STEPHEN P. HEYNEMAN

MORAL STANDARDS AND THE PROFESSOR: A STUDY OF FACULTY AT UNIVERSITIES IN GEORGIA, KAZAKHSTAN AND KYRGYZSTAN

INTRODUCTION

Universities may contribute to a nation's social cohesion through both direct and indirect means. In their syllabi they may include techniques necessary for understanding complex social problems. Faculty may model good behaviour in terms of listening and understanding points of view which may contradict their own. University administrators may illustrate ways to lead honourably which can enhance the chances for achieving consensus with respect to future dilemmas. This project assessed typical areas of university tension, including academic freedom, equity of participation and academic honesty. Three different universities were chosen as sites for faculty interviews – a foreign private university in Kyrgyzstan, a flagship state university in Georgia, and a regional teacher training college recently upgraded to university status in North-East Kazakhstan. Results suggest that the single most important arena for universities to influence social cohesion in these countries is the manner by which they address education corruption. The paper reproduces the statements of those faculty who participate in corruption as well as those who refuse to participate. It concludes with some predictions about the future of the relationship of higher education to social cohesion.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOCIAL COHESION

It is axiomatic to think of higher education as a social good, with many of its benefits and costs affecting the public at large. But what specific effect higher education may have, and how those effects can be defined, measured and calculated, has been a subject of long debate. With the emergence of many 'new' nations in the 1960s, the debate tended to centre on issues of nation-building, including the general educational role of broadening outlook and increasing tolerance and the desire to participate in the political process (Lipset, 1959); the connection between education and democratic stability (Almond & Verba, 1963; Puryear, 1994); and the degree to which education was associated with greater voluntary political participation (Gintis, 1971; Verba, Nie, & Kim, 1978). Higher

S.P. Heyneman (ed.), Buying Your Way into Heaven, 79–108.

education specifically was thought to add to a nation's technical manpower, its ability to participate in political and economic debate, and, at the highest level, its ability to generate new knowledge (Harbison & Meyers, 1964).

I have been involved in many of these debates over the last 25 years as a contributor to education policy at the World Bank and the Comparative and International Education research community. Most of the demand for my work has centered on issues of human capital development and the nature of the economics of higher education. However, after two decades of working on these issues I began to be frustrated with their assumptions and impact. I began to feel that little of what we produced seemed to be compelling to policy makers. As a result, in the late 1990s I began to explore the nature of higher education as it relates to social, instead of economic, objectives (Heyneman, 1995, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2003c). With increasing experience in different parts of the former Soviet Union, I was concerned about the drift of higher education into what is now thought of as 'corrupt' practices. My work has helped to define education corruption in general terms (Heyneman, 2001, 2003b, 2004a, 2004b), to think up ways to research the problem (Heyneman, 2002/3), manage it (Moiseyenko, 2004), calculate its costs (Heyneman, Anderson, & Nuraliyeva, 2006), and manage interventions intending to ameliorate its more problematic effects (Heyneman, 2003a, 2004c).

The larger question however has to do, not just with corruption, but with the wider set of mechanisms by which higher education might affect a community's social cohesion. There has been quite a lot of recent inquiry pertaining to this role of higher education. Desjardins (2001) argues that economic well being depends on informal and non-formal as well as formal learning through educational organizations. The OECD has suggested that the well being of nations depends on the efficiency by which they utilize both human capital (knowledge and skills) with social capital (cross-cutting networks of social relations) (OECD, 2001). After having to retract its earlier recommendation that public finance be shifted from higher, to primary education (Psacharopoulos, Tan, & Jiminez, 1986; World Bank 1994, 1995), the World Bank has directed its focus onto the non-monetary contributions of higher education to economic and social development (World Bank, 2000, 2001; Task Force on Higher Education and Society, 2004).

If one can accept social cohesion as an indicator of social performance (such as a nation like South Africa or Ukraine which emerges from a threat of civil war without bloodshed; Heyneman, 2002/3), then the question is how might this indicator be affected by various organizations?[1] The question falls within the purview of institutional economics – the study of how laws, norms and administrative policies affect behaviour (Scott, 2001; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991; North, 1990; Putnam, 1993; Olsen, 1965, 1982; Durkheim, 1997; Mansbridge, 1989), and educational institutions play a uniquely important role (Puryear, 1994; Hyman & Wright, 1979; Dreeben, 1967; Inkeles & Smith, 1974; Feinberg, 2004),

[1] There are four categories of organizations which might affect social cohesion: profit-making organizations, non-for-profit voluntary organizations, governmental organizations; and schools and universities (Heyneman, 2004c).

especially higher education institutions (Ehrlich, 2000; Gutmann, 1987; Moiseyenko, 2004).

The process by which norms might affect behaviour is a topic of some importance. Coleman pointed out that the degree to which norms are manifest can radically affect a society's economic opportunity (Coleman, 1987, 1988), and that a society's human capital must be thought of as including its social capital as well. While there are distinctions to be made between social control and social cohesion (Berfer, 1999), the general consensus might be that a nation or a community characterized by social cohesion (one of political tolerance, inter-ethnic peace, and effective governance) is socially good. Moreover if one conceives of social cohesion as a community characterized by an adherence to social norms in an autonomous manner, it would reduce the confusion between social and totalitarian cohesion. For instance, the sense of inter-ethnic community achieved in the former Yugoslavia might be characterized as tolerance through social control, not social cohesion. Had the former Yugoslavia been characterized by greater social cohesion, it might have avoided the civil conflict and ethnic cleansing which characterized its disintegration.

For the purpose of this project, social cohesion draws heavily on the precedents set in the Indian Sub-Continent in which tolerance was defined and re-enforced through the edicts of Ashoka several centuries before the birth of Christ[2] and explored extensively by modern economists interested in the social requirements of economic development (Sen, 2005, 2006). Generally, these requirements can be reduced to the instillation of respect for dissent and difference and a sense of responsibility of the dissenter to respect the rights of the majority. In some ways perhaps Sen's notion of the ideal is parallel to recent analyses of the U.S. (Colatrella & Alkana 1994; Ravitch, 2003) in which dissent is considered an integral and normal part of discourse in any 'mature' nation.

The manufacturing and management of the protocols for dissent has been a traditional role for universities since their origin in the 12th century. Born out of a merger between guilds in law, medicine and theology, the university flourished once it incorporated the lessons taught by Socrates in the dialogues of Plato. These lessons call for faculty to pose appropriate questions in the pursuit of truth, and base their responses reason and other evidence. In comparison to acceptance of answers only given by God and through the Pope, the university's role was revolutionary (Perkin, 1984).

The Socratic commitment to Platoian principles purse truth through questioning and to base conclusions on the outcomes of inquiry form the basis of the work undertaken on behalf of this project. While it is not appropriate to assume that universities have identical roles and functions in different parts of the world, it is appropriate to suggest that universities hold some essential common functions. To

[2] Two of the Edits of Ashoka: the king wishes that all religious sects in his dominions should live in peace and amity and stresses self-control and purity of mind. The growth of *Dhamma* (moral and social order of conduct) is by restraint of speech which means no praise of one's own faith or disparagement of another (source: stone tablets kept at the National Museum in New Delhi).

be legitimate, universities should have the right to ask whatever question is necessary to understand truth, and to base the answers on the outcome of inquiry. Higher education was deeply controlled and vocationalized under the Soviet Union. In the transition period, it was uncertain how well universities in the newly emerging states could regain and adhere to these traditional university functions. And given the manifest pressures for ethnic resurgence, it was also unclear whether universities could fulfil their role to teach the necessary ingredients of tolerance for contradictory views and discipline in open discourse.

The task of forging social cohesion today diverges from how nation-building might have been conceived in an earlier era. In the 1960s the major focus was on how graduates conducted themselves. Today the focus includes how universities, as organizations, conduct themselves. It includes their participation in what might be thought of as an international standard for economic and political behaviour (including social inclusion of minorities and gender equity among students and faculty), transparency of budgeting and governance, tolerance in academic endeavours, and the direct teaching of the lessons of citizenship in what is often a tense and unsettled social setting. Universities are expected to maintain their sense of professional autonomy, but with the passing of the party/states in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, state ideological dominance is no longer acceptable. This left universities to fend for themselves professionally and to establish their own standards of integrity.

This project asks how universities are doing so far. In what ways have universities in the former Soviet Union been successful at establishing their own standards of integrity? Are the perceptions of this success shared equally among faculty and students? Equally across disciplines and schools? And perhaps more importantly, given the considerable pressures for economic survival, how have universities maintained their traditional standards of equality and fairness in their treatment of students and faculty?

The three university sites were not chosen because the institutions necessarily represent the country in which they were situated but rather because each site represents a different category, with different university purposes, traditions, and challenges. One university was a foreign-supported private liberal arts college; a second was the national flagship public university; and the third was a regional pedagogical college recently converted to a university.

With the assistance of the university administration, email messages were sent to faculty, students and administrators asking for volunteers for an hour-long interview with them. The individuals interviewed volunteered to participate and were not randomly selected. With administrators, the interview protocols emphasized the macro issues of academic freedom, language of instruction, professional conduct, and equity of representation. With faculty more emphasis was placed on issues of pedagogy, history, civics and academic honesty. With students emphasis was placed on how each of the eight issues affected them directly. Unless English was their preferred language, an interpreter was present. The interpreter signed a confidentiality agreement, and this agreement was shown to the respondent. Interviews took place in a private office or empty classroom. If the respondent gave permission, the interviews were audio- recorded. This project

was *participatory* in its nature, and I had no hesitation to declare myself a 'friend' to higher education and universities generally.

Kyrgyzstan

I was invited by the Rector of the American University of Central Asia (AUCA) to interview anyone I wished. I requested that an email be sent by the vice president for international affairs inviting any student or faculty member to have an interview with me. Twenty one volunteered. These consisted of 15 faculty and students and 6 administrators. The AUCA was chosen as a site because it is a local university (accredited in Kyrgyzstan but not in the US), with a high internal international influence. AUCA is financed largely by grants from the U. S. government and the Open Society Institute (The Soros Foundation). Its 1,187 students (499 men and 688 women) come from 16 countries. 40% of the classes are conducted in English by the 227 part and full-time faculty. The ratio of student to FTE is about 10:1. The university portrays itself as a liberal arts college with a wide ranging curriculum and, contrary to local higher education tradition, significant breadth requirements to as to avoid the over-specialization common in the former Soviet Union. AUCA's description of itself in an advertising brochure is given below:

> We are American in our love of critical thinking, our dedication to the breadth of subject matter and approaches to knowledge, and our commitment to the individual learning experience of every student. We are Central Asian in our profound appreciation of the fascinating cultural crossroads where our students learn and where many will dedicate their lives to critical social change. We are Russian in that we provide many courses in Russian, treasure the study of foreign languages, and value rigorous, disciplined learning.

Interviews were conducted in a room on campus but isolated from all other activity. With one exception, interpretation was not necessary. Because these interviews were the first, effort was made to cover all eight proposed topics: (i) on how Kyrgyz history should be taught; (ii) which languages of instruction should be allowed; (iii) what areas of civics and leadership responsibilities the university should undertake; (iv) whether there was a required pedagogy; (v) how the university should lead in the higher education community; (vi) the equality of representation (of ethnic minorities and from low income families) among students and faculty; (vii) the degree of academic honest demonstrated by the faculty and the administration; and (viii) the degree to which the university supported academic freedom. Although these topics were raised in each site, it became obvious that some issues were of critical relevance and others were not. Over time, more emphasis was placed on the former.

Georgia

In Georgia, the chosen university was its flagship academic institution, Tbilisi State University (TSU). Founded before the Russian Revolution the university used

Georgian (a rare exception in the former Soviet Union) as the medium of instruction since the beginning. It has produced many important scholars and research institutes. The university today has over 35,000 students and 3,275, faculty including 55 academicians. During the period of my stay, TSU was in the midst of a major shake up. For reasons of inefficiency, the university had been ordered by the government to undertake a restructuring roughly equivalent to a private corporation. It reduced the number of faculties from 22 to eight and requested that all 3,275 faculty members resign their positions and reapply as candidates to a far smaller university structure and more modern university curriculum. Interviews were conducted in a small private room on the main campus. In about 25% of the cases, interviews were conducted in English. In the other cases, interviews were conducted in Georgian. The respondent was invited to choose the language in which h/she felt most comfortable. In addition to the eight prescribed topics, new issues arose concerning the administrative reforms and the general direction of higher education more generally. In addition, interviews were conducted with the rectors of three other universities, a member of parliament, and several senior education administrators in government.

Kazakhstan

The site in Kazakhstan was East Kazakhstan State University (EKSU), located in Ust Kamenogorsk, a small industrial town in the north east of the country, far from the capital and the nation's largest city. Before 1991, EKSU had been an institute for teacher training, and not one of the more prestigious institutions. Since many of the faculty received their degrees where they now teach, the institution is heavily influenced by its earlier purposes. EKSU has about 10,000 students studying 60 specializations. There are about 700 faculty members. The average student: faculty ratio of 14:1 hides the fact that the demand for many specializations is low, yet faculty remain permanently in their positions. The university has had 3 rectors in the last three years.[3] The new rector has not yet established his reputation,[4] and there was considerable nervousness about the possible directions he might favour. Interviews with faculty and students were conducted in an empty classroom, and interviews with seven others were conducted in offices elsewhere. With rare exception all interviews were conducted with the assistance of an English/Russian interpreter. Respondents were chosen by the deans of the colleges. I was concerned about the degree of representation, but there was no apparent effect on age, seniority, gender or opinion of the respondents whom I interviewed. They appeared to represent a broad cross-section of the faculty, and when I asked for more junior faculty and more students, my request was quickly carried out. In addition to EKSU, interviews were conducted at a local private university.

[3] Rectors are not elected by the faculty, but appointed by the government and moved regularly.
[4] In fact we joked that I should show him around the university since, after four visits to Ust Kamenogorsk, I might know more about where things were than he did.

Interviews and Their Locations

	Number
American Univ. of C. Asia	24
Tbilisi State University	41
Others in Georgia	13
East Kaz. State University	29
Others in Kazakhstan	4
Total	111

Interview Results: The Teaching of History

All 15 republics from the former Soviet Union are 'ethnically based' in that each takes its name from an ethnic group (The Russian Federation, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Armenia, and Latvia are all nations named for a local ethnicity.)[5] Hence, each has to balance a natural tendency to establish national pride in historical accomplishments of that ethnic group with the fact that many citizens of their country have other ethnic identities. In some instances, such as in Georgia, there is long precedent for this process. In Central Asia however the ethnic groups have less experience managing an education system and are only now beginning to sort out the question of their relationship with respect to other citizens of their country who are not of their ethnic background. As might be expected, there is political pressure to re-instil a sense of honour from times past for their particular ethnic group. On the other hand, it is widely recognized that there needs to be a sense of fairness to all citizens in the presentation of the nation's history.[6] In all three countries new requirements had been put into place for the teaching of national history. One had to pass a test designed by the Ministry of Education to obtain a degree from either public or private universities in Kyrgyzstan. The governments of both Georgia and Kazakhstan had also placed new requirements to study national history as a course requirement. I was curious as to how faculty and administrators might view these requirements. If they felt that there was undue emphasis on ethnic identity, what might they think a university should do about it? In essence I was asking two kinds of questions: whether the Ministry requirements represented a 'professional' view of history; and if not, what the role of the university should be in teaching history 'properly'. Thus my questions pertained to how universities balance these two, sometimes conflicting, points of view.

[5] In regional languages the common term is 'nationality'. I choose to use the term 'ethnicity' so as to not confuse group membership with national citizenship.

[6] The difference can be expressed with specific terminology: 'Kazakh' pertains to the ethnic group; 'Kazakhstani' pertains to all citizens in the territory of Kazakhstan.

Inter-disciplinary associations are rare; hence many faculty in departments other than history had little idea of the new history requirements. Many found the question uncomfortable because they 'were not a specialist in history'. This represents 'vertical association' common in all three universities where knowledge and concern is limited to one's own department, and concerns for the organization more generally were of lower priority. When assured that what I wanted was their 'personal opinion', most respondents opened up and some became quite animated about the subject. A few respondents spoke in favour of having national history be the same as the history of the dominant ethnic group. One said:

> I am in favour of having the history of Kazakhstan be a history of the Kazakh people. It is the same in Russia. If I were a Russian citizen living in Russia, I wouldn't want Russian history to include a history of the Kazakh people, so why should a Russian here in Kazakhstan complain about having to learn about the history of the Kazakh people? (65: 22)

And some praised the opportunity to learn new things about their local ethnic group. One student in Kyrgyzstan noted that she had never had the opportunity to learn about Manas (an historical epic poem of the Kyrgyz) and mentioned that the principles derived from the study of Manas were universal. It is like reading Plato text, one does it not to privilege Greek culture, but because the theories and logical principles aspire to universal relevance.

But agreeing with an ethnically exclusive view of history was rare. Most respondents emphasized the long interaction in their territory across groups and the extensive sharing of cultural traditions, poems, laws, and governments. Said one faculty member at Tbilisi State,

> Our whole history is one of mixture. Our nationalism is multicultural. One of our first queens was a Jew. We have been interacting with Turks, Russians, Armenians, Jews, and Azeris for centuries. We have no need of 'defensive nationalism' (in which a nation needs to defend its honour by preaching a jingoist view of its history). (17: p. 44)

Another Georgian reiterated this:

> Our history is regional history. Georgian history has no enemies in that our culture has been determined by the culture of our former enemies from whom we have learned. (21: p. 52)

Many expressed dismay at the crude governmental efforts to cobble together an ethnic history largely from oral accounts. Also present was a tone of professional outrage at the attempt to use history to support state-sponsored ideology. There has been of course ample precedent in the Soviet Union, and the sad history of these ideological efforts was frequently raised along with a call to make history professional.

> The history of Kazakhstan should not be taught in the way it is now. It is being taught by amateurs, and they interpret facts poorly (meaning narrowly?). My grandfather escaped from this country under Stalin and fled

> to China. These facts about the Soviet Union are not being taught. The historians today make the same mistakes as the historians under the Soviets. They leave out anything that would be uncomfortable about the past, things which would be uncomfortable about themselves. One cannot teach history as if one group had lived in a vacuum. We need to change the teachers. The teachers today are the same ones that taught history of the Communist Party. We need to have real historians, professionals who do real research in their subject. (73:18)

Because history under the Soviets had been so corrupted and was now widely recognized as such, once inhibitions had been overcome from 'not being a specialist', the topic of how to teach history was of considerable interest. One informant said:

> I learned that there was a Han from China who came to this part of the world and who fought the Russians. The Han retreated, but he retreated westward, not eastward. I always wondered, why he would retreat west instead of east. The history taught me was to consider east as east and west as west; that they were totally different. But here was a Han who retreated to where he felt safe, and he went west. That reminds me that history cannot be divided into neat small generalized categories such as east and west. It reminds me that we are all products of many influences. I see a lot of facts which are worrisome. The Russians used to teach us that all Kazakhs were nomads and that there was no agriculture here prior to Russian contact. But that was not true. There was agriculture here. Perhaps only 10% of the population practiced agriculture, but it was an important to know that fact. When I see these facts (omitted) I feel hurt inside because history is not presented in a fair way. (73: 18)

But what should a university do if it is felt that the history required from the Ministry of Education was unprofessional and biased? Here responses represented a wide range. Many felt that a university could do nothing because it 'belongs' to the state, and all faculty have the responsibility to carry out state policy. But many others said that the university had a 'duty to resist' on a topic on which its professional integrity was at stake. Said one faculty member at EKSU:

> If the university is told by the Ministry to teach a course which was unprofessional, it should resist. The university needs to look at a global set of traditions and sources of knowledge, not just local ones. (65: 8)

The key was how a university should resist. No one argued for demonstrations or strikes or public protests of any kind. Subtle methods were preferred. These included university-based request for students to take an additional course in which a nation's history could be more balanced, to the assignment of books and readings which might present a more balanced and 'professional view'.

But would resistance to unprofessional requirements from a government be successful? One professor at EKSU replied by restating a proverb:

> the dog barks, but the caravan keeps on moving. (71: 17)

LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION

All 15 nations have had to choose among alternative languages. Many chose a national language separate from the traditional international language (Russian), and have taken different approaches with respect to the use of non-traditional international languages (English, French and German). In some countries (Latvia, Georgia) the choice has not posed a significant dilemma because the local language was utilized prior to the imposition of Russian under the USSR; to return to the local language poses less academic cost. But in other instances (Kyrgyz, Kazakh, Turkmen) the choice poses a significant dilemma. There is no precedent for using those languages in universities. Teaching science, mathematics and other university subjects requires depth in an existing literature and fluency with technology which cannot be created artificially. The questions about which language should be used as the medium of university instruction were meant to explore the degree to which faculty opinions, based on academic assessment, diverged from national policy.

In general, opinions were quite consistent with national policies. In both Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, national language policies were being applied but in a rather pragmatic manner. Russian remains in full use for reasons of availability in materials and because of long academic traditions. The national languages are considered a welcome novelty. Students who graduate in Kazakh-only cohorts are limited to the humanities and have yet to establish a significant employment record. It remains to be seen if Kazakh-only cohorts will be utilized in labour markets not dominated by state industries. Unlike Georgian where English is widely learned in addition, the Kazakh-only academic streams will likely be confined to local employment. Comments from respondents to this question on language surprisingly had less to do with the use of local languages, and more to do with alternative international languages beyond Russian. At AUCA a common complaint was the insufficiency of courses taught in English. Students worried that too many courses were taught in Russian, and that the reading materials were often out-dated, poorly translated, and insufficient. Kazakhstan has outlined a policy of 'trilingualism' in which universities might use three languages (Russian, Kazakh and English). This was generally supported by a wide variety of faculty. It was pointed out, however, that the absence of sufficient English faculty made the trilingual policy 'empty words'. In Georgia, Russian was rarely used in the university, but English language programs were opening rapidly. This generated some concern that Georgian traditions were being supplanted. Some felt that English should be confined to classes in foreign language (i.e. not used as a medium of instruction). Others felt the opposite, that more degrees should be opened with English as the medium of instruction based on evidence of student demand and the availability of more materials than Georgian. The faculty who worried about the replacement of Georgian also worried about the 'commercialization' of the university and its academic legacy.

CIVICS, CITIZENSHIP AND MORAL VALUES

Universities make decisions on what to omit and what to include, on how to balance content; on what lessons to make explicit, and what lessons to teach indirectly. I asked about which principles are emphasized and why.

It was widely recognized that the principles (ideology) of the Soviet Union were generally reprehensible and should have been quickly replaced.[7] But it was also widely acknowledged that there was no consensus on what to replace it with, and often there were concerns about the nihilism of the current student generation. One faculty member at EKSU said:

> For many years we lived under the ideology of the USSR. When the country fell apart there was nothing to replace it. Young people today fill that emptiness with what they call 'values'. But I don't call them values. The students have a consumer mentality, even in their relations with each other. (75: 21)

The issue of how to influence values is especially complex in a foreign university. One administrator in AUCA remarked that

> ... we have to teach the real facts about local history, ones which are proved by different international sources. It should be left up to the student to interpret and draw their own conclusions. One can't force pride in a country. One can't build a democracy by force. The (national) goals are fine, but there has to be a transparent mechanism to merit those goals. We should make patience and tolerance among the goals of our society. We are a private university and can build our own history curriculum, but we should be very careful not to disturb. (1: p. 29)

The effect on universities of the Soviet Union was not unidirectional. On the one hand there was a significant effort to vocationalize the purposes of higher education; to reduce them to the 'practical'. On the other hand, many faculty, particularly the older ones, viewed higher education as having broader purposes. One faculty member at EKSU, with long experience, remarked that

> the university has two jobs. One is to teach skills. The other is to set an example. If you follow the history of universities you will see that they are in the centre of control. They are supposed to be an inspiration to youth, to give them skills but to also give them traditions (Tape 55: 8).

Another faculty member at EKSU remarked:

> we should return to universal values. Patriotism. Respect for each other. Everybody must be honest in what they do. If honest, one may sleep well at night and not be afraid of new ideas. A good name is more important than anything else. But it can be easily lost. One has to strive to keep a good name. There must be a certain moral obligation, and a certain barrier (limit) over

[7] The exception: the principle of equality of opportunity.

> which a faculty member cannot cross. Patriotism is being manipulated. Often chauvinistic values are hidden within the language of patriotism. To me, patriotism means treating all people equally. It means respect for all nationalities. It means an equality of opportunity in life. It means that everyone is proud of this land. Russians. Kazakhs. Everyone. Patriotism is a matter of moral honour over and above family and friends. (75: 38)

In what way should a university influence values? Should it have a specific course on ethics? Many argued that would be too blunt as an approach. One EKSU faculty member said that

> students should learn professional integrity by the way we teach. Universities are the centre of spiritual maturity and integrity. A university is a place where parents and students can meet achievements in science and the arts. Universities must accumulate the best practices and then teach them. The message of the university is humanistic. And the main purpose of the university is not to transfer knowledge; it is the upbringing of youth. (75: 15)

Should a university enforce values? Some faculty said yes, but in a way which proves effective. There was no sympathy for installing sanctions and punishments. But there was quite a lot of interest in 'effective encouragement'. Braxton and Bayer (1999) argue that there is an informal code of conduct which pertains to university teaching and that the code constrains the principle on which a faculty member does not abuse his authority over students. Of the three universities, only the AUCA had the equivalent of a written code of conduct. Nevertheless, despite the absence of an explicit code at TSU and at EKSU, many norms pertained parallel to those outlined by Braxton and Bayer.

For instance, one full professor, female expressed her discomfort with how young female students dress. She said:

> Some of our students come (inappropriately) underdressed. I feel offended. I ask the girl students to remain behind. I explain to them how I feel. I tell them that they may dress any way they want if they are in the city, but if they are in the classroom they should respect me. Am I abusing my power when I do this? I ask the girls and they said no. They said you are right. And I am happy that they understood. They did not know how to dress because no one told them before. Other teachers did not seem to mind, or notice. Unfortunately, by the time I get them they are in the fourth year. It is sad that they were not told in their first year. (75: 17)

It is apparent that this faculty member, when confronting female students about their (inappropriate dress) did not stir up resistance or resentment because her approach did not state the rules; nor did it criticize their choices or their character. Rather she took the responsibility on herself by saying – this is my classroom, and

when you come please respect my feelings. Please dress more appropriately. And then she asked them if whether that was, in their view, an abuse of her authority.[8]

In re-stating the principle, one faculty member remarked:

> A faculty member must never intimidate people, especially those who are dependent on you. Whenever I talk to students, I always use the respectful form of Russian. When I talk to them about things which bother me, or which worry me, I am especially polite. This is particularly true with young boys. If you intimidate young boys they will not grow up to be strong and confident men. (75: 19)

PEDAGOGY

The natural purposes of higher education include the ability to think for oneself and mature participation in public discussions. In the past these were not supported by the style of teaching and learning. The reputation of pedagogy under the Soviet's was stern in style, with lectures and note taking dominant. Recognizing that this may reinforce supplication rather than autonomy, many efforts, financed often by external development assistance agencies, have been made to 'modernize' teaching style in how of instilling independence in thought. How are these new pedagogical styles viewed? To what extent have they taken hold? And to what extend have they become faculty requirements? Is the principle of critical thinking so important that it should become a criterion for continued faculty employment?

Today recognition of different teaching styles is universal. One summarized the background in this way:

> To have liberal values one must have an independence of thought. In the previous regime we had a good education but the philosophy was of the workers, not the decision-makers. We could analyse very well but we could not decide things well because decisions were made at a much higher level. ...We must teach the new generation the skill to analyse policies so they can find solutions independently. In my youth we memorized very well everything but were not asked our opinions. It brings me great pleasure when my students argue with me because (by surviving the previous regime) I gave them this opportunity to develop their skills in this way. (35: 20)

Some faculty were convinced that one style constitutes a more modern approach and should be reinforced by administrative regulation. Said one:

> Older faculty are poor teachers. Students complain. We give them only minimum raises and a chance to learn critical thinking pedagogy. (75: p. 5)

There was, on the other hand, some sympathy for their predicament. They are old and set in their ways. They are asked to change their style. But if they cannot

[8] Quite by coincidence to this interview, a new sign was placed by the university administration in the hallway by the front entrance. The sign read: *Dear Students: welcome to the temple of science and learning. Please dress appropriately.*

change, should their employment be terminated? In some cases the answer was yes, on condition that they had received the opportunity to be retrained and if students boycotted their lectures. In general, including at AUCA, there was little sympathy for terminating a faculty member's employment. As a concept, employment termination is still new in Central Asia. It is more associated with cruelty on the part of the employer than with responsiveness to the needs of the client.

On the other hand, some faculty suggested that a variety of styles (including the 'old Soviet style') was preferred pedagogical policy. Many had been trained by faculty members whose style of communication was rigid, but who were eminent in their fields and considered giants intellectually. Some argued that students should be exposed to both styles. One or two even remarked that the new critical thinking pedagogical style, particularly from those trained by the Soros Foundation, was by nature weak, and based more on emotion than content.

UNIVERSITY RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Universities are expected to be more transparent with respect to their operations, and provide a social presence to the general public. With many American universities, the relationship with the local community is a long-standing tradition and considered essential. Some scholars have even argued that the economic spill over effects have been heavily influenced by the interdependency between the university and the local community (Bowman, 1962). Now that universities in Central Asia are operating in a market environment, the question is how seriously do the faculty take this new responsibility in community relations? Do they see it as an opportunity or a burden? Is it treated as a 'foreign' idea, or as an important part of its modern function?

In any ranking of university and faculty challenges by perceived importance, relations with the local community would be last. Few faculty had given thought to the issue. There were however, some exceptions. AUCA faculty and students had taken the lead in sponsoring an inter-university exposure of educational corruption. They did it by sponsoring a mock trial in which professors 'accused of corruption' were in a docket. There were prosecuting attorneys, defence lawyers, a judge, and an audience of students from many universities, all of whom seem thrilled to participate. When asked about the event, one faculty member mentioned that it was a way in which AUCA could help 'lead' other universities to see a problem but not in a way which would appear egocentric. EKSU was sponsoring night programs in certain fields, and these were suggested to me as being for the community. They were, however, fee-based, and they appeared to be as much a means of diversifying income sources as for the benefit of the community. In essence, the understanding that a university prospers when supported by the public is in its infancy.

EQUITY OF REPRESENTATION AMONG STUDENTS AND FACULTY

Soviet philosophy laid a heavy emphasis on equal opportunity beginning first with the offspring of the proletariat, but also for women and national minorities.[9] In fact, Soviet universities were well advanced with respect to gender equity, but not necessarily advanced with respect to social equity where the proportion of students from working class backgrounds was lower than in the west (Heyneman, 1997c, 1998).

Nevertheless, with today's demand that universities operate in an open democracy, standards for inclusion may have become more explicit. Were there surveys available to demonstrate the equity of participation? I was interested in to what extent demands for ethnic and economic equity have materialized? I was particularly interested in whether Kazakh or Kyrgyz felt under-represented by comparison to Russian-speaking citizens; and in the case of Georgia whether the representation of Azeris, Abkhazians, Turks, Armenians were perceived to be a problem? I asked to what extent is equity seen as a problem which requires educational policy intervention. If minorities were seen as underrepresented, what do faculty think should be done about it?

In short the answer was nothing. Equity ranks close to community relations as being low in priority in terms of a problem. Moreover there was general ignorance about the topic. No one seemed to understand the distinction between equal opportunity and equal results. Since minorities were in theory free to compete for entry, the problem was perceived as having been solved.

That said, it is also fair to say that some respondents had strong opinions about the mixture of groups in the university. One faculty member at EKSU said

> I was once asked how many Kazakhs I have in my department. I was confused and couldn't answer. It never occurred to me who was Kazakh and who was not. My parents came here before WWII. I am Kazakh. We are one nation. There are some Russians who emigrated. I can't understand this. This is my home. Perhaps my generation looks on things differently. We have suffered so much together. Famine. Poverty. War. Some of my best friends are Kazakh. I just don't make a distinction. I give them respect and I expect respect in return. (6: 8)

The gini coefficient has been widely used in North American and European sociology to calibrate over or under-representation, and was initiated by C. Arnold Anderson in his survey of student class background at Oxford in the early 1950s (Anderson, 1952, 1956, 1975). Since that time the concept has spread in terms of analysis and debate to India, Brazil and other multi-national democracies where the educational representation debate is considered be an acceptable part of the political negotiation over the sharing of power and opportunity. Sociological

[9] Gender equity in higher education had an economic as well as a philosophic rationale. Most industrial and agricultural employment was labour intensive and because so many men had been killed in the two world wars, having large numbers of women at all levels in the labour force was seen as essential to economic progress.

surveys of student background are unknown in Central Asia and the Caucasus; hence there was no experience with the measurement of 'under-representation'. When it was explained, some were fascinated as if the 'technology' had just been invented. It is tempting to speculate as to whether the equity of representation based on such a measure might be used extensively. Were one to ask the same question ten years from now, would faculty be familiar with the measure and have an opinion on the concept? Would they be in favour of special programs of assistance, or quota systems in the admissions process? Or will public debate, as in China, be considered too risky to allow.

I suspect that it will be too risky and that the practice of systematically collecting information on student backgrounds will be normal practice in some parts of the world and not allowed in others. However, the fact that data do not exist, and that they are not likely to exist, does not mean that there is no problem. In Georgia, for instance, some faculty reacted very positively to the idea that TSU inaugurate its own program of remedial Georgian for Abkhazia students. After all, they theorized, we have always considered Abkhazia to be a part of Georgia. And it was widely acknowledged that Abkhazians were at a disadvantage on admissions tests given in Georgian. So why not make the effort to assure that the best and brightest Abkhazian students could enter the university. And if the government is not able (or willing) to help, it would be a laudable service on the part of the university. Doesn't the university, they asked, have a role in the building of a peaceful nation?

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The breakup of the Soviet Union did not end the compulsion for control, though the role of universities has shifted. Universities have changed from being an administrative component in a larger ideological machine to an organization with service and technical expectations in a labour market where the rules have changed. The key element which will govern the future of higher education in this region will rest on the degree to which its universities can control their own curriculum. Along with the undergraduate and post-graduate structure, and the exchange of credit hours, the principles of academic autonomy and academic freedom are part of the expectations of the Magna Charta from the European Union's Bologna agreements (Daxner, 2004; Gibbons, 2005). The Magna Charta

> Considers autonomy as its first and fundamental principle: the university is an autonomous institution at the heart of societies differently organized because of geography and historical heritage; it produces, examines, appraises, and hands down culture by research and teaching. To meet the needs of the world around it, its research and teaching must be morally and intellectually independent of all political authority and economic power... the autonomy must be guaranteed by governmental law and its potential exploited by the governing bodies of the universities and by academia. Freedom in research and training is the fundamental principle of university

> life and governments and universities ... must ensure respect for this fundamental requirement. (Blasi, 2005, pp. 172-173)

Evidence of this important shift in autonomy might be assessed by the degree to which research endeavours have been freed from the constraints of the past. I was curious as to what extent political control was exercised over research interests, and to what extent are constraints on academic freedom considered to be a problem.

Under the Soviet Union there were many examples of state harassment of academics and the frequent abrogation of principles of academic freedom. Access to foreign publications was restricted as a matter of course with most higher education institutions not cleared for such privileges. But there were worse policies than censorship. On some occasions particular theories and interpretations were considered heretical and subversive. Among the precedents for these were psychotherapy, genetics, and certain education polices such as the language of instruction.

One respondent at TSU mentioned that

> there was a laboratory to study psychology founded at the time of the university, in 1918. Between 1920 and about 1970 all psychology was controlled in the USSR. It was considered to be a dangerous science because it considered the subconscious. Cybernetics and all the social sciences were limited by the state ideology. But the USSR was Moscow. We are on the other side of the Caucuses mountains, and we have more freedom. Psychology suffered under the USSR, but our laboratory continued. We preferred to not cite Russian books, but instead preferred to cite German, French and English books. We had freedom, but no information. Somebody finds a book and passes it around. We knew that there was an (enormous) literature out there. Our scientific doors opened about 1970. We met psychologists from the west. We held a world symposium on the subconscious in 1979. From 1920 to 1970 most of the efforts to study psychology were confined. Now there is zero capacity in psychotherapy. I am one of the only ones left; it is not a happy situation. But it is interesting.

A professor of genetics at EKSU related a similar story.

> The history of the study of genetics is really a shame. Russia (the USSR) was once progressive in genetics. But it fell behind because of the stupid mistakes of the government. Who knows where we would be today if these mistakes had not been made. All of the academic research papers on genetics were kept locked up, secret. 50 years later I discovered them. The KGB was so strong then. Many researchers fled the USSR and established research laboratories of their own in other countries; those geneticists who were left behind were arrested and killed. The story is so sad. (65: 22)

And with respect to controlling education policy:

> Under the USSR the rector gave an order saying that some of the subjects need to be taught in Russian. I don't want to praise myself, but I was the only dean who said that the order was unacceptable. Everyone must know foreign languages and the more the better but we must use Georgian. The next day I was at the Ministry of Internal Security where I had a very tough discussion. The head of the central committee said that perhaps the order had been misunderstood and I returned to the university. Today everyone can say whatever they want, but in that day (my statement) was like a bomb. Everyone supported me. Students. Faculty. There was even an illegal newspaper and it supported me. (67: 36)

The question is whether the new governments, of whichever leaning, can manage the urge to control opinions in the university which contradict their own. According to one faculty member at TSU, the government intervened for political reasons just like the Soviets.

> Our first rector in the new government was asked to fire certain professors who were not liked by the government. He refused, and instead he was fired. We were proud of the rector. You have little experience with our political realities. One month after the firing of the rector civil war broke out. We are still in a situation when we are under stress for our opinions, and these could be a threat to our lives. (67: 26)

But the sense of academic freedom can hardly exist when there is little precedent for it, and when some among the faculty themselves are not for it. Asked if a faculty member at EKSU should be allowed to criticize the record of the country's president, one respondent said no.

> Why would a faculty member criticize our president? After all, our president has had so many achievements. He has built so many things. He has helped in so many ways. I am so proud of him. Why should a faculty member be allowed to have opinions about our president which are not true. (Book 3, p. 24)

Fortunately, through contact with other universities in Europe and elsewhere, and by having openly tolerant and highly prestigious universities established locally there is some experience with academic freedom. At AUCA it is common for academics to 'sound off', including against the foreign policy of the U.S., although one of its sponsors is the US Department of State. The fact that open criticism from some of the professoriate does not in any way threaten the purpose or functions of AUCA is at first curious, and then an important precedent. Several senior administrators or faculty are involved in political party politics, participate in national debates; several faculty are being considered as candidates for the rector ship of major governmental universities, and this seems to add to its reputation rather than threaten it. At TSU, with the significant reforms occurring throughout the higher education system, similar characteristics pertain. Many faculty and administrators were in line for promotions, political appointments and were well known to the electorate. And this seemed to add to its reputation as well. In

essence, for those nations (including Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Georgia), hoping to integrate into the standards of the European Union, academic freedom is slowly but steadily becoming a reality.

HONESTY OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

Although many point out that under the Soviets, advancement into and within universities was subject to political and personal manipulation, by and large, the process was meritocratic. This is not to say that it was not cumbersome and inefficient. Entrance exams were oral. Travel to the site of the university was a necessity, and could require a week each way. If a student applied to more than one university, located in different parts of the Soviet Union, travel to take the oral admissions examinations might require months of preparation and trial.

Since independence there have been numerous challenges to the meritocracy tradition. Salaries dipped at one time to about $30/month, throwing many cherished and senior academics into the realm of poverty for the first time in their professional lives. Rules of trade, banking, property ownership, and manufacturing were being broken with regularity. For the first time, universities were expected to seek their own revenues. The generation of fees and profits quickly became an essential element to the university's and the professoriate's survival. With neither precedent nor experience to act as a guide many believed that their activities were the norm elsewhere. After all they asked, didn't western universities have to raise monies too? Weren't the ways in which universities make money here the same as in the west? Is it a problem if a student pays for gaining entry? Isn't that part of being a market economy?

I was interested in how the challenges to meritocracy were seen by the faculty and administrators themselves. Are they being ignored and excused, or seen as a threat to university integrity? If the latter, what steps have been contemplated for addressing the problem? To what extent are these steps seen as being effective? Questions of academic honesty (corruption) were of higher concern than any other question. Some respondents were honest and confident enough to describe incidents in which they participated in dishonest acts. They also included detailed answers to the question "how did participating in that act make you feel?" Although some were clearly nervous about that question, only three respondents refused to allow a tape recording of their answers.

One senior professor at TSU laid out what he considered the recent history of corruption at his university:

> Admissions were a way to make money, huge money. But once inside the university, corruption depended upon the department. It was worse in law and business and economics.10 It makes no sense to be corrupt in math and physics. (Why?). No one in his right mind would study math or physics if he is corrupt. If you go into math or physics there is no work, no jobs, so we get

[10] The tendency of corruption being worse in subjects with the highest labour market demand appears to be common elsewhere (Heyneman, Anderson, & Nuraliyeva, 2006; Teixeira & Rocha, 2006; Hrabak et al., 2004; Kerkvliet, 1994; Nowell & Laufer, 1997).

> only highly motivated students. Medicine was the first faculty to become corrupt. But it is not only because of demand; there is also the question of prestige, the diploma. (44: 27)

Corruption could occur in any circumstance in which a student needed a service from the university. It could occur over access to library books, student housing, requests for transcripts, even approval of a doctoral thesis. One professor from EKSU said:

> When I was a student I did not know what corruption was. But then I got to Almaty and I found out. Now it is even here at this university. When I wrote my thesis I faced many difficulties. It took me seven years to defend my thesis. I had to go back again and again and again to get the signature of the committee chair. I did not pay, but I know that it would have been expedited if I had paid a bribe. (75: 1)

Why is corruption so prevalent? One TSU faculty member attributed it to the mentality of today's students.

> Corruption is big, very big. The main reason is the low salary. The next reason is the mentality of the students. We have to change this mentality. Western countries have had two hundred years to develop their market economies. We have had ten years. Students still think of employment as they did under the Soviets; many of them have already been promised jobs. These jobs depend on their obtaining a diploma. So they come to university focused not on learning but on obtaining a diploma. They don't have to earn their diploma in order to be employed; all they have to do is have one. This is because these are the first formative years of our market economy. (79: 29)

Others attribute corruption to the problem to local culture. Corruption happens

> because of the 'Kazakh mentality'. But this mentality is not only for Kazakh people; I have many Russian friends who have the same mentality. The 'Kazakh mentality' is 'Kazakhstani'; it is typical of all people who live here. (73: 29)

Do the faculty understand the 'macro- implications' of corruption? Some do. One Kazakh professor mentioned that:

> Corruption is bad. It is clear even for a fool that we are producing not very smart people. Corruption will affect our economy. If we produce a foolish agriculturalist, and he chooses a bad crop, a bad seed, the result will affect all of us. We have suffered before from famine. We can again. There are implications of corruption in which it becomes an internal threat to our economy. This is true for every discipline, chemistry, physics, and mathematics. That is why foreign companies are using all kinds of screening and testing devices for their new employees. Our local companies should do the same thing; and these screening devices should be independent. (79: 39)

But educational corruption is not solely defined by bribery. As problematic, and certainly as common, is the commitment of an illegal act for reasons of loyalty to family and friends. This was described as 'moral terrorism' and comes in the form of phone calls and special pleas from intimate family members, sometimes older and more senior than oneself. One TSU professor put it this way:

> Moral pressure used to happen frequently. Of course we get phone calls. How many depends on the department and on the year. In some years I used to get between 25 and 50 requests to change a grade/year; in other years, only two or three. I try to explain that I can't do it. But the caller is never satisfied (with that answer). They continue to put pressure on me. They will say that my son is a good student, but he was ill and had no chance to study. Please improve his grade. (Did you change?). I did change grades. It was a matter of pressure. The pressure was just unbearable. But I only changed a grade from 'satisfactory' to 'good'; I never changed a grade from 'satisfactory' to 'excellent'. (44: 28)

And a faculty member from TSU:

> I am an honest person and I don't have a bad name among students. However, if 'protection' is considered to be a part of corruption, I am also corrupt. We have big pressures from relatives and friends, and society; and we can't hide it. Even if we try to point out that protection hurts their daughters and sons, they say we are 'the enemy'. I get calls very often. I have many classes. It happens very often. The new (exam) system helps. Students have learned that I am angry when asked to give them a favour. How often I get requests depends on how strict I am. If I am more liberal, I get more pressure. Before the new system, the teacher was over-whelmed with special requests. The new system helps me to be more objective. It is very difficult to not take account of friends and family, but the result will be a (nation of) semi-professionals. (36: 13)

The worst occasions of 'moral terrorism' occur when faculty colleagues or senior administrators request that one change a grade for a particular student. From TSU for instance:

> The worst are my colleagues who put pressure on me. They meet me in the hallway and start to say 'hello', then they ask me about the grade of a particular student. And the worst are colleagues who were our former teachers. What can you do? This is the system. Even the dean puts pressure. Not directly, but he will ask someone close to me to inquire about a grade for a student on his behalf. It makes me feel pretty bad. Teachers who are corrupt should go. But how? The most corrupt are the most influential. It is very difficult. Very hard. (44: 28)

Said another faculty member from EKSU:

> The pressure from higher levels usually begins with a hint. Teachers may or may not listen. But the argument may include the fact that we can't fail all students because we need the tuition. (77: 25)

And from EKSU:

> Once the dean called me about a grade for the daughter of the vice rector. The vice rector had been removed from his position and was in the hospital. The dean said that the vice rector had already suffered and let's not make him suffer any more, so give his daughter a good grade. After I gave her a good grade I suffered. (62: 1)

> Yes I have changed grades. It happens a lot. You get indirect requests and direct requests through phone calls You just do it. There is no way out. You have to change grades. One former vice rector had a daughter. She was a poor student. She skipped many classes. The dean called to tell me to give her a good grade, and I did. I gave her an 'excellent'. Afterwards I felt disgusted. I have certain requirements for my students and they try to meet those requirements, but some students receive good grades without even trying. (62: 10)

When faculty admitted to changing grades illegally, I sometimes asked how it made them feel.

Many described it as making them feel terrible. Several respondents ended up in tears, and the interview had to be delayed. One woman suggested that it 'made her feel violated'. But often there were rationalizations. One faculty member at EKSU said that when she changed a grade she knew:

> that someone else benefited; I did something good for someone else even though I suffered. I told myself that students who got excellent marks will be good specialists in the future and those who got good marks but who didn't earn them; they will be poor specialists in the future. They will suffer because of not learning. (62: 10)

And another said:

> For a while I had a firm position about changing grades. But I was making a lot of enemies. Now I try to meet the requests half way. I still make the student study, but I will give him a good grade. I will give a student an easy assignment to complete and then give him/her a good grade. I get phone calls and direct requests. On the inside I know I am not doing the right thing. But I remember my high school I went to a private high school with students from wealthy families. The director used to get many phone calls from parents asking her to give special results for their particular children. I know it is wrong to change a grade because of this pressure. A student needs to understand that the grade is a reward for effort. (82: 12)

Education dishonesty (corruption) is a universal concern and perceived to be pervasive. It is also the case there are numerous faculty members who remain

adamantly resistant to participation. In an environment of deep personal poverty, massive general disrespect for the law, and ferocious pressures from senior administrators and important public figures to illegally alter grades for personal and protected relatives, there is adamant resistance among the faculty. It may be true what Burton Clark and others have suggested about universities, that they do in fact try to uphold their own definition of moral order.

For instance a professor from TSU mentioned:

> When I get a call from a student, do you know what I say? I say, do you know what I love? I love to see you study hard. I don't get angry. I say you don't need to call me. You will do just fine. It is absolutely clear that their call means nothing. (Then why call?). Because this is Georgia. This is our culture and our tradition. It may be hard for you to understand. If I am tough though, the number of calls decreases. I try to be honest. The students know that there is no reason to call me. (What if a special friend of yours calls?). Will I change a grade because the mother is my special friend? No. Absolutely not. Whether the mother is my friend has nothing to do with changing a grade. (Why not?). Because there is another student next to her whose mother is not my friend. Why should the student whose mother is not my friend suffer? I have to be fair. (40: 2)

> (Why don't you change the grade; nobody will know.). I will know. It is a question of moral values. We must choose which is the most important moral value. Fairness to students is more important than 'loyalty' to friends and family. It is important for a university to have many faculty who choose fairness over family loyalty. (Why?), It is not only about yourself. It is about the kid. And the kid next to the son of your friend. It about setting a moral example, a moral lesson for the others. It is about showing all the students how to make a moral choice, even if it is a difficult choice. (Do your students know about how difficult your choice is?). I tell my students that a mother called me, and without saying who, I tell them my policy. They know. (40: 7)

Many were able to identify the strength of their values and to explain where they came from.

> People are individuals but we must represent moral values. Personally I just do it. I decide what to do in my case. If my friend calls to say he has a child in my class who needs me to improve his grade I tell my friend that his child is intelligent and educated and would advise my friend to have his child work harder on his moral skills. I would not give in because I do the same for my children. I tell my children that they must achieve on their own; I will never help them with a special phone call and moral pressure. I tell them they need to gain education on their own and if they cannot do it own their own that they must do something else with their lives. (51: 1)

> And family pressure is strong. We Kazakhs have huge families. But as for me, I would not change a grade in response to family pressure even if it was

> my own father asking me. That is how my father raised us. He was a leader in the Communist party and he taught us to be honest; to never take money from people illegally. My students are the source of my pride and I want them to succeed on their own. (77: 25)

> I have had such cases of friends and family calling me to ask me to change a grade and when this happens I become very aggressive. I have never changed a grade because of the pressure of friends. (Why not?) Because if they are really my friends they will respect my authority. When they call me I feel very angry. Friends must not ask me to do something which will harm me. Friendship does not allow people to ask such things. (If the call comes from someone in senior authority?). I try to defend myself in a correct and delicate way. I explain in a respectful way that I can't do this. (Where did you learn this?) From my mother and my father. (55: 1)

Where does honesty begin?

> Everything starts in the family. I teach my children. I tell them that they should work hard with their minds and have knowledge as their tool. My oldest daughter graduated from high school and wanted to go to a university in the south. I told her that it would be very hard; that she would have to study very hard but that she should never give up; she should never give in to paying a teacher (to change a grade). I told her that she should prove herself with her knowledge. Even if they are pressing (pressuring) you should never pay. The teacher is not the last authority. You can contact other people. You can ask to form a committee. There has got to be a way to prove that your (knowledge) is right. There is an anonymous corruption phone line here at this university, but no one uses it. Students should educate each other on this and take matters into their own hands. (74: 39)

Should faculty members obey their loyalty to being fair or their loyalty to their family's needs and requests for special treatment?

> I don't believe that any teacher needs to give in to family pressure. People must make a choice for themselves. I don't believe in fate. It is up to them to decide. And they should remember that people who do bad things begin small, they begin with small bad things. (75: 17)

In one instance a faculty member related the story of her husband who was her student.

> My husband is a student in night classes and is one of my students. He would not accept a low grade. It makes me angry. It is not fair. But I am not strong enough to resist the pressure to change the grades of my students. (Book 3: p. 68)

But there were other cases where loyalty to family was clearly superseded by adherence to the laws of fairness.

> I had an older sister and in high school she was my Russian language teacher. One day I told her that I was not prepared, and please do not call on me today. She replied that she would call me on specifically on that day because I want you to be a good student. I don't want you to shame me. She was correct because in class she saw me as a student and not as her sister, and she wanted me to be an excellent student. She didn't want me to take the easy way out. (62: 5)

What should one do with those who are caught?

> Corruption is like a disease, like a virus. With virus, like avian flu, we have to eliminate all the affected chickens and even the chickens that just might be affected. What should we do in the case of corruption: shoot all the students and faculty? (!) (74: 37)

> I can't imagine that I would ask a student to leave the university if he is caught in corruption. It is difficult to enter the university and students who get here deserve to study. But the student who is corrupt is stupid. He pays money for nothing; he comes to the university to gain knowledge and he pays for a grade without getting knowledge. That is stupid. That is why a corrupt student is not my problem; it is his problem. A faculty member who is corrupt should leave the university. But maybe he has a serious problem. Maybe his family is poor. Perhaps he does not want to be corrupt; perhaps he is corrupt because of the pressure on him. In that case it is not his fault; it is the fault of the pressure. We should do our best to make the case public. A faculty member should be ashamed. Shame is the worst punishment of all. (56: 24)

Although it was widely acknowledged that the problems of corruption were pervasive, there was also evidence that in some instances they were on the decline. All three countries had recently instituted standardized, computer-graded admissions exams with the explicit purpose of addressing the problems of corruption in university admissions. One professor at TSU assessed the results in this way:

> Before national (standardized) exams corruption was very high and moral pressure (to change grades) was also. The departments which are more prestigious are the worst in terms of corruption. Law, Business. International Relations. Because of the exams however, many things have changed. Students from rural areas and from poor homes are more numerous. When bribery was necessary to enter the university, these students had no chance to enter. Today because of the examinations, they do. This is very new and very good. (35: 10)

Does access to a standardized examination eliminate the problems of corruption? Hardly. Said one professor at EKSU:

> After two years, each college student takes an internal exam designed by the ministry of education. For the first several years it operated fairly. But now it too has become corrupted. Cell phones and cheat sheets (for a price) are allowed into the test. (73: 36)

SUMMARY

It is not possible to support a conclusion on the basis of empirical evidence from this project. Interviewed subjects were not chosen at random. Nor is it possible to portray them as representative of national trends. Still, it might be possible to draw some impressions.

Each university among those chosen appears to have different characteristics and challenges. At AUCA the challenge is to live up to its claim of providing an American liberal arts educational experience. In many ways it is already successful. Among the interviewed students and faculty there was a surprising consensus: they would prefer to be nowhere else. For local faculty, the pay was significantly in excess of what other universities could pay (although less than a typical American university). All enjoyed a freedom of research interests and bright, highly motivated students. Academic honesty was considered a principal selling point, and in stark contrast to other local universities. Time and again respondents would point out this fact. They would mention the rigorous code of conduct and the internal structures for managing breaches in the conduct code, either by students or faculty. Because the reputation of academic honesty is so rare in the region, the precedent may be of importance for all local universities and for any students whether at AUCA or elsewhere. How else is a Kyrgyz student to know what a normal university looks like if there are no honest local universities?[11] TSU is struggling to rid itself of three past characteristics: its corruption, inefficiency and intellectual lethargy (based on Soviet employment principles of an 'iron academic rice bowl'). However, it is undergoing this adjustment with a surprising degree of cooperation and support from among its faculty in spite of the fact that many of their positions have been threatened. Though there were complaints about age discrimination, faculty and students generally support the new directions in which the university is headed. TSU represents the future of universities more generally. It is attempting to become competitive in a higher education world defined by the success of teaching and research universities in Europe and North America. It looks to the Nordic nations for language policy and has begun to emphasize English in a broad spectrum of courses and degree programs without a threat to local culture and tradition.[12] On the other hand,

[11] In a corruption ranking, a student survey in Kyrgyzstan has listed foreign universities (Turkish and American) as being more honest than any local university (Heyneman, Anderson, & Nuraliyeva, 2006).
[12] Nordic universities typically utilize English as a medium of instruction, particularly in the sciences, yet without threat to local languages.

EKSU is struggling to have any effective connection to the world outside the traditional Russian-language sphere of influence. It is impoverished in resources and handicapped by crippling government regulations and administrative decrees. Because of low mobility, faculty remain in place for decades. The struggle at EKSU to emerge as a 'normal' university will be long and difficult.

There are similarities across all three universities. Faculty leaders exist, even in the most austere and debilitating of environments. There are some who lead by virtue of moral principle. There are others who rise to the occasion and lead on the basis of practical assessment. Regardless of the source of their strength, given this commonality, there is a universal standard of the professoriate. The standard is parallel to the characteristics as identified by Braxton and Bayer (1999). It includes the promise to treat all students with fairness and impartiality. And it includes selecting a common hierarchy among differing moral principles. In particular it requires that faculty choose the principle of fairness (to students and colleagues) over the principle of loyalty to family and friends. In this small but important way, certain faculty in Central Asia and the Caucasus may be leading the way for other local organizations in government, business and the not-for-profit sector. These 'quiet heroes' of the university classroom, those who stand up for their principles without legal or administrative support, in their own way these resisters are upholding the principles associated with development and freedom. They do this without the possibility of reward; on the contrary, they do this in spite of making enemies and enduring the criticism of their corrupt administrative superiors. They do this for one reason: that it is right and that it is consistent with what their mothers and fathers taught them.

The future for these universities and for these faculties is not simple. In terms of pedagogy, they will work out standards of excellence and adhere to them gradually but steadily. In terms of teaching history, there are deep problems ahead, stemming particularly from the requirements handed down by ministry authorities. The new histories are based largely on oral stories and not subject to normal testing for verisimilitude. The principal problem, however, is not the over-reliance on oral tradition but the lack of balance among heroes and villains, exaggerations in claims to uniqueness and wisdom, and an omission of alternatives stories of neighbouring groups (including early Russian settlers) an absence which is obvious to all neighbours and many of their own citizens. In terms of civic values, under the circumstances, many faculty are doing an excellent job. The problem, particularly in EKSU, is there is little support from the administration underpinning the moral principles in need of reinforcement. There is an absence of empirical data on corruption. There are no student or faculty codes of conduct; no reports of trends, no punishments announced nor awards for resistance to temptation. There is silence and rumour. To uphold standards when the standards are not even written, much less clear, may be too much to expect. In terms of community relations, most universities have not yet understood its importance and may not be able to focus on this problem for a generation or more. In terms of equity of representation, the discussion is in its infancy. There will be discussion, but governments will continue to be too nervous to allow surveys of student backgrounds. Until then

debate will include only impressionistic claim and counter claim. In terms of academic freedom, except at AUCA, there is little testing of the water. With the new international connections to universities in Europe, the issue can be expected to become more important and more common at TSU. This would be true of all universities which have close relations with Europe.

In general it can be said that in spite of the considerable differences in precedent and local conditions, that the faculty in each of these three universities were very concerned about having a moral and attitudinal effect on their students. It is possible to conclude that they understood that their effect was expected to be broader than to provide technical skills. And it is fair to conclude that part of the way in which they see their responsibility is to make social cohesion in their society more possible.

REFERENCES

Almond, G. A. & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Anderson, C. A. (1952). *School and society in England: Social backgrounds of Oxford and Cambridge University students.* Annals of American Research (Public Affairs Press).

Anderson, C. A. (1956). Social status of university students. *Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology, 5*, 51-63.

Anderson, C. A. (1975). Expanding educational opportunity: Conceptualization and measurement. *Higher Education, 4*, 393-400.

Berger, P. (1999). *The limits of social cohesion.* Westview Press.

Blasi, P. (2005). Science as practice: Extending university autonomy by combining research and teaching. In Observatory for Fundamental University Values and Rights (Ed.), *Managing university autonomy: University autonomy and the institutional balancing of teaching and research* (pp. 159-178). Bologna: Bononia University Press.

Bowman, M. J. (1962). Land grant colleges and universities in human development. *The Journal of Economic History, 22*(4), 523-546.

Braxton, J. M. & Bayer, A. E. (1999). *Faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Colatrella, C. & Alkana, J. (1994). *Cohesion and dissent in America.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1987). Norms as social capital. In G. Radmitzky & P. Bernholz (Eds.), *Economic imperialism* (pp. 133-155). New York: Pergon Press

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*, 95-120.

Centre for Civics Education (1994). *National standards for civics and governance.* Calabasas, CA: National Centre for Civics Education

Daxner, M. (2004). *Academic freedom and university institutional responsibilities in South Eastern Europe.* Bologna: Bononia University Press.

Desjardins, R. (2001). The effects of learning on economic well-being: A comparative analysis. *Peabody Journal of Education, 76*(3-4), 141-153.

Durkheim, E. (1997). *Suicide: A study in sociology.* New York: Free Press.

Dreeben, R. (1967). The contribution of schooling to the learning of social norms. *Harvard Education Review, 73*(2), 211-237.

Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education.* Washington: ACE/Oryx.

Feinberg, W. (2000). *Common schools/uncommon identities, cultural differences and national unity.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Gibbons, M. (2005). Engagement with the community: A new basis for university autonomy in a knowledge society. In Observatory for Fundamental University Values and Rights (Ed.), *Managing university autonomy: University autonomy and the institutional balancing of teaching and research* (pp. 121-150). Bologna: Bononia University Press.

Gintis, H. (1971). Education, technology and the characteristics of worker productivity. *American Economic Review*, *61*, 266-279.
Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Harbison, F. H. & Myers, C. A. (1964). *Education, manpower and economic growth: Strategies of human resource development.* New York: McGraw Hill Publishers.
Heyneman, S. P. (1995). Economics of education: Disappointments and potential. *Prospects*, *XXV*(4), 559-583.
Heyneman, S. P. (1997a). Economic development and the international trade in education reform. *Prospects*, *XXVII*(4), 501-530.
Heyneman, S. P. (1997b). Educational choice in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. *Education Economics*, *5*(3), 333-339.
Heyneman, S. P. (1997c). Education and social stability in Russia. *Compare*, *27*(1), 5-18.
Heyneman, S. P. (1998). The transition from party/state to open democracy: The role of education. *International Journal of Education Development*, *18*(1), 21-40.
Heyneman, S. P. (2000a). From the party/state to multi-ethnic democracy: Education and social cohesion in Europe and Central Asia. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *22*(2), 173-191.
Heyneman, S. P. (2000b). A renewed sense of purpose of schooling: Education and social cohesion in Africa, Latin America, Asia and Europe and Central Asia (Co-authored with S. Todoric-Bebic). *Prospects*, *XXX*(2), 145-166.
Heyneman, S. P. (2001). *Education: A passport to social cohesion and economic prosperity* (Co-authored with G. Catlaks & I. Dedze). Riga: Soros Foundation.
Heyneman, S. P. (2002/3). Defining the influence of education on social cohesion. *International Journal of Education Policy, Research and Practice*, *2*(4), 73-97.
Heyneman, S. P. (2003a). Education, social cohesion and the role of international organizations. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *78*(3), 25-38.
Heyneman, S. P. (2003b). Education and misconduct. *Encyclopaedia of education,* Vol. 6, pp. 1659-1668 (Ed. J. Guthrie). New York: Macmillan Publishers.
Heyneman, S. P. (2003c). Education and social cohesion. *Encyclopaedia of education*, Vol. 6, pp. 2242-2250 (Ed. J. Guthrie). New York: Macmillan Publishers.
Heyneman, S. P. (2004a). Education and corruption. *International Journal of Education Development*, *24*(6).
Heyneman, S. P. (2004b). Corruption in education – Is it a problem of education or society as a whole? *School Director* (Moscow) *3*, 3-11. С. Хайнеман «Коррупция в образовании – проблема самого образования или общества в целом С. 3-11. *«Директор школы»* №3, 2004.
Heyneman, S. P. (Ed.) (2004c). Organizations and social cohesion. *Peabody Journal of Education*, special issue.
Heyneman, S. P., Anderson, K. H., & Nuraliyeva, N. (2008). The cost of corruption in higher education. *Comparative Education Review*, *51*(2), 1-25.
Hrabak, M., Vujaklija, A., Vodopivec, I., Hren, D., & Marusic, A. (2004) Academic misconduct among medical students in a post-communist country. *Medical Education*, *38*(3), 276-285.
Hyman, H. H. & Wright, C. R. (1979). *Education's lasting influence on values.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Inkeles, A. & Smith, D. H. (1974). *Becoming modern.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Kerkvliet, J. (1994). Cheating by economics students: A comparison of survey results. *Journal of Economic Education*, *25*(2), 121-351.
Lipset, S. M (1959). Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, *53*, 69-105.
Moiseyenko, O. (2004). Higher education and social cohesion. *Peabody Journal of Education*, special issue on *Organizations and social cohesion* (Ed. S. P. Heyneman) (forthcoming).
Mansbridge, J. J. (1989). *Beyond self-interest.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nowell, C. & Laufer, D. (1997). Undergraduate student cheating in the fields of business and economics. *Journal of Economic Education*, *28*, 3-12.
Olson, M. (1965). *The logic of collective action: Public goods and the theory of groups.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Olson, M. (1982). *The rise and decline of nations.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2001). *The well being of nations: The role of human and social capital.* Paris: OECD.
Perkin, H. (1984). The historical perspective. In B. Clark (Ed.), *Perspective on higher education: Eight disciplinary and comparative views* (pp. 17-55). Berkeley: University of California Press.
Psacharopoulos, G., Tan, J. P., & Jiménez, E. (1986). *Financing education in developing countries: An exploration of policy options* Washington, DC: The World Bank.
Powell, W. W. & DiMaggio, P. (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Puryear, J. M. (1994). *Thinking politics: Intellectuals and democracy in Chile 1973-1988.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Ravitch, D. (2003). *The language police: How pressure groups restrict what students learn.* New York: Knopf.
Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Sen, A. (2005). *The argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian history, culture and identity.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and violence.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Teixeira, A. A. C. & Roacha, M. F. (2006). Academic cheating in Austria, Portugal, Romania, and Spain: A comparative analysis. *Research in Comparative and International Education, 1*(3), 198-209.
Task force on Higher Education and Society (2004). Moderated discussion: The task force on higher education and society. *Comparative Education Review, 48*(1), 70-88.
Verba, S., Nie, N., & Kim, J. (1978). *Participation and political equality: A seven nation comparison.* London: Cambridge University Press.
World Bank (1994). *Higher education: Lessons of experience.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.
World Bank (1995). *Priorities and strategies for education.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.
World Bank (2000, March). *Higher education in developing countries: Peril and promise.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.
World Bank (2001). *Constructing knowledge societies: New challenges for tertiary education.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

AFFILIATIONS

Stephen P. Heyneman
Peabody College
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee
USA

BOJAN MARICIK

MODELS OF CORRUPTION AND HOW STUDENTS COULD RESPOND

Corruption Experienced by the Students during Their Studies in Macedonia and Their Anticorruption Measures

INTRODUCTION

In South Eastern Europe after the fall of the Berlin wall a period of social, political and economic transition took place. There was an absence of good governance, transparency and accountability in public institutions. Because of a lack of legal enforcement stakeholders took advantage of the situation. The education system was no exception and the result was education corruption. Education corruption is more important than corruption in other areas. The educational process is crucial in the shaping of a young person's personality and one of the main stages of socialization. If young people become used to corruptive and manipulative behaviour as a means for advancing that damage cannot be remedied later.

This analysis will explain some of the causes, conditions and models of corruption within higher education in Macedonia. These have been recognized by students through different surveys conducted by different non-government organizations including the Foundation Open Society Institute – Macedonia (in the further text FOSIM). In May, 2003 FOSIM sampled 2000 students from three main Macedonian universities (Sts Cyril and Methodius, Skopje, University St. Kliment Ohridski Bitola and the University of South East Europe in Tetovo). In addition to the evidence from Macedonia the paper will draw on a broader set of influences including the legal framework proposed through the Law on higher education (Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia No. 35/08 and 103/08) and the impact of the European Credit-Transfer system. This analysis will also draw upon the work of the Youth Educational Forum, a non for profit organization responsible for raising the corruption issue and suggesting the first regulatory actions to be taken.

DEFINING THE PROBLEM AND FACTORS FOR OCCURRENCE

From a student's perspective, corruption could be defined as any kind of manipulation which breaches the legal, moral, ethical and functional rules and regulations of the process of higher education. In this sense corruption could

S.P. Heyneman (ed.), Buying Your Way into Heaven, 109–119.