 expanded into new areas of education policy. Similar points found in the EEC Treaty established an economic perspective that resurfaced in the Social Charter. For example, to reinforce the free movement of goods, services, and people, the Social Charter focused specifically on the movement of people. This was accomplished through recognizing degrees from other member states besides native ones (Neave and Van Vught, 1991). This would permit those with, for instance, a medical degree to practice in all member-states’ hospitals and clinics.

Application of the Social Charter

The Community's Charter reiterated the idea of co-operation in its enforcement mechanisms. The EU preferred to avoid legal restrictions for policy compliance and opted to enforce education policy through a 1991 Memorandum, "On Higher Education in the European Community" (Hantrais, 1996, 41). Unlike the Charter, the memo outlined the framework for EU initiatives in order to coordinate the number of programs found within member states since the 1970's. This memo also addressed the problem of co-ordinating programs, a philosophy the EU was committed to, but had difficulty in defining.

Following the memo, education policy continued to be determined under an economic framework, but was slowly gaining recognition on its own rather than in connection with economics (Hantrais, 1996). Objectives shifted to a more qualitative focus where student mobility exchange programs were seen as a source of "cultural enrichment" versus a utilitarian perspective (Hantrais, 41, 1996). Further, this memo provided clear policy objectives for EU education in both post-compulsory and vocational training aspects.

The EU's new adoption of education initiatives coincided with national governments' centralization efforts in higher education. In the 1970's and early 1980's, national governments were reluctant to allocate funds without guidelines. University budgets were tightly controlled, a new administrative framework was developed for education, and more governmental agencies were created in both

France and Germany to monitor higher education institutions. Education was revised through all of these elements, but even more importantly governments looked for “quick fixes” to their complex problems. Long term goals and objectives in higher education were pushed to the wayside in order to cope with the present fiscal difficulties and make small improvements in national higher education.

Higher Education in the 1990's: New Directions

The 1970's and early 1980's were characterized by increasing centralization of national education systems. The 1990's experienced an opposite trend. In 1987, universities and the EU began co-ordinating programs and resources for students. National governments' tight control over education decreased and the EU internationalized education initiatives. Neave categorizes the 1990's as an era of reunification and internationalization of education (1995). First, new approaches have been initiated and implemented through various EU policies, but not forced upon member-states. Second, economics is playing an even greater role than before in formulating education policy. Third, administrative responsibilities have shifted from the central authority to a regional or local authority, giving educational institutions more flexibility, but also new problems to face. Last, as a result of a regional focus, the nation-state has lost some control over education policy making, particularly in centralized governments like France. These have been the main characteristics of education policy in the 1990's and they will be elaborated in the following sections.

Two Dimensions of Higher Education in the 1990's

The five main characteristics concerning education in the 1990's seem to create two central tensions in education policy. First, economics has played a crucial role in education, utilizing vocational training as a means of retraining workers prepared for diverse needs in the marketplace (Hantrais, 1995). Second, the EU social charter has dedicated itself to "secure equality of opportunity for young people to develop their talents and skills without regard to their financial means, social class, gender, ethnic origin, or geographical location of residence" (Hantrais, 1995). These are the main dimensions of EU higher education policy and they will most likely continue to play a prominent role in education. Turning to the specific trends in higher education, the first two emphasize the economic dimension, the third a social dimension.

From Academic to Economic Considerations. Universities were desperate for funds in the 80's and 90's. This caused governments to act and look for new alternatives for obtaining and distributing funds. The first of these alternatives was the new relationship between universities and industry. This relationship was justified as part of regional development, which the EU had begun to encourage under the Single European Act (SEA) in 1986 (Hantrais, 1995). Regional development, particularly in France, has made tremendous progress. François Mitterrand, in his second term as French president, initiated legislation that would encourage regional funding from industries and local governments (Guin, 1990). Local initiatives

continued in 1995 under Prime Minister, Alain Juppé to extend business' role in financing (Amelan, 1995). Despite this new resource that European universities so desperately needed, there were three problems encountered with this collaboration: first were the different goals and aims each pursued; second, the university structure lacked flexibility in order to cooperate with industry; third, the small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) had little understanding of university curricula and requirements (Cerych, 1989). These problems were successfully resolved through the creation of "science parks, industrial liaison offices within universities, various types of intermediary bodies, and teaching companies [the intricacies of university curricula]" (Cerych, 1989, 86).

There are two areas that remained central for university-industrial relations in the 1990's: SMEs' links to universities and the implication of these links for other academic disciplines (Cerych, 1980). First, the EU initiated the Cooperation Program between Universities and Enterprises for Education and Training for Technology (COMETT) that centers on industry-education relations and hopes to address the SME issue (Cerych, 1989). The problem still remains at the regional level where less important and provincial universities rarely have interacted with industry. The most efficient way to solve this is through investing in regional development and encouraging these sectors in local areas to interact (Cerych, 1989). Second, the university-industry liaison could pose a threat to encouraging students towards areas not economic or business-oriented (Cerych, 1989). This could result in a serious imbalance in professional sectors. France has already experienced this in the areas of

teaching and research. The French government has offered monetary incentives to students entering teaching and research fields in hopes of maintaining a balance (Neave, 1990).

Regionalism and Education. The second economic dimension complements funding reforms in higher education. In the 1980's, regional governments in nation-states played a new role in education policy. This was encouraged by Jacques Delors, then President of the European Commission. He introduced legislation to harmonize social policies without infringing on national agendas (Hantrais, 1995). The Single European Act (SEA) in 1986 had important implications for protecting national policy while "harmonizing" EU and member states policies. The SEA's article 23 added a new dimension to the Treaty of Rome's emphasis on "Economic and Social Cohesion" (Dinan, 1994). This committed the EU to "reducing the disparities between the various regions and the backwardness of the least favored nations" (Dinan, 1994, 406). The SEA laid the groundwork for a regional policy within the EU.

This new regional development reinforced ties between industry and universities, but also gave depressed regions an opportunity to internationalize (Cerych, 1989). Linking provincial universities with both the local and regional governments gave more credibility and publicity to their programs. Instead of remaining backstage, these universities were encouraged to develop new dimensions in their curricula and new perspectives for students. This could attract more students

to their programs and result in fewer economic difficulties for these smaller universities. Under the SEA, they were finally given some of the tools to compete with the more prestigious institutions.

The implications of this new regional authority in higher education were especially felt in highly centralized education systems, like France, as a result of budgetary deficits at the national level (Guin, 1990 and Neave and Van Vught, 1991). This could be a consequence of the decreasing role of the nation-state, which will be discussed in the next section. As a result of regionalism, institutions of higher education were given more autonomy (Neave, 1995). At the same time, budgets were cut drastically and many universities were forced to viciously compete for funds (Neave and Van Vught, 1991). There seemed to come mixed messages from national governments: on the one hand, an increase in regionalism and authority, but, on the other hand, the national government maintained a great deal of control in education, particularly in France (Neave and Van Vught, 1991). What seemed to be happening was that national governments saw the need for change, but were very reluctant to give authority over to the regions, particularly in unitary or centralized states. Once the regions were given more authority, the national governments realized that there was little chance of regaining sole control over education policy.

EU Principles: Co-ordination, Co-operation and Diversity

New developments in the economic dimension of EU politics had ramifications for the social realm. Since the EU's 1976 initiative for migrant

workers, education policy has continued to emphasize co-ordination and co-operation between the member states. National reforms were prominent in the 1950's and 1960's. In the 1970's, the EU began initiating education policy because of the economic crisis faced by its members. Finally, in the 1980's and 1990's, for the first time, trends at the supranational level coincided with national policy. The EU encouraged universities and regions to form links with other member states' universities and national governments pursued more regional development and stronger local ties between higher education institutions and industry. National legislation also reinforced decentralization in terms of funding and authority as did the EU through its emphasis on regional development.

The EU's approach to education stresses co-operation and diversity as demonstrated through its main initiatives. Some programs focus on economic development and educating a skilled workforce. The other dimension it has pursued is in general university education in order to better prepare students for competitive markets. Education initiatives have allowed students in various higher education institutes to participate in exchanges and perfect a number of skills from technical to language skills. Programs have created the framework and some funding for university students and teachers to study across national borders.

The EU's Decision to Participate in Education

Financial difficulties in national higher education institutions, high unemployment rates and an increase in the number of students entering higher

education all contributed to the EU's involvement in education initiatives. The EU was primarily concerned with the educational effects on economics (Ambler, 1990). Paul White, a member of the Committee of Regions exemplifies the EU's economic concerns and education initiatives in a 1995 quote,

Our aim must be to ensure that everyone can play a full part in the development process and receive the maximum benefits from these opportunities. Each region has a great deal to offer and we must do all we can to share good practice between the regions, certainly in the field of education and training. (Reuter European Community Report, 1995 January)

Education programs allow a number of actors to participate in diverse educational experiences and foster deeper cultural understanding between EU member states.

Main EU Initiatives: ERASMUS/SOCRATES, LEONARDO and LINGUA

Prior to the EU's education initiatives, western European countries informally exchanged students. This was particularly true for the Dutch and Germans (Haigh, 1970). The EU has institutionalized education programs for member states, making grants available to students, universities, and teachers. Financial constraints and high unemployment rates have created difficulties for some higher education institutes. EU programs have helped universities maintain a level of quality, while enhancing relations between member states through student exchanges. A brief overview of these programs is provided in Table 1. These programs' specific objectives, actions, funding sources and projects will be discussed next.

ERASMUS/SOCRATES

Though education integration was first envisioned in the field of vocational training, ERASMUS as the first general education initiative targeted university students. When ERASMUS was first developed, its goal was both political and economic: to create a stronger European identity and improve the EU's competitiveness abroad (deWit, 1996). On June 15, 1987, the EU outlined five main goals for the ERASMUS program in a Council Decision. All five intend to enhance co-operation between member states (Commission of the European Communities, 1990). The goals are: (1) to achieve a significant increase in the number of students from universities spending an integrated period of study in another Member State, in order that the Community may draw upon an adequate pool of manpower with first hand experiences of economic and social aspects of other Member States, while ensuring equality of opportunity for male and female students as regards participation in such mobility schemes; (2) to promote broad and intensive co-operation between universities in all Member States; (3) to harness the full intellectual potential of the universities in the Community by means of increased mobility of teaching staff, thereby improving the quality of the education and training provided by the universities with a view to securing the competitiveness of the Community in the world markets; (4) to strengthen the interaction between citizens in different Member States with a view to consolidating the concept of a People's Europe; and (5) to ensure the development of a pool of graduates with direct experiences of intra-

Table 1

Overview of Main EU Education Programs

Approved	Initiated	Estimated Budget	Duration	Program Type	Study Length	Participants	Goals
ERASMUS/LINGUA Action II							
May 1987	June 1987	85 Million Ecu for first three years	Unlimited	student mobility	3-12 months	all EFTA ¹ countries as of 92/93 and EU member states, the US and Canada	increase student mobility w/in the EU by 10%
SOCRATES							
March 1995	1997-1999, (scheduled for 1996, but was delayed for one year)	850 Million Ecu for total duration	1995-1999	action program for transnational co-operation in education		15 member states, EEA ² countries EU plus Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway	student mobility and encompasses a number of EU actions (Lingua, Erasmus)
LEONARDO da Vinci							
December 1994	January 1995	620 Million Ecu for total duration of 5 years	1995-1999	student mobility within enterprises professional environment	3-12 weeks or 3 to 9 months	same as Socrates	encourage vocational based skills, develop closer links between schools/industry
LINGUA							
July 1989	January 1990	153 Million Ecu spent (200 Million Ecu allocated)	1990-1994 Phase I	linguistic training for EU teachers and students	2-4 weeks or 3-12 months depending on the specific action	same as Socrates	improve linguistic skills for students at all education levels and better train language teachers

1 Ecu = \$1.13 US dollars (1997 May) The Economist.

¹ European Free Trade Association, members include Austria, Britain, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland.

² European Economic Area, 19 countries including EFTA members.

Community co-operation, thereby creating the basis upon which intensified co-operation in the economic and social sectors can develop at Community level.

These objectives are applicable to all EU member states and European Free Trade Association (EFTA), a free trade union outside of an EU framework, countries that participate in ERASMUS (“Guide to European...,” 1994). Teachers, university administrators and students are encouraged to participate in this program. Exchanges range from 3 to 12 month stays (“Guide to European...,” 1994). There are three means of support for both of these groups: first, grants to universities for European Dimension activities; second, mobility grants for students; third, other support for teachers, administrative staff, or students for activities related to European activities (<http://europa.eu.int/en/comm/dg22/socrates/erasinf.html>, 1996).

Similar to other EU initiatives, the EU member states are not required to participate. Universities negotiate and initiate exchanges with host universities, though follow the specific guidelines by the EU for funding purposes (Commission of the European Communities, 1991). The partnerships are arranged under the so called Interuniversity Cooperation Programs (ICPs) (Commission of the European Communities, 1991). Each ICP has an individual coordinator based at the higher education institution engaged in the exchange. A director based in the host country oversees all activities and coursework for foreign students (Maiworm and Teichler, 1995). The EU encourages universities to look for partners who offer different study possibilities than the home institution and search for partnerships that are not in high demand. It urges universities to focus on one partner rather than multiple partners

(Commission of the European Communities, 1991). Partnerships usually last for three years, but are not limited to this time frame (European Commission, 1996). The EU funds projects and annually evaluates their success. If the funded university fails to accomplish its proposed objectives, then it is likely that the EU will discontinue its funding for the remainder of the project (Commission Européenne, 1996).

Another important aspect of ERASMUS is the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). This allows students to transfer coursework from the host country to their native universities (Commission of the European Communities, 1990). The ECTS was recommended by the ERASMUS Advisory Committee in 1988 to solve “academic recognition problems” at the university and coursework level (Commission of the European Communities, 1990). Evaluation of degrees and coursework is based upon the principle of mutual trust. An “inner circle” of 81 universities and 3 consortia were selected by the Commission to evaluate coursework and university degrees. Institutions not selected for the “inner circle” join the “outer circle” and are regularly informed of evaluations made by the “inner circle” (Commission of the European Communities, 1990). There is interaction between the two circles in that the outer can make recommendations. This approach again emphasizes national responsibility and local responsibility rather than the EU’s authority. It also assists in the mutual recognition of degrees and coursework valuable to students, universities and employers across national borders.

ERASMUS’ budget has dramatically increased since its first years. This is due to the high demand for the program from students, teachers and university

administrators. The estimated budget for ERASMUS' first three years of operation was 85 million Ecu (European Currency Unit, roughly equal to 75 million US\$) (Commission of the European Communities, 1990). The first year's (1987-88) allocations were 11.2 million Ecu followed by 30 million and 52.5 million in the second and third years of operation (Commission of the European Communities, 1990). There was a significant increase in the next three years for ERASMUS at 64.9 million Ecu in 1991-92, 94.9 in 1992-3 and 71.1 million Ecu in 1993-4 ("Guide to European...", 1994). In 1995 when ERASMUS was placed under SOCRATES, 55% (467.5 million Ecu) of the 850 million Ecu budget was designated for ERASMUS for 1995-99 (deWit, 1996). The 106.9 million Ecu jump from the first year of ERASMUS to its current annual budget is quite significant especially when looking at the overall expenditure for education under the EU framework. In 1991, 8% of the total EU budget was designated for social policy and contained no specific reference to education (Eurostat, 1992). Five years later, the EU spent 9% of its annual budget for education and young people and had designed a new category in the budget for this expenditure (Commission Européenne, 1996). Though an improvement from the 1991 budget, education still remains low on the agenda as the second lowest EU disbursement in 1996 (Commission Européenne, 1996).

In 1995, a new plan was devised for the ERASMUS Action plan. ERASMUS is now encompassed under the new SOCRATES program (<http://europa.eu.int/en/comm/dg22/SOCRATES/info.html>, 1997). SOCRATES incorporates all previous programs under one structure, as requested by the member states (Agence

SOCRATES France, 1997). The program starting date was originally the 1996-97 academic year, but was postponed for one year because of German reservations regarding the funding of pluriannual programs in general (Torres, 1995). The change in name is a result of the 1992 Maastricht Treaty, which gave the EU a greater role in education policy and reassessed past program success (deWit, 1996). The main difference between SOCRATES and ERASMUS is that the former covers not only higher education, but all levels of education policy (deWit, 1996). The sections it includes are higher education (ERASMUS), primary and secondary school education (COMENIUS), language learning (LINGUA), Open and Distance Learning (ODL), Adult Education and the exchange of information and experience through a number of initiatives under SOCRATES (<http://europa.eu.int/en/comm/dg22/socrates/info.html>, 1997). The projected 1997-98 budget for SOCRATES is 850 million Ecu of which 55% will go towards the ERASMUS program (deWit, 1996).

The goals and objectives outlined by the ERASMUS program remain important to SOCRATES, such as student/teacher mobility and exchanges, language skills, joint curricula and school projects and university staff/administrator development. Specifically, these objectives as pronounced by the European Commission's Decision 819 in March 1995 include: (a) to develop the European dimension in education at all levels so as to strengthen the spirit of European citizenship, drawing on the cultural heritage of each Member State; (b) to promote a quantitative and qualitative improvement of the knowledge of the languages of the European Union, and in particular those that are least widely used and least taught,

leading to greater understanding and solidarity between the peoples of the European Union, and to promote the intercultural dimension of education; (c) to promote wide-ranging and intensive cooperation between institutions in the Member States at all levels of education, enhancing their intellectual and teaching potential; (d) to encourage the mobility of teachers, so as to promote a European dimension in studies and to contribute to the qualitative improvement of their skills; (e) to encourage mobility for students, enabling them to complete part of their studies in another Member State, so as to contribute to the consolidation of the European dimension in education; (f) to encourage contacts among pupils in the European Union, and to promote the European dimension in their education; (g) to encourage the academic recognition of diplomas, periods of study and other qualifications, with the aim of facilitating the development of an open European area for cooperation in education; (h) to encourage open and distance education in the context of the activities of this program; and (i) to foster exchanges of information and experience so that the diversity and specificity of the educational systems in the Member States become a source of enrichment and of mutual stimulation.

Participants include the 15 member states and Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area agreement (<http://europa.eu.int/en/comm/dg22/SOCRATES/LINGUA.html>, 1997).

The basic objectives of ERASMUS remain the same for SOCRATES, with an increase in resources for participants, several structural changes and one new emphasis on curricula development. First, the total budget for SOCRATES is 850

Million Ecu. This is so far the most money the EU has designated for education. The reason for the increase is to meet the growth of demands for exchanges. Dieter Breitenbach, then the German science and culture minister for Saarland (a German region) said that “the budget will not meet all needs,” but continued to say that it’s not “just a question of money, but of the individual commitment of all the universities and schools which organize partnerships” (Hughes, 1995, 12). He anticipated that “students will have lower grants but the principle is that they will have access to exchanges funded by European national or private sources” (Hughes, 1995, 12).

Second, structural changes are related to budgetary concerns. Interuniversity Cooperation Programs (ICPs) have previously supported exchanges for a year or less with larger budgets (gopher://resul1.ulb.ac.be:70/00/.erasinf.ans, 1997). Under ICPs, partnerships are arranged at the individual higher education institutes. Since their creation, more than 1,500 institutions have participated and worked under this program (Teichler, 1993). In 1989, ERASMUS experienced an 46% increase of student exchanges as compared with the preceding year. One year later, there was a 90% increase of these student exchanges (Teichler, 1993). Its budget was also expanded from 11.2 million Ecu in its first year (1987-88) to 52.5 million Ecu in its third year (1989-90) (Wielemans, 1991). This budgetary increase represents the EU’s strong commitment to these programs and belief that they can help foster greater co-operation among member states. In 1987-88 there were 398 ICP programs and 2,505 in 1994-95 (gopher://resul1.ulb.ac.be:70/00/.talt.ans, 1997). The EU’s limited budget has not kept up with the demand for ICPs. Beginning in 1997-98 under SOCRATES,

all ICP funding will be arranged through a three year “institutional contract” for participating institutions rather than annual contracts. The EU hopes that the new three year contract will encourage “institutions to adopt a coherent policy for their European cooperation activities, to achieve a more durable impact and to ensure more effective use of available funds” (gopher://resull.ulb.ac.be:70/00/.erasinf.ans, 1997, 2).

SOCRATES represents the success and continuation of the original action programs. It supports the same goals as originally outlined in previous programs while adding more funding for participants. The EU anticipates that this will allow more students and other eligible candidates to participate in mobility programs than before. SOCRATES serves as a link from one member state to another by exchanging its participants within Europe. These exchanges affect the most basic level of a community, the individual that aids in the process of integrating Europe.

LINGUA

Adopted in 1989, LINGUA is the EU’s initiative to enhancing language skills for member states’ students ranging from the primary to tertiary level (Commission of the European Communities, 1990). Unlike SOCRATES for university students and LEONARDO for vocational students, LINGUA transcends both programs. It promotes students’ mobility language exchange under ERASMUS/SOCRATES as well as vocational language training programs under LEONARDO. LINGUA’s initial program phase was to run from 1990-94 with a 153 million Ecu budget. It was

extended under the SOCRATES program (Commission of the European Communities, 1995). In 1999, the EU is likely to evaluate its progress after the SOCRATES contract is completed.

Like ERASMUS, LINGUA encourages joint projects between the member states and other countries. This program supports the 9 official EU languages, but also two national languages, Gaelic and Letzeburgesch, as spoken in Ireland and Luxembourg, respectively (Commission of the European Communities, 1994). There is a particular emphasis on those languages not widely used and the EU provides various support for projects with less frequently studied languages. Under the European Commission's 1988 program aims, LINGUA was intended to: (a) increase the capacity of the Community's citizens to communicate with each other by a quantitative and qualitative improvement in the teaching and learning of foreign languages; and (b) ensure that the present and future workforce acquires the necessary levels of foreign language expertise in order to enable enterprises to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by the Internal Market (1990).

LINGUA reinforces the EU's commitment to diversity, especially through its focus on the least widely used EU languages. There are 5 types of activities that are supported under this program known as actions A-E (also sometimes referred to numerically). All programs are designed by national authorities in participating countries (LINGUA, 1997).

The specific actions range from student to teacher language development programs. The first area that LINGUA supports is language teacher training or

European Cooperation Programs (<http://europa.eu.int/en/comm/dg22/SOCRATES/LINGUA.html>, 1997). Action A seeks to enhance the professional skills of “future or current foreign language teachers and trainers” (LINGUA, 1997, 1). Cooperative activities included the “joint development of curricula, teaching materials, modules and training schemes” (LINGUA, 1997, 1). Action B focuses on in-service training grants for foreign language teachers. Grants help support 2-4 week intensive training courses for teachers. The objective is to improve the “teacher’s capacity to teach foreign languages or to teach through the medium of foreign languages” (LINGUA, 1997, 2). Continuing with in-service training is Action C, European language assistantships. This enables teachers to spend 3-12 months as an assistant in a country where the foreign language they teach is the native language. Grants are to help sustain teachers while immersing them in the culture. The EU hopes this will stimulate interest in not just the host country, but other EU countries as well. Action D, another tool for teachers, is for the “Development of instruments for language-teaching and the assessment of foreign language competence” (LINGUA, 1997, 3). Again, grants are provided to encourage development in three areas: curricula; innovations in teaching methods and resources; and improvement in existing resources to assess competency in the second language. Programs of this type are supported by LINGUA for up to three years and do not cover more than one half of the total costs. Finally, Action E “promotes exchanges of young people enrolled in schools or in one-school institutions providing apprenticeship training within the framework of joint projects” (LINGUA, 1997, 3). Joint projects are defined in the

EU LINGUA handbook as an “activity which runs over a relatively long period of time involving young people between the age of 16 and 25 from educational and training institutions in at least two different member states of the European Community” (Commission of the European Communities, 1994, 5). Priority is given to the vocational and technical education sectors. Like ERASMUS, creating partnerships is the responsibility of interested parties. The partnership process involves five steps as outlined by the EU (Commission of the European Communities, 1994).

The first step is the preliminary stage where a partner is selected. The member state can use personal links, city twinning, the European School Exchanges Database, the Council of Europe’s connections with its own exchanges or international organizations, the media, especially “Le Monde Educatif” and “Times Educational Supplement,” non-governmental organizations or the LINGUA partner finding system to find a suitable partner for the exchange. Second, once a possible partner is found, organizers arrange for a preparatory visit to the host country. The main component of the exchange must be focused on any of the eleven EU languages. Action IV of LINGUA provides financial support for these visits. Third is the pre-exchange. Educators, administrators and organizers should promote partnerships in their own country and encourage as many interested students as possible to participate. Fourth is the actual exchange. Parents in the foreign country host students in their homes and teachers from the native country are involved in the language teaching process. The suggested teacher-to-student ratio under LINGUA is 1:10, but it is recommend that 2

adult escorts accompany every 10 students. For full language benefit, students are encouraged to stay for two weeks. The partnership between institutions can last up to two years, depending on the motivation of the organizers. Once the exchange is finished, assessment is crucial to the productivity of the exchange. The post-exchange period looks at the outcomes at both the national and the supra-national level. Organizers are asked to present results to their communities through public presentations and the media. This is expected to stimulate future interest and maintain the existing partnership.

The estimated program budget was set between 200 and 250 million Ecu (Commission of the European Communities, 1990). For the program's four year duration, 153 million Ecu was spent (Commission of the European Communities, 1995). The 1994 actual budget for LINGUA was 44.2 million Ecu for all actions (Commission of the European Communities, 1995). In 1993-94, 18% more projects were arranged than the following year ("Guide to European...", 1994).

Under the SOCRATES program, LINGUA's objectives and actions remain the same. LINGUA attempts to build on linguistic actions pertinent to all other education programs, not just student exchanges (Commission of the European Communities, 1995). Only specialized languages related to "economic life" and known as "linguistics assistantships" (LINGUA action III/C) fall under the LEONARDO program, strand III (Commission of the European Communities, 1995, 17). The EU anticipates that the new structural arrangement for LINGUA (SOCRATES and LEONARDO) will "serve to maintain the coherence of linguistic

policy at the European Union level” (Commission of the European Communities, 1995, 18).

LEONARDO

Besides mobility exchanges that have so far gained the most support from member states, vocational training is another important aspect of the EU’s education action programs. The first major advancement in education was specifically for vocational training. The Treaty of Rome’s provisions on education focused on vocational training, but were broadly applied to include general education. Since the EU’s main interest in education began with vocational training, two programs, LINGUA (Action III/C) and LEONARDO, exemplify this interest. The expansion of these programs from the 1980’s to the 1990’s has given them a broader scope rather than just teaching a specific skill to students. For example, teachers are invaluable in creating exchanges and links between vocational schools, emphasizing culture and language aside from the skills the students are learning.

Though the Treaty of Rome established the principle of a European vocational training program, little initiative was taken until April 1963. A common policy was adopted for vocational training through ten key clauses (Neave, 1984). The two main purposes were: first, encourage young people to “harmoniously” develop into well-rounded individuals; second, continue technical innovations and develop new methods in “production and changes in both the social and economic spheres” (Neave, 1984, 59). In December 1963, an Advisory Committee for Vocational

Training was set up to address questions and the importance of vocational training based on either its own initiative or that of the European Commission. Representatives included two from each member state, two from industry (the employer) and two from employees' organizations of each member state (Neave, 1984, 59). This Committee met twice annually and its function was reviewed every two years.

Aside from the Advisory Committee, other steps were taken to advance vocational training in a European framework. The Regional Development Fund, the Fund for the Guidance of European Agriculture (used for training young people and others in declining sectors of industry or agriculture) and the European Social Fund. These three funds aid in encouraging and retraining youths in vocational fields to better prepare them for new requirements in the labor market and assure that future demands for these skills are met (Neave, 1984).

Since the ten clauses established in 1963, the EU has made significant efforts to encourage vocational training for young people through the LEONARDO da Vinci program. On December 6, 1994, the Council of Ministers adopted the LEONARDO da Vinci program for developing a community policy on vocational education and training (LEONARDO, 1997). One year later, 4,500 projects were submitted and 749 funded with 89.7 million Ecu (Council Decision 94/1340, 1994). Similar to ERASMUS/SOCRATES, LEONARDO is an umbrella program for a number of other vocational initiatives. The program is embedded in the "European Year for Lifelong

Learning” that emphasizes continuing education with a specific vocational training focus.

In 1994, six priorities and the means to accomplish these were outlined in the 1994 Council Decision. The first is to “improve the attractiveness and the parity of esteem of initial vocational training, including the enhancement of the value of ‘work-related’/vocational knowledge” (Council Decision, 1994, 14). This includes developing new types of apprenticeships and relations between enterprises and vocational schools in member states. In order to carry out this priority, the EU plans to “analyze the links between theoretical and practical knowledge” by looking to new institutional arrangements between universities with general education and those with a vocational focus (Council Decision, 1994, 15). Second, the EU will examine numerous models and methodologies that may provide new opportunities and career prospects for students in vocational curricula. A second priority is to develop access for those at a “disadvantage on the labor market,” particularly those at risk for economic and social exclusion (Council Decision, 1994, 15). This priority will entail addressing ways to retrain “at risk workers,” by devising new training programs and strategies particularly at the regional or local level. The third priority is to arrange new financial investments in vocational training and ways to evaluate the costs and benefits of these investments. This will require comparing evaluative methods of cost-benefit analysis and contractual or voluntary agreements at the national/regional level and industry level. Fourth, LEONARDO will anticipate skills needed by workers through cooperation between labor market institutions and training bodies.

This will depend on a multi-level analysis from companies, numerous sectors, and both regional and national governments to determine future skills needed for both workers and companies in a changing economy. Fifth, LEONARDO will extend cooperation between member states through clarifying terminology and standards used in vocational schools. This can be accomplished through examining vocational standards and qualifications within the member states, promoting new methods at the European level, and exchanging information between member states to determine the most successful way to increase cooperation in national vocational schools. The sixth priority is best accomplished through examining diverse sources for training professionals in vocational education and includes determining which are the best practices for implementing professionalism. These rather diverse priorities emphasize the need to revitalize vocational education in skills, professionalism, and reputation. This includes looking to a number of levels, not only the institutes themselves, but cooperating across regional/national boundaries at a supra-national level.

The structure of the LEONARDO program is similar to that of ERASMUS and LINGUA in that member states submit proposals for funding. In 1995, a total of 4 million Ecu was available to fund projects falling under the six priorities. If a project falls under the first three priorities, then it is submitted to the National Coordination Unit for LEONARDO of either the relevant Member State or EFTA country. The main issues that comprise the first priorities entail the “exploitation and consolidation of studies and development work already under way in the Member States and the analysis of major national initiatives taken by other Member States”

(Council Decision, 1994, 17). National priorities for vocational training can be obtained from the national agencies, one in Germany and six in France. The three former priorities for vocational training are submitted directly to the European Commission. Projects falling under these priorities must focus on the same priority as the member states, but at the European level (Council Decision, 1994).

Commonalities Among EU Programs

There are a number of basic features prominent in all programs mentioned above. First, all exchanges are arranged by the individual institutions not by the EU or central authority. This reinforces the decentralization trend found at the national level and the regionalization of member states' policies. Second, proposed objectives for these programs have remained relatively consistent since they were initially launched. Though they are quite new, beginning in the 1980's the same principles of co-operation and co-ordination have resurfaced in formal proposals or memos from the EU. Third, budgets for these programs have remained modest and funding is not solely derived from the EU. Programs are built rather on the collaboration between institutions, regions, and the EU to financially assist candidates. Finally, these programs foster relationships between Europeans at the most basic level, individuals. They encourage involvement from a number of different levels in order to fund and continue support for EU exchanges.

Conclusion

Originally, the first attempts to integrate education among European countries were dominated by national actors. Though these attempts were limited, they fostered the idea of cooperation between national education systems. The increase in higher education students, rising unemployment rates and difficulties in financing have forced EU member states to find new funding options. Over time, various governmental and private actors started to contribute to funding higher education. Where nations once supplied all educational resources, the EU has recently helped in part due to financial difficulties faced by member states higher education systems, beginning in the 1970's and 1980's. EU programs have emphasized common principles dedicated to protecting the diverse interests of its member states.

EU programs have demonstrated success: the number of applicants and allocated funds have increased. Each program's objectives have remained relatively stable over time, but broad and ambiguous in scope, illustrating the EU's reluctance to promote an integrated education and commitment to protecting national education systems. Member states have taken an interest in these programs since they provide resources otherwise unavailable to students, faculty and administrators.

Despite the EU's reluctance to initiate education policies, current trends at the national and supranational levels are parallel. Funding for higher education is derived from numerous sources both at the national and supranational level. Consistent with EU legislation and national legislation, regional governments are participating more

in education policy-making through financial resources. No longer is education solely the responsibility of one actor, but increasingly includes the participation of the supranational, national and local authorities.

CHAPTER III

FRANCE AND THE EU

Decentralization and Regionalization

Introduction

One of the major questions concerning European integration are its effects on the policy process in the member states. This analysis concerns itself with France, which since the 1980's has made major adjustments in national education policy. These changes are a result of pressure from the EU, local institutions, and "consumers" (students, faculty and administrative staff). Since 1981, higher education policy in France has followed a decentralization trend. These new developments have made implementing the subsidiarity principle, the EU's regional development principle, found in Article 3b of the Maastricht Treaty easier for France, but not nearly as easy as compared to federalist countries, such as the Federal Republic of Germany.

This chapter examines French education policy in the context of broader European trends. The first section outlines recent trends in national policy that stress decentralization. Second, the overall structure of French higher education, France's national educational goals, and the decentralization of education policy will be

discussed. This is followed by an analysis of the impact of EU programs on the French education system and how the two are interrelated.

Recent Trends in National Policy: Decentralization

One of the most significant reforms by the French Socialist government from 1982-1986 was decentralization (Ehrmann, Schain, 1992). There were 14 pieces of legislation passed during this period to grant more authority to local governments. Local governments were given a number of new responsibilities that were all designated by the central government. This section describes the three levels of government below the national level and highlights the main components of the decentralization laws.

Subnational government in France consists of 36,763 communes, 96 departments and 22 regions (Hunter, 1996). Communes are responsible for the most basic level of government (Stevens, 1992). They all have the same legal status, but vary in population size (Stevens, 1992). Communes also decide town and county planning, provide various public services within the community, and are responsible for some infrastructure, especially local roads.

The next higher level of French subnational government are the departments. They were formed in 1790 based on geographical location (Stevens, 1992). Their purpose was to implement the central government's policies. Not until 1871 were departments given elective powers and perceived as a means of local democratization.

The third level of the subnational government are the regions. The 22 regions have since the 1982 decentralization laws received more autonomy, which includes executive powers, extended regional responsibilities, and more freedom over regional investments and operating costs (Stevens, 1992). Though the regions' budgets are less than those of the departments, they have contributed greatly to French economic development. In 1982, total public spending for regions was 2.1%, 26.5% for departments and 50.2% for communes (Budd, 1997). In 1986, the figures rose to 4.4%, 24.6%, and 50.2%, respectively. Direct and indirect investments for regions amounted to 26,237 million francs in 1989 and 40,071 in 1993, as compared to the departments at 58,976 in 1989 and 77,044 in 1993 (INSEE, 1996). Though regional spending and investments still lag behind the departments, regions have nearly doubled their total expenditures and investments since 1980. The EU's 1991 Maastricht Treaty has also enhanced regional development through the Regional Fund, which provides grants to developing regions.

Legislation related to decentralization consisted of 14 detailed laws in the 1980's. Decentralization had already begun in 1964 when regional prefects were created under national legislation, and in 1972 another piece of legislation was passed to consolidate the regional administration under the prefects (Ehrmann and Schain, 1992). Prefects were then appointed by the central government and acted as administrative arms for national policies (Blondel, 1974). Since the 1980's, they have lost most of their power and are now primarily responsible for local security, i.e. law and order (Ehrmann and Schain, 1992). The most important decentralization law was

the framework law (loi cadre) in 1986 (Ehrmann and Schain, 1992). It established regions as political units, transferring all administrative powers from the department and prefects to elected officials (Ehrmann and Schain, 1992). French leaders view decentralization laws as successful, but when compared to other countries, France remains highly centralized. The 1980 reforms demonstrate France's willingness to devolve the central authority's power and promote a new adherence to the EU's emphasis on regional development.

This decentralization trend is also prevalent in higher education. Regions and higher education institutions have more autonomy over administrative functions than ever before. This is partially the result of national financial constraints, especially felt by the central government since the 1970's and 1980's. France has had to turn to both private and public sources to meet financial needs in higher education. The next section will first outline the structure of French higher education followed by regional trends in the context of French education policy and the motives for these changes.

The French Education System

Universities, Grandes Ecoles and IUTs

The higher education sector in France is comprised of four types of institutions: universities, Grandes Ecoles, Institutes Universitaires de Technologie (IUTs) and research institutes. Though research institutes have become more important in higher education in recent years, this analysis will focus on the first three

sectors (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). IUTs have only since De Gaulle's presidency become an integrated part of higher education. Universities and the Grandes Ecoles demonstrate France's traditionally academic focus, affirming a national pattern of elitism and centralization especially in higher education (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987).

Today, there are a total of 75 universities in France, all subsumed under the National Ministry of Education's authority (Luchaire and Massit-Follea, 1993). Each university specializes in particular disciplines in order to avoid competition among the universities (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). Three main points clearly describe the French universities (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). First, during the French Revolution, which abolished traditional universities, universities were closely linked with the secondary school level, i.e. the "lycée" or academic high school that leads to the "bac" or high school graduation exam. This was a result of the First Republic's and Napoleon's opposition to a religiously dominated school education, which led to the creation of a public education system. The system was structured around national examinations, securing a minimum level of training, particularly in the medical and legal fields. Scientific research, except in the natural sciences, has had little place in universities, preventing liberal arts students to interact with researchers (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). The Ministry of Education has tried to diminish the research lag by creating research institutions that are independent from universities and publicly funded (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). Second, universities experienced difficulties coordinating university curricula among themselves and locally in various disciplines.

Numerous laws were passed to bridge the differences, but the non-disciplinary factor remains. Only sixteen universities can truly be considered multidisciplinary, reinforcing the difficulties of inter-university cooperation. Third, centralization remains a strong element in higher education. In the past, centralization primarily referred to a geographical location, namely Paris and its surrounding region, the “Ile de France.” The Parisian center is not as strong as it once was in both a quantitative and qualitative sense. The current connotation of centralization applies more to administrative affairs such as diplomas, national curricula, admission requirements, staff salaries, and other personnel and activities of the Ministry of Education. Universities have gained some autonomy from the Ministry of Education, but numerous administrative functions remain controlled by the national bureaucracy (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987).

Alongside the universities exist 177 “Grandes Ecoles,” the most prestigious higher education institutions in France (Hunter, 1996). These schools were established in the eighteenth century as training centers for governmental elites, military officials, and engineers (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). After the French revolution of 1789, a number of new institutes and schools were created including the Ecole Normale Supérieure specifically for training teachers. Another prominent school, the Ecole Polytechnique became one of the most prestigious institutions for civil servants and technical bureaucrats (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). Later, Grandes Ecoles were created in a number of other disciplines ranging from architecture to political science. The vast majority of these schools are state funded,

but a number of them are financed either by local chambers of commerce or private sources (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). Grandes Ecoles are highly selective; they usually each enroll about 2,000 to 3,000 students and annually graduate a total of 17,000 students (Hunter, 1996). These schools are closely linked to the professional sector, giving their students both academic and practical skills. Between the schools, competition is fierce for recruiting the best students with an interest in their field (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987).

The third sector in French education is comprised of the IUTs or Technical Institutes that are affiliated with universities. Each IUT has its own director appointed by the National Ministry of Education (Kurian, 1988). In 1955-56, 152,246 students were enrolled in universities compared to 791,178 in 1975-76, which represents a 520% increase in enrollments in 20 years (Ambler, 1981). IUTs were created in 1961 to solve the overcrowding issue in universities (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). The curriculum in IUTs focuses mainly on more practical and vocational skills. Students may enroll in an IUT after passing the final high school exam (bac) or immediately following the completion of 4 years of studies in a general university curriculum, with a *Diplôme d'études universitaires générales* (DEUG). Students with the DEUG continue with a master's degree in a vocational training area rather than a bachelors degree. Though IUTs have increased their enrollments, they still lag far behind universities. In 1976, only 35,000 out of 900,000 students in higher education studied at IUTs (Bienayme, 1984). In 1982-83, there were only 56,000 students at IUTs out of a total of 930,000 students in higher education. IUTs

have neither fully resolved the overcrowding problem in universities nor have they attracted as large a number of applicants as had been anticipated (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). The more respected education paths continue to be either the Grandes Ecoles or universities rather than the IUTs. Technical schools may begin to flourish, though, in the next few years, particularly if unemployed university graduates begin searching for new skills other than academic ones.

National Goals for Higher Education

There have been three main concerns for French educational policy-makers in the late 1980's and early 1990's. These problems relate to France's commitment to "democratize" and increase participation in the tertiary education sector, an idea pursued by the Socialists. First, the national government is concerned that not enough students are continuing beyond the post-secondary level. In recent years, education ministers have advocated that 80% of secondary students pass the baccalauréat, which allows them entry into a university (Neave, 1991). Second, there seems to exist a desire to invest more in education than in previous years. This includes both financial backing for universities as well as giving students an education that allows them to compete in an international economy. Third, France shows a continued effort to develop a system of mass education where more students from various economic and educational backgrounds obtain a higher education degree (Neave, 1991). These three priorities of the French government derive from both France's commitment to democratizing education and increasing participation in education. As a result,

France has reexamined the structure of its education system and has given universities more autonomy over policies than in previous years. The specifics of decentralization in education will be explained in a later section.

Related to France's commitment to increase democratization of education, or as some call it, mass expansion of higher education, France has been forced to examine the number of students obtaining the baccalauréat (bac), which allows entry into higher education (Neave, 1991). After evaluating higher education in the 1980's, the French government realized that the number of students who passed the bac following their secondary school studies was far too low (Neave, 1991). This was illustrated by a 7.4% decrease in students passing the bac from 1975 to 1987 (Guin, 1990). In 1987, slightly more than 30% of 18 to 19 year olds passed the bac and 83.8% of those applied to a university (Neave, 1991). The Socialists, beginning with Jean-Pierre Chevènement, the last Socialist Minister of Education before the 1986 elections, advocated that 80% of 18 to 19 year olds should qualify for the bac (Neave, 1991). The Ministry's anticipated goal of 80% was an overambitious leap in "Bacheliers" rates. Immediately following Chevènement, René Monory, his conservative successor, reduced this percentage to 74% by the year 2000 (Neave, 1991).

These goals will affect a number of education sectors, including primary and secondary schools as well as higher education. Teachers at the primary and secondary school level will be forced to prevent failure so more students pass the bac (Guin, 1990). This could decrease the level of education quality in schools simply to

increase the number of students eligible for the bac. In higher education, universities will be faced with an increase in applicants requiring more professional staff and physical space for these new students. Besides these difficulties, it is questionable whether the government will reach its 74% goal by the year 2000.

The Socialists' motivations for these reforms were not only academic in nature and sought to democratize education, but economically driven. Following the 1973 oil crisis, the national government found it difficult to offer the same services to students as it had in the past. This forced the government to diversify funding sources including those from industry (Neave, 1985). This was significant since 90% of all funding for higher education derived from the central government (Bienayme, 1984). In 1991, 77.6% of all French education was funded by the national government, 7.3% from the regions, and 15.1% from local governments (OECD, 1993). One year later, regional and local percentages rose to 10.4% and 15.7% with the central government contributing 73.9% (OECD, 1995). The national government, determined to raise standards in higher education through its 80% target for the bac, was forced to increase quality while decreasing education expenditures at the national level.

Political Parties and Education

Political parties are the major force devising new legislation for education policy. French politics are driven by two polar forces: the left (*la gauche*) and the right (*la droite*). The main spectrum of political parties from left to right are the Communists (PCF, *Parti Communiste Français*), several small Green parties (*Les*

Vertes, Les Ecologistes), Socialists (PS, *Parti Socialiste*), Union for French Democracy (UDF, *Union pour la Démocratie Française*), the neo-Gaullist Rally for the Republic (RPR, *Rassemblement pour la République*), and the far right National Front (FN, *Front National*). The education reforms of the 1980's were mostly driven by the Socialists who sought to "democratize" and increase the number of students passing the bac.

French conservatives opposed decentralization from 1958-1981, since they held national power. The Socialists supported decentralization because they enjoyed strong support in certain cities and regions. In addition, they had formed a number of coalitions at the local level enhancing their political status (Ehrmann and Schain, 1992).

The 1980's decentralization legislation for the regions and the education system was passed by Socialist governments, headed by François Mitterrand. President Mitterrand was elected in 1981 for his first seven year presidential term and he was re-elected by the French in 1988. The 1981 elections were a significant defeat for the UDF and RPR, the French center and conservative parties who since 1958 had dominated French politics (Ehrmann and Schain, 1992). Mitterrand carried all but 19 departments, including those that were historically conservative (Ehrmann and Schain, 1992).

In the 1986 legislative elections, the left was defeated by a conservative majority. Mitterrand continued as president, but without a Socialist majority in the National Assembly (AN), France's elected legislative body. When a president and the

majority in the AN are from different parties, the French term this as “cohabitation.”

In 1986, a conservative Prime Minister, Jacques Chirac, was appointed by Mitterrand and from 1986-88 little was accomplished because of the tense relations between the two chief political executives (Tiersky, 1994). The Conservatives made significant efforts to reverse a number of previous laws passed by the Socialists (Tiersky, 1994). Education policy made little progress towards decentralization due to the political strife resulting from cohabitation.

The Communists (PCF) were adamantly opposed to all decentralization reforms in the 1980's and 1990's. The primary school teacher's union is tightly controlled by the PCF. The National Union of Higher Education (SNE), the largest faculty union in France, is historically influenced by PCF factions (Ambler, 1981). However, the PCF's influence has decreased particularly since the 1988 Presidential elections, in which they won less than 20% of the vote, nearly a 10% decrease from the 1970's (Ehrmann and Schain, 1992). The PCF has had to develop closer ties with the PS due to its diminishing popularity.

In the 1980's the right had little influence in politics because of the mainly Socialist controlled governments. Once Chirac became the President in 1995, he appointed a conservative education minister, François Bayrou, to his cabinet. Bayrou has demonstrated an interest in regional development and in efforts to decentralize financing for higher education (Chambraud, 1996). However, the right has not adopted the Socialist principle of democratization of education, but rather favors a more selective system of higher education (Neave, 1985).

On the far right, the Front National (FN) is adamantly opposed to the European Union and the democratization of education (Ehrmann and Schain, 1992). Le Pen, the FN's party leader has focused more on immigration policy advocating "zero immigration." Since the 1980's, the FN has gained more support especially in the Parisian working class suburbs and Marseilles. Its membership has risen from 30,000 in 1986 to 100,000 in 1990 (Ehrmann and Schain, 1992). Though the FN has increased its membership, in 1997 a number of protests against Le Pen's party were staged by the Left and Center from Strasbourg to Grenoble (Askolovitch, Domenach, Guinard, and Pons, 1997). Despite the rise of the FN, it has less influence in policy areas like education. The main governing parties, PS, UDF, and RPR are more likely to affect education policy because of their electoral popularity in France.

Regionalism in France: A New Shift?

The main focus in French education is traditional academics rather than a technically based education. Despite the differences in philosophy between the universities (including the Grandes Ecoles) and the IUTs, they share a significant commonality: the state oversees most functions within these institutions. Parallel to the 1980's decentralization reforms in national and local government, education has followed a similar trend toward decentralization. Though 1980 education reforms attempted to decentralize education, the Ministry of Higher Education and Research continues to maintain a great deal of authority over education as compared to other

country's education systems. To exemplify this decentralization trend, the concept of regionalism will be examined in the following paragraphs.

Regionalism tries to capture a new type of relationship between the supranational, national, and local level of government. As Marks et al. point out, it "is the existence of overlapping competencies among multiple levels of governments and the interaction of political actors across those levels" (Marks, Neilsen, Ray, and Salk, 1996, 41). There are a number of political actors acting across the local, national, and supranational networks. Political influence is also shared by these three levels of authority.

Ladrech terms the interaction between multiple levels of government as "Europeanization," which is "an incremental process reorienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making" (Ladrech, 1994, 69). The local level plays a greater role in EU policy-making and integration because of Europe's new focus on the regions.

In France, the regions have become more prominent since the 1980's through numerous pieces of national legislation. There are two forms of regionalism: first, there is "top-down" regionalism, which occurs through national regional policies and second is a "bottom-up" type, based on "regional political and economic mobilization" (Jones and Keating, 1995). The first French regional practices were adopted during the 1960's and initiated by the central government (top-down), but became most extensive in the 1980's. Regionalism is caused by both political and

economic factors (Jones and Keating, 1995). Politically, regional autonomy has given more legitimacy to the government through direct elections. Economically, the state was financially burdened specifically by the rising costs in education and now is able to acquire funds from public and private sources. These developments forced France to revise past policy-making and resulted in more regional autonomy.

Regionalism has evolved into more than Jones and Keating suggest, i.e. to a new relationship between three different levels of government; the EU, the national government and local government. This reinforces the notion of Europeanization, as outlined in the introduction. Regionalism is fostered by the national government, appropriating regional autonomy through legislation and funds; the EU initiates education programs and allocates funds; and the subnational governments interact with both the private and public sector in higher education decisions and funding. This recent focus in European politics towards the development of the “region” or local government and how they interact with the two other levels of government is the result of new economic and political constraints faced by national governments.

French regionalism has advanced because of the 1980 French reforms and the EU’s principle of subsidiarity initiated under the Maastricht treaty. The subsidiarity principle is a “federalist-type doctrine to delineate the proper level at which decisions should be made” and has limited the EU scope of action to help legitimize the policy-making process (Dinan, 1994, 4). The adoption of this principle has prompted the EU to encourage regionalism in the member states. Second, it is also the result of an attempt to legitimize government in both an EU and national context to strive for

more democratic conditions at all three levels of government. This is observed through changes in regional governmental structures and national legislation, particularly in higher education.

Regional Governance

Another way France has tried to decentralize its strong state is through more regional governance. After 1980, there were two plans that guided the relationship between the state and local governments, known as the Ninth and Tenth National Plans. Under the 1982 Ninth National Plan, the government attempted to build a regional authority, but failed (Guin, 1990). The 1989 Tenth National Plan was far more comprehensive and specifically addressed the position of the university between the state and the regions. The details will be discussed in the higher education section.

In the area of administrative control, reforms during 1982 and 1986 gave regions more autonomy. Instead of the national government appointing members to Regional Councils, direct elections were held (Guin, 1990). Executive powers were also transferred from the local Prefects to elected Presidents of Regional Councils improving legitimacy at the regional level and emphasizing decentralization. Finally, regions were able to receive financial backing from private sources such as industry and other local resources. Included in this new arrangement was an increase in coordination between the regions. For example a number of southern French regions formed “le grand Sud” linking both the local level with that of the European

Community and circumventing the central government (Guin, 1990). The new emphasis on regional governance and legitimacy not only enhanced regional autonomy, but affected higher education legislation.

Regionalism and Higher Education

Regionalism has only recently been introduced to the field of higher education. Since the 1980's, a number of reforms occurred under the Socialist government. Regionalism has become a model for higher education. Economic problems, high unemployment, and concern for local development have all contributed to this shift from the central state to the region (Guin, 1990). Regionalism also corresponds to such national goals as democratization and participation because it allows for more involvement outside of the traditional elite in Paris. At the supranational level, the principle of subsidiarity found in the Maastricht Treaty and the EU's regional fund both reinforce the European commitment to regional development. French legislation that has fostered this regional arrangement is the 1989 Tenth National Plan (Guin, 1990). This plan made 2000 million French francs (approximately 400 million US\$) available to local authorities for higher education. This has allowed regions greater access to available governmental funds and has permitted them to use their own funds for local universities (Guin, 1990). Unlike the past, universities have become more financially stable because of these reforms and are better equipped to evaluate where funds should be spent locally.

National Legislation, Regionalism and Education Policy

Aside from the factors mentioned above, French legislation clearly demonstrates a trend of decentralization and regionalism in education policy. Specific laws, the *Loi Faure* and *Loi Savary* contributed to decentralization. The first initiative was launched in 1968 as a result of student protests in Paris and throughout France. Since that time, the French government has been forced to periodically evaluate education policies and reform them in significant ways. The greatest changes in education policy have occurred specifically in higher education. In the 1980's, France ignored complaints made by students, professors, and administrators in universities (Guin, 1990). It wasn't until the 1990's that the government again attuned itself to the problems in higher education as it had done in the 1960's. This was because of various political disputes, leading to stalemate particularity from 1986 to 1988 when cohabitation was prevalent with a Right wing majority in the National Assembly and a Socialist President overseeing the government. Since the late 1980's, reforms in higher education have emphasized decentralization through various legislative initiatives.

Major higher education policy reforms began in 1968. The "Loi Faure" granted universities greater authority and independence, but was extremely difficult to implement because of the attitudes then prevalent in French society (Guin, 1990). These attitudes favored diploma regulation and allocation of resources by the central state rather than the regions. This prevented the Loi Faure from being fully

implemented. The law wanted to give the state a lesser role in education policy, but because of public opinion, the state remained the central authority in university affairs (Guin, 1990).

In 1983, the Savary Act was initiated by the Education Minister of that time, Alain Savary (Baumgartner, 1989). Two years later, it was officially adopted by President Mitterrand (Staropoli, 1987). This legislation, also known as the Higher Education Guideline Law was an important attempt by the French government to “democratize” and increase participation rates in the tertiary sector (Neave, 1991). It was one of the most ambitious attempts by the French government to link higher education with national economic and social strategy (Neave, 1985). This law not only enhanced regional authority, but extended the universities research base, deepened relations between the university and industry, and revised undergraduate and doctoral level studies (Neave, 1991). In essence, nearly all sectors of higher education were affected. The main issues surrounding this law consisted of improving relations between junior and senior faculty, creating closer ties between universities and industry, diminishing the competition between universities (Grandes écoles and universities), and changing the power of authority in academic departments (Baumgartner, 1989). This Act became controversial because of the political climate in a time of cohabitation, and the specifics it outlined (Guin, 1990). Though unsuccessfully implemented due to the resistance from universities to comply and political parties in power that would not accept the conditions of the law, the Savary

Act was unlike previous legislation, i.e. a major attempt to reform higher education (Guin, 1990).

A second component of the Higher Education Guideline Law was the creation of an evaluation committee, the Comité National d'Evaluation (CNE) or the National Evaluation Committee. The CNE is an independent administrative agency that assesses all activities under the tertiary sector and institutions under the Ministry of Higher Education (European Commission, 1995). It is responsible for evaluating the "quality of research and teaching, teacher training, continuing training, the administration of staff and service, the academic environment, the admission and supervision of students, local integration, and national and international contacts" (European Commission, 1995, 162). An annual evaluation report is submitted to the President of the Republic.

Considering regionalism and decentralization, the CNE has played a prominent role in the process. In the 1985-1989 CNE final report sent to President Mitterrand, the committee took a firm stance on continuing with regional development as advocated by Jules Ferry's, a French politician in the late 1800's, promoting primary school reforms that favor community authority over education policy (Guin, 1990). The report mentions that the central state is far too distant from the concerns of students and staff involved in higher education. Most noteworthy was the CNE's commitment to financing higher education through more regional resources rather than the central government (Luchaire and Massit-Follea, 1993). Unlike the difficulties faced under most legislative efforts, the CNE has become more

successful in advocating decentralization and its views are supported by regions, local authorities and politicians alike (Guin, 1990).

Following the Guideline law, new attempts again were made to reform higher education. The new conservative education minister, Alain Devaquet, was asked to draft higher education legislation after the 1986 elections. The Devaquet Bill modified university fees, called for a more selective admission process into universities, and granted more autonomy to individual universities (Guin, 1990). This Bill was an “expression of the trend towards economic liberalism in the West” whereas in the early 1980’s France had been considerably more reluctant to favor market forces and capitalism (Guin, 1990, 124). Like previous legislation, the Devaquet Bill failed because of protests from students.

Another important aspect of education reform and the new regionalization are the Regional Committees and Departmental Committees. Both are consultative committees for issues related to higher education (Neave, 1985). Their main objective is to form closer ties with regional industries and higher education institutions particularly because of excessively high unemployment rates. Regional Committees have two functions: first, inform regional administrations of latest developments in qualifications for specific sectors and second, act as a liaison between the various higher education institutions and training schools within the region (Neave, 1985). Departmental Committees act in a more horizontal nature rather than top down as do the Regional Committees (Neave, 1985). Their focus is at the departmental level evaluating courses at the post-secondary sector and conducting

experiments related to education. Though both committees consult and recommend policies and procedures to universities, they have created a more defined balance of power between “the government, administration, the representatives of the public and academia as it is exercised outside the individual university and at the various intervening levels-local, regional and finally, national” (Neave, 1985, 121). This new shift of power has decreased the central government’s autonomy in higher education policy, but not to the extent found in a federalist country like the Federal Republic of Germany.

Though legislative reforms to decentralize higher education were controversial in the 1980’s, the French government continued to support a less centralized authority. Regions now have full administrative powers: there are direct elections for Regional Council seats, elected Presidents of Regional Councils have authority over the local Prefects, and regional bureaucrats have greater control over their budgets (Guin, 1990). There are also more links with the tertiary sector and the private sector that has helped resolve some of the financial distress experienced in a number of universities. Finally, higher education policy-making in France now involves three levels: the central state, regions and the local authority rather than just the central government (Neave, 1985).

EU Programs and French Participation

Despite France’s traditionally highly centralized education system, regionalism has changed operations between administrations at the central and local

level as well as financial aid. Another factor added to these national changes are the EU's education initiatives. The goals of these initiatives (ERASMUS/SOCRATES, LINGUA and LEONARDO) are to encourage French and other EU students to study in another member state. The programs particularly have helped France continue to maintain similar education programs despite economic difficulties.

Since the 1980's, the EU has moved from a narrow area of education, vocational training, to a broader area, general education and university curricula. These changes are demonstrated through the various initiatives accepted by the member states. The Treaty of Rome in 1957 was one of the first EU documents that gave education more attention than in previous years. This section focuses on the French response to EU programs and how committed the French are so far to decentralization in a national and supranational context.

The French Response

France has, in most of the EU programs, demonstrated high participation rates. This seems to indicate that France has turned to new funding sources for higher education since the financial difficulties of the 1980's and 1990's. As compared to her neighbor in the East, France has not had as much experience with exchange programs as Germany has. France continues to be committed to excellence in education, but has devised new approaches to meet all its students' needs. EU programs in some instances filled the gap. Participation rates in three programs will be examined, excluding SOCRATES, since it is in its first year of operation. The

other programs' participation rates will be compared with countries such as Germany and the United Kingdom who are leaders in EU integration.

French participation rates in ERASMUS have been quite high in relation to the total number of ERASMUS grantees, the total percentage of French students participating, as well as the number of participating higher education institutions, ICP's, and of sending and receiving partners. Table 2 outlines the first two years of ERASMUS participation. France is second in grants for 1988-89 and first for 1989-90. France has received more students than it has sent, but the imbalance dropped slightly in the second year. In 1993-94, France continued to receive more students (19,824) than she sent (11,288), but in 1994-95 France maintained a higher total of participants (24,045 students sent) than Germany (20,470), as illustrated in tables 3 and 4. Regional participation rates of higher education institutions in ERASMUS also demonstrate a strong interest in EU programs. Referring to Table 3, Alsace and the Ile de France (Paris) have the highest regional participation rates at 28% and 27%. Participation rates in regions like Haute-Normandie, Pays de la Loire, Aquitaine, Midi-Pyrénées, Rhône-Alps, Languedoc-Roussillon range from 21% to 25%. All of these regions are border regions, either near ports or neighboring countries, suggesting an attentiveness to internationalization. These regions have also invested 280 to 500 million French francs (FF) in 1994 for professionally based education and internship programs outside of education institutions (Girard and Larné, 1994).

Table 2

ERASMUS Students 1989-89 and 1989-90 by Country of Home Institution
Compared to the Proportion of the 18-25 Age Cohort and of all
Higher Education Students in EU Member States; Ratio of
Students Received to Sent 1988-89 and 1989-90

EU Member State	Number of Erasmus Grantees		Percentage of Erasmus Grantees		18-25 year olds (%)	All Higher Ed. Students (%)	Ration of students received to students sent	
	1988-89	1989-90	1988-89	1989-90	1988	1989-90	1988-89	1989-90
Belgium	403	731	4.0	4.0	2.8	3.3	0.78	0.97
Germany	1,715	3,603	17.2	19.7	21.5	22.9	0.90	0.73
Denmark	187	404	1.9	2.2	1.5	1.5	0.80	0.65
Spain	1,064	2,123	10.4	11.6	12.1	13.2	0.85	0.88
France	1,779	3,776	17.9	20.7	15.6	17.8	1.36	1.14
Greece	194	444	2.0	2.4	2.8	2.6	0.60	0.50
Iceland	1,390	1,918	14.0	10.5	17.6	16.3	0.64	0.71
Ireland	193	340	2.0	1.9	1.0	1.0	1.27	1.68
Luxembourg	31	-	0.3	-	-	-		
Netherlands	664	1,219	6.7	6.7	4.7	5.2	0.89	0.80
Portugal	161	272	1.6	1.5	3.2	2.2	0.99	0.95
UK	2,164	3,446	21.8	18.9	17.2	14.0	1.20	1.48
Total	9,945	18,276	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	1.0	1.0

Source: Teicher, U. (1993) Student Mobility within Erasmus 1989-90. Brussels: Erasmus Bureau.
(absolute numbers and percentages; ratios)

Table 3

France's Regional Participation in ERASMUS, 1994-95

	Outgoing students	Incoming students	Eligible institutions	Institutions with ICPs	Ratio of Regional Participation
Total	24,045	24,829	1,984	400	20
Ile de France	4,935	5,413	362	99	27
Champagne-Ardenne	522	485	51	7	13
Picardie	282	259	48	5	10
Haute-Normandie	635	644	46	10	21
Centre	615	559	78	7	8
Basse-Normandie	412	461	49	6	12
Bourgogne	441	505	58	3	5
Nord-Pase-de-Calais	1,961	1,772	151	28	18
Lorraine	734	739	93	16	17
Alsace	1,031	1,153	59	17	28
Franche-Comté	256	271	47	6	12
Pays de la Loire	1,278	1,302	104	25	23
Bretagne	1,139	1,039	106	21	19
Poitou-Charentes	521	600	46	7	15
Aquitaine	1,685	1,555	82	20	24
Midi-Pyrénées	932	1,018	87	20	22
Limousin	155	156	37	5	13
Rhône-Alpes	3,441	3,623	185	47	25
Auvergne	472	461	46	9	19
Languedoc-Roussillon	927	1,053	70	16	22
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	1,521	1,605	144	24	16
Corse	37	28	10	1	10
Départments d'Outre-Mer	113	128	26	2	7

Source: WWW: gopher://resul.ulb.ac.be:70/00/.RegionalStatistics/.france.asc
(January 1997)

These regions also had unemployment rates in 1984 close to the national average's 10.6%, ranging from 10% to 13% with the exception of Rhône-Alps at 7.8% (Derbyshire, 1987). Rhône-Alps' major city, Lyon, has demonstrated a strong

Table 4

Germany's Regional Participation in ERASMUS, 1994-95

	Outgoing students	Incoming students	Eligible institutions	Institutions with ICPs	Ratio of Regional Participation
Total	20,470	18,789	351	213	61
Schleswig-Holstein	452	426	13	7	53
Hamburg	542	576	9	6	66
Niedersachsen	1,880	1,619	25	19	76
Bremen	472	462	5	4	80
Nordrhein-Westfalen	3,823	3,563	65	30	46
Hessen	1,790	1,608	24	15	62
Rheinland-Pfalz	1,402	1,279	25	14	56
Baden-Württemberg	3,226	2,952	73	40	54
Bayern	2,794	2,562	33	23	69
Saarland	529	549	7	3	42
Berlin	1,579	1,546	18	14	77
Brandenburg	126	122	10	6	60
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	214	162	6	5	83
Sachsen	1,128	929	24	15	62
Sachsen-Anhalt	197	197	9	7	77
Thüringen	316	237	5	5	100

Source: WWW: gopher://resul.ulb.ac.be:70/00/RegionalStatistics/.france.asc
(January 1997).

commitment to industrialization with a regional investment of 167 million FF versus Paris' 125 million FF (Girard and Larné, 1994). A regional interest in EU programs reinforces the increased role that regions are playing in politics, economic development, and education.

Compared to the German figures, however, the French regions lag behind. The average rate of regional participation in France is 20% versus Germany's 61% (see Table 4). It is important to remember that the Germans have had far more

experience with federalism and regional and university autonomy than the French. By contrast, the French have more outgoing and incoming students compared to Germany. There is a major discrepancy between the eligible institutions in France and Germany. The French data include all higher education institutions (universities, both private and public, IUTs, various other institutes) accounting for the higher number of eligible institutions. Unlike the French figure, the German data do not reveal a clear pattern of regional participation. More important is that the Germans have a long experience with regionalism while the French have only recently strengthened subnational government.

In 1989-90, there were a total of 18,276 students participating in ERASMUS (Teichler, 1993). 20.7% of these students were from France, with the Germans close behind at 19.7% (Teichler, 1993). In 1995-96, 17.4% of the 137,599 ERASMUS participants were French, compared to 14.8% from Germany (Tables 3 and 4). Third, the number of French ICP's participating in 1988-89 was 189, as compared to 127 in Germany and 163 in the UK (Teichler, 1993). The following year, again France maintained a slightly higher total with 247 ICPs, with Germany at 171, and the UK at 239 (Teichler, 1993). Fourth, the total number of eligible institutions in France is quite higher than that in other member states because it includes both vocational and universities. In 1989-90, 1,982 (47% of the total) French institutions were eligible to participate, while only 461 were from the UK (11.2%) and 348 from Germany (8.5%) (Teichler, 1993). Finally, the total number of active partners in 1989-90 again was highest in France (601), compared to the UK (583) and Germany (577) (Teichler,

1993). The number of active partners shows the correlation between total number of eligible institutions with those that are actually participating in the ERASMUS program. Here France maintains first place.

Another program that has been received favorably in France is the LINGUA action under SOCRATES. From 1991 to 1994, France has maintained second place the UK in terms of joint projects and exchanges for young people aged 16 to 25 (European Commission, 1995). In 1994, nearly 7,000 exchanges and projects were supported in France and over 8,000 in the UK (European Commission, 1995). Overall, France has continued to have the highest number of LINGUA participants received in 1991-92 with 4,860 participants, in 1992-93 with 4,801 participants, and in 1993-94 with 6,120 participants (SOCRATES Bureau, 1995). The same trend holds for the number of participants France has received during the 1991-94 period (SOCRATES Bureau, 1995).

As with the ERASMUS/SOCRATES program and the LINGUA initiative, the French have high participation rates in the LEONARDO program. In 1996, France was first in projects selected for LEONARDO with a total of 286 financed by 20 million Ecu from the EU (LEONARDO, 1997). There were slightly more projects financed in 1996 with 271 projects and 18 million Ecu (LEONARDO, 1997). These high participation rates are quite significant for the French case, especially since vocational training was virtually absent from the French higher education system until the 1960's. France is taking interest in improving technical training, especially through EU programs and funding sources.

The analysis of these EU initiatives and their impact on France represent a strong interest in promoting EU programs. France has in most instances been receptive to new programs and received growing funding for its efforts. EU programs have likely helped alleviate the vast fiscal difficulties experienced by the French government and universities. This could explain French enthusiasm for EU initiatives. Second, returning to the notion of Europeanization, changes have occurred on local, regional and national levels and French governments have realized that they can no longer fulfill all educational requests through a central bureaucracy. France has turned to new sources and innovations to maintain a higher level of education quality as emphasized by several education ministers calling for more students to pass the bac. The French national government, as well as regional and local governments, has developed a new working relationship, which allows for more flexibility, particularly in financing education. Politicians, the CNE, and university officials view these changes as positive especially to resolve the numerous problems in higher education (Guin, 1990).

Decentralization and the French Commitment

When evaluating trends in France, a significant degree of decentralization has occurred. Decentralization suggests that local authorities now have more control over educational policies, but also that France has expressed support for EU education initiatives. These are the two components of decentralization. Nationally, decentralization has so far been accomplished through the 14 laws, mainly

promulgated in the 1980's and through the CNE. The regions now play a greater role in allocating financial resources to universities under the Tenth National Plan. It also seems that there is more support from politicians and the public for a regional university system. The mayor of Lyon, Michel Noir, fully agreed with decentralization by saying,

Whether one likes it or not, higher education has got to be decentralized. The universities need to be independent and form partnerships within their social and economic environments, which they cannot do under a centralized system (Guin, 1990, 128).

Another strong supporter of decentralization policies is the Haut Comité Education-Economie (HCEE), which was created to offer advice to the national government on education relevant to labor market issues (Ambler, 1990). The HCEE favors a more practical based school curriculum giving students skills necessary for a competitive market (Ambler, 1990). This view conflicts with the traditional French view of education solely for academic use and for a comprehensive understanding of the French culture and language.

Aside from the CNE and the HCEE, the strongest support comes from the national government (Ambler, 1990). The government has initiated policy specifically under Mitterrand's two terms. He even went so far as to announce one of his priorities in the late 1980's was to create a "Citizens' Europe" (Ambler, 1990, 48). The Ministry of Education closely linked with the national government, has also shown support for a European dimension to education. The Ministry supports an annual "Europe Day at School" for school children to better understand Europe and

European affairs (Ambler, 1990). In 1988, regional academies were asked to submit reports of their plans for the Europe day and were rewarded for promoting Europe. The former Minister of Education, Lionel Jospin, has also reinforced a European dimension in the school curriculum following the death of Jean Monnet, a pioneer of EU integration. Jospin asked teachers to read one of three suggested texts to their students as a reminder of international cooperation (Ambler, 1990). Higher education is devolving from a centralized authority to regional governments as a result of financial difficulties faced by both the universities and the state. France is also looking to new options for education provided by EU initiatives. So far, French students and university administrators have favored these programs as demonstrated by their participation rates. France will most likely continue to decentralize authority to address the financial difficulties experienced in the 1980's and enhance its relationship with the EU.

France has made considerable efforts to change its higher education policies since the 1968 student protests. This has occurred because of a number of factors: the EU, local demands, and student/faculty/administrators' concerns over the direction of higher education. The French have also demonstrated approval for EU programs through their high participation rates in recent education initiatives. Despite the 1980's education laws and the EU's programs, France still faces the centralization dilemma. Some scholars argue France is moving closer towards decentralizing education while others view education laws more as an increase in bureaucratic authority.

Decentralization: How Far?

To what extent then has France successfully decentralized her education system? When comparing today's France with the French system twenty years ago, the country has made significant progress in increasing local participation. Since the 1980's, 14 laws were passed related to decentralization and regionalization. Included in these laws were the establishment of direct elections in the regions. During the first elections in 1986 for regional councilors, participation was quite high at 77.6% (Balme, 1995). This percentage was equivalent to participation in municipal elections and higher than that in department elections. Significant for these elections, too, was that regional councilors were elected rather than appointed as they had been in the past. The 1986 law also promoted regions to full local authority status rather than remain under control of the central government (Balme, 1995). In the area of expenditure rates, the regions saw an increase of 26.3% between 1982-88 (Balme, 1995). This has changed the elitist view slightly since regionalism requires citizen input in the form of regionally and locally elected officials versus appointed ones. The effects, though, are viewed more as a new element in political life rather than as an improvement in democratic conditions, but regionalism has added an important dimension to the French political system (Balme, 1995).

On the other hand, France remains quite centralized compared to some other EU member states. The changes are recent and in many instances still do not hand complete control over to the regional governments or the universities. For example,

national standards are still set and published each year by the Ministry of Higher Education and Research, including an approved list of textbooks for schools (Baumgartner, 1989). Second, France's national ministry of education maintains utmost control over teachers, continuing to treat them as national civil servants rather than local employees (Baumgartner, 1989). Third, it is the government that has given the local governments all of their autonomy, not the governments themselves (Balme, 1995). Legislation is initiated from the top down to the region, reinforcing the national government's control over regional development. Related to legislation is a law restricting the number of regional positions politicians are allowed to hold (Balme, 1995). This has caused prominent politicians to abandon the regional mandate allowing less established politicians with little influence to support regional policies (Balme, 1995). Another limitation for the regions was Mitterrand's rejection of regional elections rather than departmental elections (Balme, 1995). This was a political strategy by the Socialists who feared losing seats at the departmental level, especially when right-wing parties were winning more seats in local elections. Finally, new higher education laws have not decreased government control, but rather increased it because of all of the new measures that require implementation (Neave, 1991). There are now more bureaucrats required to enforce and implement changes in education policy.

Considering the 1980 legislation, politicians and university officials desire far more autonomy from the central government. Assuming continued support from the EU for regional development, France is likely to proceed with decentralization in

education. An additional factor favoring this trend are the diminishing financial resources from the central government. The French government has and most likely will continue to become more dependent on resources from local, regional and supranational governments to fund education. The regional structure, though not complete, has just begun to develop. Support for regional development from the central government, education evaluators and politicians is likely to continue.

Conclusion

France, typically classified as a strong state, has reformed national education policy to decrease the national government's role in education. This is demonstrated through the increase in the number of actors involved in education, the diversification of funding, and high regional participation rates from provincial universities in EU programs.

Since the 1980 decentralization laws and Higher Education Guideline law, more actors play a prominent role in education policy-making. Regions and individual universities have more autonomy over policies directly affecting them and their students. Industry and universities collaborate to better prepare young people for the job market. Though the increase in actors adds complexity to higher education in France, it also is more efficient. Local officials, politicians, and administrative agencies agree that universities are better equipped to assess the institutional needs. This has resulted in a more effective use of resources.

Funding sources are also far more diversified in France. Private industry and local and regional authorities help meet the financial needs of higher education institutions within their geographical locations. Provincial institutions have a chance to compete with larger universities because of the diversification of funding now available to them. Finally, smaller institutions have gained importance through EU initiatives and funds available for student exchanges.

Despite French progress with decentralization, France still lags behind other member states. Reforms demonstrate a willingness to change, but the national government continues to maintain overall control over education in administrative responsibilities, curricula aspects, and teaching staff. In spite of regionalization, most decisionmaking remains in the hands of the political elite in Paris, rather than the regional or local authorities. As France faces high unemployment rates and budget deficits, it is likely that the national government will use caution when delegating authority to the regions, but it will have to do so to meet financial needs of its citizen.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

National Education Policy and EU Programs

Introduction

Though an integrated education policy under a EU framework is a recent phenomenon, EU programs have expanded greatly over the past ten years. Initiatives that began by addressing vocational education only have now developed to include primary schools to universities. The EU, committed to principles of co-operation and co-ordination, has advocated an education policy for its member states that is flexible and allows them to participate at their discretion.

When looking at trends at the EU and national level, a number of parallel developments can be detected in terms of education policy-making and integration. At the national level, France has moved towards regionalism and decentralization of higher education. Likewise, the EU has emphasized regional development and devised a number of programs targeted at the regional or local levels. Education programs are administered by the individual academic departments, an administrative body below the regions and the universities. Since the initiation of integrative education programs by the EU, France has made adjustments in national education

policy. The French trend is consistent with the EU's support for the regions and decentralization. Both policy developments have mutually reinforced each other.

A History of EU Education Initiatives

Allied governments in the 1940's sought to integrate education as an attempt to fight fascism, but their efforts were quickly halted after the end of World War II. National actors recognized the benefits of cooperating with other countries, but realized that coordinating different standards was far from an easy task. It was not until the 1970's that the EU began to support education for migrant workers and language training. Initial education efforts were economically driven and later were based on cultural and political issues. In the 1980's, education initiatives became far more extensive than the first program for migrants and incorporated not only vocational education, but general university curricula as well. Education programs now include primary to higher education and continue to emphasize the original principles of co-ordination and co-operation. These principles are receptive to national education policy and have resulted in national adjustments as in the case of France.

French Reforms

The EU's initiatives have resulted in a number of changes in the traditionally centralized French higher education system. Since the 1980's, the overall trend in France has been to decentralize education. Funding sources for education are far

more diversified than they were prior to the 1980's. The private sector and the regions now contribute to higher education. Legislation passed in the 1980's has advocated regionalism with a focus on granting local and regional governments more autonomy. This trend has been reinforced at both the EU level and the national level. The French have also taken more interest in vocational education programs than in the past. Technical Institutes (IUTs) were unpopular when they were first developed, but are now attracting more students than in the past. Vocational training is crucial to developing a skilled workforce, a needed resource for all EU member states. The control over French education remains in the hands of the national government, but 1980's legislation demonstrates the national education ministry's willingness to decentralize educational policy.

France's economic concerns in reforming education are similar to the EU's motives for integrating education. The EU addresses problems that member states are unable to resolve alone, such as high youth unemployment and the diminishing skills of the workforce. These domestic problems, common in France and other EU member states, have hindered economic prosperity in recent years. The motive of initial EU integration and the first EU education initiatives was economically focused in order to help solve domestic problems (Ambler, 1990). The progress of EU integration depends in part on the support and prosperity of the member-states (Dinan, 1994). The collaborative effort of EU education programs between the supranational and national institutions implies that legislation at the national level and regional level

will have an effect on policy-making and decision making at the supranational level, and vice versa.

The Europeanization of French Higher Education

Returning to the three hypotheses set out in chapter one, how has France reacted to Europeanization in terms of the number of actors in education policy-making, the diversification of funding, and provincial universities' participation in EU programs?

This thesis hypothesizes that if French higher education is becoming increasingly "Europeanized," then the number of actors involved in policy-making will increase. Though legislation in the 1980's (the Savary Act and Devaquet Bill) was protested by students and faculty, it was successful in increasing the number of actors in education policy. The newly created National Evaluation Committee (CNE) is an agency independent of the national government, its task is to assess quality in higher education. It has also taken a firm stance on increasing the regionalization of higher education, particularly in financing.

Regional and departmental committees have also played a greater role in higher education. Their goal is to recommend policies to universities, particularly in industrial-university relations. They have shifted the balance of power from the central government to a number of actors.

Industry and the private sector are other actors increasingly influential in French higher education. Regional and departmental committees foster the public-private relationship and industries now interact directly with students through internship and apprenticeship programs. Prior to the 1980's, universities and industry rarely interacted with each other. Now they are coordinating curricula requirements and focusing on practical skills students need for future employment.

The CNE, regional and departmental committees, and industrial-university relations all demonstrate that the central government and National Ministry of Education no longer dictate all aspects of higher education, but rather have diversified the number of actors involved in the process. The central government continues to regulate diplomas, but higher education institutions have far greater freedom and autonomy than in the past. Universities and institutes have developed a voice within a centralized system, attempting to express regional and local concerns through a variety of networks (CNE, committees and industry) rather than just one institution, the National Ministry.

The second hypothesis is that if French higher education is becoming increasingly Europeanized, then funding for higher education will become more diversified. Prior to the 1980's, 90% of all funding for higher education was derived from the central government (Guin, 1990). In 1991, 8% came from the regional governments, 15% from the local governments, and only 77% from the national government (OECD, 1993). The National Ministry also encouraged local and

regional governments to use all available sources for a comprehensive youth education plan (Derouet, 1991). In 1982, regions accounted for 2.1% of total state spending, départements 26.6% and communes 49.7% (Budd, 1997). In 1986, these figures were 4.4%, 24.6%, and 49.7%, respectively (Budd, 1997). From 1989 to 1993, regional budgets again nearly doubled in size (INSEE, 1995). The sub-national level in France has begun playing a greater role both in education and in general expenditures. The French case demonstrates a diversification of funding sources with particular attention to regional and local governments.

The third hypothesis is if French higher education is becoming increasingly Europeanized, then regional participation rates in EU programs of universities with fewer students and less regional investments will be almost as high as those of larger university regions, such as Paris. In chapter three, regional participation rates for ERASMUS were examined. A number of regional universities fell only slightly short of the 27% participation rate of the universities in Paris. Notably, Alsace, not Paris had the highest participation rate with 28%. French regions, though, are not demonstrating rates as high as the German Länder, but they have become far more important since the 1980 legislation. The leaders in participation are not only the largest universities, but those with less students and lower regional budgets. This demonstrates the EU's interest in less developed regions and its desire to encourage transnational cooperation between provincial regions.

Having affirmed the three hypotheses, this indicates that there is a Europeanization occurring in French education. The national government retains a crucial role in education, but now both the EU and subnational governments have greater influence in policy-making. There are far more actors involved in the process, funds are no longer solely granted from the national government, and provincial universities are gaining more importance because of national reforms and EU initiatives.

National Identity and EU Education

Protecting Diverse Systems

The Europeanization of education in the French system fosters greater regional autonomy within the EU and member states. At the same time, Europeanization stresses a new emphasis on regional identity in national and EU politics. Since the nineteenth century, nations have utilized education for nation building and national identity. The EU continues cautiously with education initiatives, despite the potential benefits of a fully integrated education system. Though a unified education system would be advantageous for transnational relations, including uniform standards for all member states, it infringes on national cultures and identities. The approach the EU has taken so far is to foster relations between member states in efforts to recognize and appreciate their diverse languages, customs, and traditions. National governments in the future may lose some of their decision-making power over

education, particularly in the French case, but this is more likely a result of decentralization laws and regional policies, not EU policies. The EU may have recognized the advantages of education for nation building prior to the 1980's, but realized member states would most likely oppose a unified system to the current cooperative system.

EU Involvement in Education

Prior to the 1980's and with the exception of the EU's 1976 initiative for migrant workers, education was absent from the Union's political agenda. Education has historically remained a priority for national governments directed by their own ministries. In the 1980's and 1990's, education has continued to be a national responsibility, but other actors and institutions are now involved. This trend relates to the new emphasis on regional and local governments and also the economic difficulties incurred by member states. The French government can no longer be the sole provider for its citizens, but needs private and public funds to maintain the growing costs of education and the increasing number of students in higher education institutions. EU education programs are also a means of promoting EU policies through cultural exchanges. Students benefit from the exchanges and if their experience is positive, then it is likely that their support for other EU policies will increase. These programs have also encouraged European citizens to learn about each other through experience, not textbooks. Students are able to acknowledge not only

the differences from one country to the next, but also the common European heritage that they share across national borders.

So far, EU programs have been supported by member states and participants. Budgets and participation have increased annually. Students are learning skills, such as language or technical skills that could not be acquired without study abroad. Skills learned abroad may set them apart from their peers and help them become employable in the future. EU programs have provided outside funding for national education systems and regional higher education institutions. Despite national limits placed on funding, the EU has given member states an additional financial resource for education with limited formal rules and restrictions to qualify. EU education initiatives are flexible and allow local governments to allocate funds for needed resources. They attempt to guide, rather than direct individual departments and universities in transnational agreements. This approach is far more accepted by national governments, especially considering that education is still mostly a national responsibility. Gradually, national governments may develop EU standards as has been done with the mutual recognition of degrees and diplomas, but it is unlikely that a centralized education system under a European framework will develop (Cerych, 1991).

Regionalism and the EU

The Maastricht Treaty

In 1992, the Maastricht Treaty was signed by the member states emphasizing regional development through the subsidiarity principle in article 3b. The article mentions that the EU must act within the limits of the Maastricht Treaty and that

in areas which do not fall within its exclusive competence, the Community shall take action, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, only if and in so far as the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States and can therefore, by reason of the scale or effects of the proposed action, be better achieved by the Community (gopher://wiretap.spies.com:70/00/Gov/Maast/title.2, 1997).

This principle stresses that “decision-making should be taken at the lowest appropriate level” (Keating and Jones, 1995, 294). Regional governments now have more leverage in EU policy-making. The EU only has the authority to intervene if the member state cannot achieve its objectives alone or when the EU can best accomplish the objectives (Newman, 1996, 123).

This principle has improved the legitimacy of EU decisions, since lower levels of government are encouraged to participate in the policy-making process. Though each policy in the EU is shaped according to the particular circumstances, the subsidiarity principle provides a general structure for complex policy-making in the EU (Holland, 1993). The importance of subsidiarity to the EU and its member states

manifests itself in the fact that it was included in the third article of the Maastricht Treaty.

Subsidiarity has encouraged France to continue to decentralize as it did with the 1980's reforms. It persuades lower levels of government to participate in EU decisions (Dinan, 1994). At a 1992 summit, the heads of state went so far as to say subsidiarity "must be taken as closely as possible to the citizen" and that "greater unity can be achieved without excessive centralization" (Dinan, 1994, 189). Applying the subsidiarity principle to education policy suggests that decentralization will continue if not increase. Though there are basic rules for education under an EU framework, such as the mutual recognition of degrees and diplomas, current EU programs and their analysis in the education literature so far indicate that the EU will neither create a centralized education system nor try to aggregate all decisions at the supranational level. Future trends in education policy and possibly other policy areas will follow a more decentralized approach, involving a number of actors that in the past were absent from the process. Though enforcing the subsidiarity principle may diminish efficiency, increase delays in policy-making, and add complexity to European politics, it encourages more levels of government to participate in EU policy-making, further legitimizing EU decisions.

In addition to the EU's subsidiarity principle, a Committee of the Regions (COR) was formed in 1994 to advise the EU on various issues of concern to regional governments (Newman, 1996). Representatives come from the largest to the smallest

regions within the EU with a total of 189 members (Jones and Keating, 1995). COR's priorities include education, culture, public health, trans-European networks, economic and social cohesion, and regulations on the EU's Regional Development Fund (Newman, 1996, 122). Given that COR is a new institution, it is unclear to what extent it will influence future policy.

Further evidence of the subsidiarity principle's implementation is provided by the numerous regional accords arranged by the individual regions in France. Various arrangements include the Association of European Frontier Regions created by the French transnational regions, the Community of the Western Alps formed by France's mountain regions, the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions organized by the peripheral regions, the Union of Capital Regions founded by regional capital cities, and various bilateral accords between Corsica and Sardinia (Ladrech, 1994, 84). Other projects include a 1986 accord between the French region, Rhône-Alpes with Baden-Württemberg in Germany, Catalonia in Spain, and Lombardy in Italy for scientific, technical and cultural cooperation and a Euro-region agreement with five regions in France and Belgium to prepare for the Single Market, the Channel Tunnel, and the northwestern section of the TGV, France's high speed train (Ladrech, 1994).

The subsidiarity principle has provided new financial resources and an increase of autonomy particularly for the French regions. Regions outside of the Parisian center have become more influential and economically prosperous since the 1980's. This is true for the Alsacian region and Rhône-Alpes. It is quite likely that

on the basis of the 1980 French decentralization laws and the EU's focus on the regions, regional autonomy from national governments will continue to grow. The French regions are no longer directed by the national government, but rather have an impact on national and EU policies according to their local interests.

Regionalism and the Future

Given the strong regional tendencies at both the national and supranational level, it is likely that the regions will continue to play a crucial role in education policy as well as other EU policy areas. The EU policy-making process is no longer viewed as dominated by one or two main actors, but multiple levels of government cooperate on a more equal basis (Ladrech, 1994, Marks, Hooghe and Blank, 1996). France has given more autonomy to the regions through direct elections of regional presidents and private and local funding for education. Regions have significantly more policy influence than in prior years.

In the case of the reception of EU programs in France, participation has been high. The overall demand for these programs has resulted in a budgetary increase for the 1990's. Regional participation in France as compared to Germany is lower, but France has made attempts to further enhance regional autonomy and participation. The French are inexperienced with regionalism compared to the Germans. France, however, continues to make gradual reforms towards regionalism.

The EU has reinforced France's regional tendencies. Regional development has become a priority on the EU's agenda as it has designated a specific fund to encourage regional development and devoted article 3 of the Maastricht Treaty to regionalism. EU policies encourage economic development, particularly in depressed regions of the member states.

The regional tendency both at the national and supranational level suggests that the role national governments play in policy-making is gradually decreasing and authority is devolving to a number of governmental levels. French regions, local institutions, and academic departments all have been playing a greater role in education policy since the 1980 reforms. The National Ministry and the government continue to influence policy-making, but now they must consider the response of other actors involved in the process.

Europeanization is motivated by the EU-institutions, regional authorities and even national governments. National actors might be attracted to Europeanization and regionalism in order to avoid the blame for unpopular policies or to justify tough policies to a critical public, arguing, for instance, that its actions are necessitated by supranational or subnational demands. Europeanization has also alleviated some financial pressure faced by national governments. Regional autonomy legitimizes policies implemented by the supranational authority. The regions benefit from Europeanization through financial resources and more autonomy over policies. Though these are factors so far observed in the EU, these trends may also prevail in

other polities, making Europeanization a useful concept for analyzing other integrative processes.

The national and EU-level focus on regionalism suggests that integration is no longer driven by the supranational and national levels, but rather the subnational governments are becoming more important in policy-making. Particularly in a system as centralized as France, Europeanization and regionalism are affecting higher education in terms of the number of actors involved, diversification of funding, and giving provincial universities a greater role in national and supranational affairs. Considering the influence that national governments have traditionally had over education policy, it is significant to observe this new regionalism in European education. This may attune policy-makers and scholars of EU integration more to the growing importance regions play nationally and supranationally. Future integration of policy areas will involve a number of levels, rather than one. Though this may complicate integration because of more actors, it will also enhance the legitimacy of EU policies and attune policy makers to a number of interests across national borders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agence SOCRATES France. (1997 January). SOCRATES Cooperation Educative, DGRCST/ML. France: Bordeaux.
- Alter, K.J. & Neunier-Aitsahalia, S. (1994). Judicial Politics in the European Community: European Integration and the Pathbreaking *Cassis de Dijon* Decision. Comparative Political Studies, 26, 535-561.
- Ambler, John. (1981). Politicization of Higher Education in Britain and France. Policy Studies Journal, 10, 136-149.
- Ambler, John. (1990 Summer). French Education and the Uniting of Europe. French Politics and Society, 8, 37-53.
- Amelan, Roni. (1995, June 30). French Students, Professors Worried by New Government's Plan for Reforms. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A33.
- Anderson-Levitt, K., Sirota, R., & Mazurier, M. (1991 September). Elementary Education in France. The Elementary School Journal, 92, 79-95.
- Askolovitch, C., Domenach, N., Guinard, L., & Pons, F. (1997). La Revolet Antifasciste. L'Evenement du Jeudi, 647, 24-28.
- Balme, Richard. (1995). French Regionalization and European Integration: Territorial Adaptation and Change in a Unitary State. In B. Jones & M. Keating (Eds.), The European Union and the Regions (pp.167-188). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Baumgartner, Frank. (1989). Conflict and Rhetoric in French Policymaking. PA: University of Pittsburgh.
- Bienayme, Alain. (1984). The New Reform in French Higher Education. European Journal of Education, 19, 2, 151-164.
- Blondel, Jean. (1974). The Governance of France (4th ed.). New York: Thomas Crowell Company.

- Budd, L. (1997). Regional Government and Performance in France. Regional Studies, 31, 2, 187-192.
- Cerych, Ladislav. (1991 Summer). Higher Education and Europe after 1992. European Education, 23, 77-95.
- Chambraud, Cecile. (1996, May 16). François Bayrou face aux suggestions du RPR. Le Monde.
- Clark, Burton. (Ed.). (1987). The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Commission of the European Communities. (1990). Social Europe. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Commission of the European Communities. (1991). Short Guide for Universities in the European Community Which would like to Prepare Thoroughly as New Student Mobility Program within the Framework of ERASMUS. Brussels: ERASMUS Bureau.
- Commission of the European Communities. (1994a). Guide to the European Community Programs in the Fields of Education, Training and Youth (2nd ed.) [Brochure].
- Commission of the European Communities. (1994b). LINGUA: Joint Educational Projects Handbook. [Official handbook]. Luxembourg: Office for Official publications of the European Communities.
- Commission of the European Communities. (1996). SOCRATES: Guide du candidat 1997. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Commission Européenne. (1996). Vade-Mecum budgétaire. Bruxelles: Office des publications Officielles des Communautés Européennes.
- Council Decision 94/1340/EC. (1994, August 19). Call for Proposals for surveys and analyses (Strand III.2a) in the LEONARDO da Vinci program. Official Journal of the European Communities, C141/15. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Council Decision 819/95EC. (1995, March 14). Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Community action program "SOCRATES". Official Journal of the European Communities, L87/10.

20.4.95, [on line], Available, WWW:<http://europa.eu.int/en/comm/dg22/SOCRATES/decsocr.html>

Dalton, Russell. (1993). Politics in Germany (2nd ed.). New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Derbyshire, Ian. (1987). Politics in France: From Giscard to Mitterrand. Cambridge, UK: W & R Chambers Ltd.

Derouet, Jean-Louis. (1991). Lower Secondary Education in France: from uniformity to institutional autonomy. European Journal of Education, 26, 2, 119-132.

deWit, Hans. (1996 Spring). European Internationalization Programs. International Higher Education, [on line], Available WWW: http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/sihe/direct1/News4/text3.html

Dinan, Desmond. (1994). An Ever Closer Union?: An Introduction to the European Community. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Doulsan, Gérard. (March 1997). Dix ans de Mobilité Etudiante en Europe. Bulletin Officiel, 11, 768-773.

Ehrmann, Henry & Schain, Martin. (1992). Politics in France (5th ed.). New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.

ERASMUS and LINGUA approved activities 1988-89 to 1994-95. (1997). [On line], Available: <gopher://resul1.ulb.ac.be:70/00/.talt.ans>

Europa homepage. (1996). Higher Education/Erasmus. [On line], Available: WWW: <http://europa.eu.int/en/comm/dg22/socrates/erasinf.html#what>

Europa homepage. (1997a). Promotion of Language-Learning in Europe (LINGUA). [on line], Available: WWW: <http://europa.eu.int/en/comm/dg22/SOCRATES/LINGUA.html>

Europa homepage. (1997b). SOCRATES: The European Community Action Program in the Field of Education, [on line], Available: WWW: (<http://www.cec.lu/en/comm/dg22/SOCRATES/.html>)

Eurostat. (1992). Europe in Facts and Figures (3rd ed.). Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

- Friedberg, Erhard & Musselin, Christine. (1987). The Academic Profession in France. In B. Clark (Ed.), The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary and Institutional Settings (pp. 93-122). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Girard, Laurence & Larné, André. (1994 March). Les régions qui en veulent! Industries et Technique, 747, 16-17.
- Guide to European Higher Education & Research Programs. (1994, January 21). The Times Higher Education Supplement, p. iv.
- Guin, Jacques. (1990). The Reawakening of Higher Education in France. European Journal of Education, 25, 2, 123-145.
- Haigh, Anthony. (1970). A Ministry of Education for Europe. London, UK: George B. Harrap & Co. Ltd.
- Halls, W.D. (1965). Society, Schools, and Progress in France. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Hantrais, Linda. (1995). Social Policy in the European Union. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Hoffman, Stanley. (1982). Reflections on the Nation-State in Western Europe Today. Journal of Common Market Studies, 21, 21-37.
- Holland, Martin. (1992). European Community Integration. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Hughes, S. (1995, July 7). SOCRATES set for demand crisis. The Times Higher Education Supplement, 12.
- Hunter, B. (Ed.). (1996). The Statesman's Yearbook (133rd ed.). New York: McMillian Press.
- Information Brochure on Higher Education: ERASMUS. (1997). [On line], Available, [gopher://resul1.ulb.ac.be:70/00/erasinf.ans](http://resul1.ulb.ac.be:70/00/erasinf.ans)
- Institut National de la Statistique et des études économiques (INSEE). (1996). Annuaire Statistique de la France (Vol. 99, pp. 950-951). Paris: Ministère de l'économie et des finances.

- Jones, Barry & Keating, Michael (Eds.). (1995). The European Union and the Regions. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Kingdon, John. (1995). Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies. New York: HaperCollins College Publishers.
- Kurian, George. (Ed.). (1988). World Education Encyclopedia (Vol. 1, pp. 418-420). New York: Fact on File Publications.
- Ladrech, Robert. (1994). Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France. Journal of Common Market Studies, 32,1, 69-88.
- Lawerence, Robert. (1996). Regionalism, Multilateralism, and Deeper Integration. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute.
- LEONARDO Agence National. (1997 January). La lettre France: Leonardo da Vinci: 1996: Second Rendez-vous Leonardo da Vinci (No. 3). Paris: European Commission and the National Ministry of Education.
- Lowe, John. (1992). Education and European Integration. International Review of Education, 38, 579-590.
- Luchaire, Francois. & Massit-Follea, Francoise. (1993 Winter). Role of the National Evaluation Committee in France. European Education, 25, 4, 67-77.
- Maiworm, Friedhelm. & Teichler, Ulrich. (1995). ERASMUS Student Mobility Programs 1991/92 in the View of the local Directors. Brussels: ERASMUS Bureau.
- Marks, G., Hooghe, L., & Blank, K. (1996). European Integration from the 1980's State-Centric v. Multi-level Governance. Journal of Common Market Studies, 34, 3, 341-377.
- Marks, G., Nielsen, F., Ray, L., & Salk, J. (1996). Competencies, Cracks and Conflicts: Regional Mobilization in the European Union. In Marks, G., Scharpf, F., Schmitter, P., and Streech, W. (Eds.), Governance in the European Union (pp. 40-63). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Mazy, Sonia & Richardson, Jeremy. (1996). EU policy-making: A garbage can or an anticipatory and consensual policy style? In Y. Mény, P. Muller & J. Quermonne (Eds.), Adjusting to Europe (pp. 41-58). London: Routledge.

- Neave, Guy. (1984). The EEC and Education. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.
- Neave, Guy. (1985). Higher Education in a Period of Consolidation 1975-1985. European Journal of Education, 20, 2-3, 109-124.
- Neave, Guy, (1990). On Preparing for Markets: Trends in Higher Education in Western Europe 1988-1990. European Journal of Education, 25, 2, 105-122.
- Neave, Guy. (1995). On Living in Interesting Times: Higher Education in Western Europe 1985-1995. European Journal of Education, 30, 4, 337-393.
- Neave, Guy & Van Vught, Frans (Eds.). (1991). Prometheus Bound: The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.
- Newman, Michael. (1996). Democracy, Sovereignty and the European Union. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- O'Neill, Michael. (1996). The Politics of European Integration. London, England: Routledge.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). (1993). Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators. Paris: OECD.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). (1995). Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators. Paris: OECD.
- Peisert, Hansgert & Framhein, Gerhild. (1978). Systems of Higher Education: Federal Republic of Germany. New York: Interbook Inc.
- Puchala, Donald. (1994). The Integration Theorist and the Study of International Relations. In Phil Williams, Donald Goldstein & Jay Shafritz (Eds.), Classic Readings in International Relations (pp. 260-272). Belmont, CA: Wasworth Publishing Company.
- Regional Participation in ERASMUS 1994-95 France. (1997 January). [On line], Available, WWW: gopher://resul.ulb.ac.be:70/00/RegionalStatistics/france.asc
- The Reuter European Community Report. (1995, January 26). EU breaks deadlock on Education Programs. Brussels, Belgium: Torres, A.

- The Reuter European Community Report. (1995, September 21). Committee of the Regions examines new Education Challenges. Brussels.
- Reuter Textline Agence Europe. (1991, September 12). EC: European Library. Brussels.
- SOCRATES Bureau. (1995, April 8). LINGUA: Promoting Language-Learning in Europe [on line], Available gopher://resul.ulb.ac.be:70/00/.lingua.ans
- Staropoli, André. (1987). The Comité National d'Evaluation: Preliminary Results of a French Experiment. European Journal of Education, 22, 2, 123-131.
- Stevens, Anne. (1992). The Government and Politics of France. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Tapia, Iván & Nagelschmitz, Helmut (Eds.). (1993). The Paths to Europe (In Visitors Information No. 730 Q1016). (Brangwyn Jones, Trans.). Bonn, Germany: InterNationes.
- Teichler, Ulrich. (1985). The Federal Republic of Germany. In B. L. Clark (Ed.), The School and the University (pp. 45-76). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Teichler, Ulrich. (1993). Student Mobility within ERASMUS 1989/90 (Research/Technical Report No. 143). Brussels, Belgium: ERASMUS Bureau and Kassel, Germany: Kassel University, Scientific Center for Professional and University Research.
- Tiersky, Ronald. (1994). France in the New Europe. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Wielemans, Willy. (1991). ERASMUS Assessing Erasmus. Comparative Education, 27, 165-180.
- Wiretap homepage. (1997). Maastricht Treaty, [on line], Available: gopher://wiretap.spies.com:70/00/Gov/Maast/title.2