

# New Europe College Yearbook 1999-2000



---

CĂTĂLIN CIOABĂ  
OVIDIU CONSTANTIN CRISTEA  
MIHAELA CZOBOR-LUPP  
MĂDĂLINA DIACONU  
ȘTEFAN GHENCIULESCU  
SORIN IONIȚĂ  
MARIUS LAZĂR  
GEORGIAN TIBERIU MUSTAȚĂ  
TOADER NICOARĂ  
IOAN I.C. OPRÎȘ  
ROBERT D. REISZ

---

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright © 2003 – New Europe College

ISBN 973 –85697 – 7 – X

NEW EUROPE COLLEGE

Str. Plantelor 21

023971 Bucharest

Romania

Tel. (+40-21) 327.00.35, Fax (+40-21) 327.07.74

E-mail: nec@nec.ro



## **ROBERT D. REISZ**

Born in 1964, in Timisoara

Ph.D., University of Timisoara, 2000

Dissertation: *Mathematical Models Using Stochastic Automata over Infinite Words*

Associate Professor, Faculty of Mathematics, University of Timisoara

Member of the Romanian Society of Mathematical Sciences

Member of the Romanian Society of Political Sciences

Member in the editorial board of *Educatio*, Budapest

Member in the editorial board of *Romanian Journal of Political Science*,  
Bucharest

Participation in international conferences and symposia in Romania, Bulgaria,  
Finland, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Switzerland, United Kingdom,  
and Netherlands

Contributions to several books, papers and studies published in Romania,  
Germany, Hungary, Lituania, Poland, United Kingdom, Netherlands

Several research, consulting and expertise contracts for Joint East European Center for Democratic Education and Governance, Budapest; Otto Benecke Foundation, Bonn; AES, Kassel; Civic Education Project; Council of Europe; World Bank; DAAD; László Teleki Alapítvány Magyar Külügyi Intézet, Budapest; Hungarian Institute for Educational Sciences; DKMT Euroregion, etc.

# OPINIONS AND STRATEGIES OF ROMANIAN ACADEMICS RELATED TO EMIGRATION

“Am Besten ist es anderswo,  
Denn hier bin ich sowieso.”

Wilhelm Busch

The myth of the milk and honey flooded Canaan, of a wonderful country where “we all should move” (Crnjanski, 1992) seems to be endemic. The recourse to a “promised land” as an escape from a dim daily life can be found in the religious songs of the African-American, the dreams that supported the cohesion of the Jewish people as well as in the great adventure of the transatlantic migrations from the last century. The individual or collective search of the Promised Land has always been intermingled with the nostalgia of the paradise lost and the myth of the golden age, becoming a reason for migration. Still, how within a group of persons migration selects some and not others seems to have no clear and simple law. My goal is to take a closer look at a well determined and in many characteristics homogenous social group to find elements that relate to the different degrees of emigration propensity and the different ideologies upon emigration. The importance of the ideology upon emigration in the academic field lies not only in the relatively high numbers of academics currently emigrating from Romania, but even more in the general image academia offers on emigration and transmits through the invisible curriculum in the university.

After giving definitions and short descriptions of the thematic elements of research, I will present the general hypotheses and I will particularise these to reach operational forms, which the empirical research could verify or reject. I will also present a series of basic results relevant to this context. A further part of the theoretical elements of the paper will deal with a comparison between migration and academic mobility as two

different strategies of personal realisation in the academic field. I have tried to identify in my sample the persons that subscribe to one of these two strategies and will present a comparison of these two groups.

The main subject of my research, **migration** is a total social phenomenon (Sandu, 1996) being in the same time juridical, economical, social, demographical and cultural, engaging a large number of individuals and groups. Following the definition of the total social phenomenon (Mauss, 1993) I recognise three social systems involved in the process, the community of origin, the community of destination and the migratory group. Migrations are a research subject not only to social studies, but also to social psychology, demographical studies, law, economical sciences, cultural studies, etc. Even more, the study of the migratory behaviour and the phenomena of migration in general can lead to a better knowledge of societies as a whole. Any research on a field of such interdisciplinarity will have to determine as clearly as possible its boundaries in methodological and problematical terms. If methodologically I subscribe to the area of empirical social science research, the description of the scope of research still needs a series of preliminary steps.

## 1. Definitions and preliminaries

**Migration** is generally defined as the relatively permanent change of residence over a significant distance. At least two terms of this definition need clarifications.

First of all, what is *relatively permanent*? In migration studies two different approaches have been proposed to solve this dilemma.

One functionalist point of view eludes the setting in a strict time period to look for the role of migration. As such, a migration would be a change of residence that leads to a participation in some economical activity at the place of destination or that is determined by such a participation of a member of the primary group. The participation in legal economical activities can nevertheless be delayed for quite a while without producing remigration, especially in the cases in which the motivations of migration have been of political nature. The intentions of the mobile person to move for a long period to the place of destination can also be rarely known. Certain parts of legal international migration that need special visas are the only ones for which these informations

exist. But these represent a small part of the social phenomena that can be considered under the definition of migration.

In need of a demographical and juridical setting of the phenomenon, a recommendation of the United Nations (U.N.O., 1949) accepted by the majority of member states defines migration as the change of residence over a period longer than one year. Even if less logical from a conceptual point of view, the international acceptance of such a definition can allow for the comparison of national statistics on migration and, even if with a delay of a year, can allow for a simple and general setting of the migratory act.

The second problem of the mentioned definition is that of *significant distance*. The change of residence within the same town is not migration, while the move to another country is. Between these two extremes, the problem can become sometimes difficult to decide. It is generally accepted that migration is a change of residence that implies a change of cultural context. The significant distance can as such be seen as a cultural distance and not a geographical one. A move from a rural area to an urban one is usually considered migration, the move from a poorer part of a country to a richer one as well (e.g. the migration from southern Italy to the northern part of the country, or from Moldavia to Banat in Romania, both in the period following the Second World War). Let us not forget that a change of residence from one country to another (e.g. between some Scandinavian states or within the European Union) might mean a smaller change in cultural context than a move from a village in Siberia to St. Petersburg. Geographical distances can also be smaller when moving from one side of a border to the other, than during changes of residence within a country. A series of migrations very important during the history of mankind can hardly be considered in such a framework. Just to mention the period generally named as the period of the great migrations.

An administrative solution can also be mentioned in this context. The U.S. Bureau of Census considers a move the change of residence within the same county, while a migration is the change of residence from one county to another. This second group is subsequently divided between same-state migration, bordering-state migration and non-bordering-state migration. Such a classification does not take into account the rural-urban migrations as a different category.

The subject of my research is international migration.

**International migration** is a migration that implies a change of residence from one country to another. Such migrations differ from those within the

same country, also named internal migrations, by a series of factors. In the definition the change of community or cultural environment will be taken by the change of country of residence. This will ease the setting of the phenomena. The problem that appears in parallel with this ease of the position of the researcher is the difference that often exist between the ways statistical data is collected in different countries. These differences lead to the missing of many persons from migration statistics.

The characteristics that separate international migration from internal are mainly those of juridical nature. If internal migration is rarely subject of barriers of any kind, international migration usually is. The modern time restrictions know their beginnings with the 1919 restrictions to immigration in British Palestine and the 1921 and 1924 acts that excluded Asian emigration to the United States. Restrictions to leave a country have existed in all totalitarian regimes of this century. These restrictions generally limit international migration and reduce the propensity for it.

Another characteristic of international migration that cannot be found in the case of internal migration is the determination of migration by political reasons. Modern states being homogenous from a political point of view and often also from a legal point of view, the only way of escaping persecution on political, ethnical, racial or other reasons is international migration. Such migrations that are forced by environments that tend to endanger ones physical integrity are usually called self-exiles or exiles, considering them similar to the changes of residence that are produced by a legal decision (the classical meaning of exile).

In the current research I followed just one of the faces of the phenomenon of international migration, that is emigration, the social fact of leaving ones country. The majority of studies that have been conducted in Western countries deal with the problems of immigration, investigating adapting, assimilation, keeping of cultural identity, effects upon the labour market of the destination country, demography, etc. The problem of emigration contains usually two essential themes, the problem of motility or propensity to emigrate and the problem of the community that is left behind. Next to these, the current liberalisation of international contacts in almost the whole world has brought up the theme of total and partial remigration, and specially the so-called functional remigration.

A clarification is needed regarding the degree of freedom involved in the decision to emigrate. According to the U.N.O. population movements as deportations, refugee groups resulted from actions of ethnic cleansing, etc. are not migrations (U.N.O., 1953). I will only consider those changes



of place of residence where the decision to emigrate was taken by the subject or a member of its family or other form of primary group. Exile, in the proper sense of the word is as such not migration. As my interest lies in the construction of an emigration ideology most evidently, I am interested in the situations this ideology evolves in without being a direct result of external pressure.

**Motility** is the individual ability to engage in acts of mobility. The term can be used for social mobility as well as for geographical mobility. In my case, motility is used as synonymous with the propensity to migrate.

**Ideologies** are generally systems of beliefs or belief substitutes (preconceived ideas, etc.) used explicitly to orient human action at individual or social level. Social level ideologies are since the last century coagulated along the lines of: conservatism, liberalism, and socialism (Wallerstein, 1995). On the individual level there exist ideologies that fundament the individual strategies, family structure, relation to community, state, etc.

According to Romanian sociologist Dumitru Sandu (1999) opinions about emigration in particular and migration in general are part of ideological constructs. **Emigration ideologies** seem to have a direct impact upon action being independent from the resources or information the actors are holding (De Jong, Sandu, 1998). The central subject of my research will be the search for various variables that are correlated, positively or negatively with motility and with the defining terms of the emigration ideology – is it good or bad, is it a choice only for the young, etc.

**Individual strategies** are quasi-algorithmic constructions intended to foresee and plan ones life, usually constructed around a certain goal to be fulfilled. Not all individuals view their future according to this paradigm. Still, academics are particularly inclined towards such kinds of constructs, as we will see in my later considerations.

The second defining term of the study is the **population** under scrutiny. The group of **academics** is easy to define and relatively well described in official statistics. Let me try to describe in the following academics in their particularities that differentiate them from the rest of the population and coagulate the group in the same time. I have considered for the benefit of this research academics as persons employed full time in higher education institutions on teaching positions. I constructed the relatively small sample (210 persons) of the undertaken empirical research by a multistadial method, selecting according to university location, discipline,

and academic degree. There have been considered 5 locations (Bucharest, Iasi, Cluj, Timisoara and Sibiu) covering all historical regions of Romania. The distribution upon disciplines has considered a grouping of the disciplines in six categories: Humanities and social sciences, Economical sciences and law, Human and veterinarian medicine, Natural sciences and mathematics, Engineering, Arts and sports. The sample survey was conducted in April – May, 2000 using self-administered questionnaires that have been distributed and collected by operators. The survey was possible due to the generous support of the New Europe College.

This sampling method was based on considerations upon the high homogeneity of the population in many major elements. Let me describe these.

A scanning of the particularities of academia has to begin with the mentioning of their membership in an age group (between 23 and 70 years) and an educational level (higher education graduates). The gender distribution (approx. 35% women) and the nationality distribution are also different from those existing on a national level. Let me mention here that even if the gender distribution has not been controlled, the percentage resulted within a reasonable interval from the theoretical value (37%). These characteristics of the independent variables are not the only ones that interest us, as working in academia brings even greater homogeneity to the group of research.

From a staffing point of view, academics form an administratively stratified population, with exactly known volumes of the strata and clear promotion rules. The strata (in the Romanian denominations these are: *preparator, asistent, lector, conferentiar, profesor*) are ordered and promotion can take place with only one step. Even if theoretically recruitment can take place in any of the strata and retention is also possible from any of the strata, empirical evidence shows that most of the entries in the structure take place in the two lower strata, while exits take place more or less from all strata, with some preference for the higher ones.

Demographically and professionally, the strata have progressively different characteristics, specific for hierarchically stratified staffing systems. E.g., the percentage of women and of ethnic minorities declines in the higher strata. The income, age average, prestige and decision making power are directly related to the level of the strata.

Basic differences to other hierarchically stratified staffing systems result from the particularities of academic labour. Each academic is supposed

to engage in two main forms of activities: teaching and research. Next to these, a growing proportion of the time of academics is taken by administrative activities in their own benefit as well as in the benefit of the organisational structures he/she belongs to (chair, department, faculty, institution or research group, research centre, etc.). This threefold activity leads next to some cases of specialisation also to cases of equilibrium. These are probably the most prestige building situations in the academic field.

The setting of academic activity in an environment has known different models of paradigmatic value during the history of higher education systems. To be able to describe these and to find the origins of the present system I will have to take a short look back. Medieval higher education presented itself under two major models, which have also been named the Pembroke model and the Bologna model (de Winter Hebron, 1993). The first university or at least the first educational institution that used the name was the University of Bologna, at the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century. Very different from the modern universities, the University of Bologna was actually organised and administered by its students. Wealthy people in search of knowledge, these hired professors to educate them. Most evidently such an institution was directed primarily to fulfil its teaching mission and to serve the community of its stakeholders. On the other hand, we will have to consider the old English universities from Oxford and Cambridge, monastic institutions economically supported by foundations (the first of these was set up by the Duke of Pembroke) meant to research the holy books and transmit their wisdom. If on the line of the Bologna model we can consider as further developments the Napoleonic vocational system as well as the modern Anglo-Saxon universities with their "fitness for purpose", the Pembroke model can be regarded as a forerunner of the Humboldtian paradigm that centres the higher education system around the researcher-professor in the lonely search of truth ("In einsamer Suche der Wahrheit"). The genealogy of higher education systems is not devoid of interest if one has to study value systems that these universities cultivate and transmit. In previous writings, I have tried to put these two systems in parallel also naming them output-oriented and process-oriented higher education (Reisz, 1994b). The development of the Romanian higher education system of the last decade has brought these models to a quasi-symbiosis. The communist period was clearly a reinforcement of the teaching and service element of the higher education system to the loss of the research element. The polytechnisation on Soviet

model and the transfer of all funded research to the institutes of the Romanian Academy were elements of this policy. On this basis we are currently witnessing a come-back of the Humboldtian model mitigated by the much talked about reintroduction of academic freedom, as well as the accreditation and evaluation systems that are primarily based on elements related to personnel and scientific activity. All major policy moves of the Ministry of Education during the last decade have been concerned with the status of the academic or have evaluated academic activities as activities of the academics. The pre-eminence of any of the two mentioned models determines largely the higher prestige that is granted within the group to one or the other of academic activities. As such, within the Humboldtian (or Pembroke) model an overvaluation of research activities tends to be the case, teaching becoming just a kind of necessary evil. On the other hand, the model of the teaching university can often lose its scientific academic character and with it the so important valuation of independent critical thinking. During the current research, I could also gather some data on the value systems of Romanian academics that will be presented later on. Nevertheless, as much should be said that the prevailing values of Romanian academics seem to be mainly influenced by the Humboldtian model, as most Continental Europe is. The highest values seem to lie in the complex of scientificity, research and truth, rather than fitness, adequacy, modernity, and usefulness. I will return later to discuss how the value systems of academics relate to emigration ideologies and motility.

According to a very often mentioned model of Burton Clark (Clark, 1983) the identity of academics can be defined within a two dimensional matrix that has on one axis the higher education institutions and on the other the scientific disciplines. So, each academic belongs on the one hand to the institution he works at with all its geographical determinations including cultural, national elements while on the other hand he is part of the "invisible college" that unites all academics of a scientific "nation" positioned in a territory of knowledge defined by the discipline he subscribes to. The invisible college as well as the visible one contain persons that are acquainted, that have common rules, value systems, specific rituals and ways of socialisation (Becher, 1989). Disciplines build their own languages, go to war for certain territories of knowledge or sometimes collaborate. There exist neighbouring disciplines as well as disciplines that will probably never meet. It is a fact that this belonging to an invisible college projects the academic outside of his national

system of higher education in the non-ethnocentric world of knowledge. Ideally, the academic has to have a double self-image as a citizen of a country and as a "citizen" of a scientific discipline. Such a characteristic has to influence in a way or another its opinions upon emigration as well as its motility. To eliminate the oversimplification that the correlation of motility with disciplinary cultures is determined by the better prospects of integration for certain disciplines as regarded to others I also had to consider more intimate characteristics of the studied population. It is well known that certain disciplines produce a higher cohesion of the invisible college than others do (Clarke, 1983). Such disciplines are those that elude in a high degree the importance of national languages, as are mathematics, computer science, etc. There also exist disciplines that know in a certain period an increase of international activities, that leads to a higher number of international conferences and joint research teams. This was the case of physics for a relatively long period around the middle of the century; this seems to be nowadays the case of genetic engineering, computer science and even of some social sciences. Let us mention that a reverse causality is also possible, as is the more reduced motility or more negative emigration ideology in the case of disciplines that have nationally determined fields of interest, as are language and literature studies.

An important characteristic in the context of opinions about emigration is the clear separation in two generations of academics that has existed for the past years in Romanian higher education (Reisz, 1994a). Post-war Romanian higher education has known three periods of expansion, which in what regards employment of academics can be positioned in the 1948-1950, 1961-1968 and 1990-1993 periods. As the persons that entered the system during the first expansion (the polytechnisation and sovietisation of the system) have already retired, I could sense that during the 90s two generations of academics were active, the generation of the "defrost" and that of the revolution, representing as good as all the academics employed in the system. Between these two, a gap of almost 20 years exists, next to large value system differences that also influence their opinions upon emigration. It is well known that motility is considerably higher at young adults, than any other generation group. Still we will realise that biological age is less important in the academic field than academic position and in the Romanian case, the year of recruitment in the system. If former investigations in the Romanian academic field have lead to the recognition of a certain numerical equilibrium of the

generations, I can now state according to the current data that the older generation, as expected, began to leave the system and currently represents only 28%, while the young generation represents 66%.

Let us mention another characteristic of academic life. Higher education systems always imply a certain participation of the academic in the decision-making system of the institution, even if dependent on the degree of autonomy from the state. It might be only the choice of the way to organise a seminar or course or even a participation in the organisation of the whole activity of the institution. Nevertheless, the academic has a certain freedom to decide upon his daily labour that is unspecific to most economical activities. Universities are loosely coupled systems (Trow, 1984), each of the subunits has a much larger autonomy than in the case of economical enterprises of similar size. This participation to the decision-making system of the institution has to be seen differently from one institution to the other, but always determines a more evident belonging of the academic to the higher education institution. If previously mentioned characteristics have supported the opinion of a higher motility and a more positive emigration ideology from part of the academics than others, this might reduce to some degree their propensity to migrate.

Other independent variables that have not represented part of the sampling variables but have resulted from the survey underline even more the homogeneity of the population. Over 80% of academics have an urban origin and have been educated in urban schools. 80% of academics have at least one of their parents having highschool education or more; while over half of them have at least one of the parents having higher education. The knowledge of foreign languages is also higher in academia than throughout the population of the country. Academics speak on average 2.4 foreign languages; almost 90% speak English, while 75% speak French. On the third position there is German with approx. 30% of cases. Only three persons of the sample have declared no foreign languages at all.

## **2. Ideologies and Motility**

Survey conducted in different periods and geographical areas (Rossi, 1955; Appleyard, 1964; Cuceu Branda e.a., 1997) lead us to the following main motivations for emigration:

- economical (generally the search for employment);
- family related (the rebuilding of a family or the accompanying of a family member);
- political (avoiding political, racial, ethnical, etc. persecution).

Let us realise that each of the upper categories include attractive ("pull") and repulsive ("push") characteristics. Such are, for instance, the employment opportunities at the destination and the high unemployment at the source of migration for many of the economically motivated migrations. Other less important motives for emigration that have been reported by the mentioned studies include educational opportunities, medical treatments, clima, etc.

All the mentioned motivations are related to the social environment of the potential emigrant, respectively her/his relation with this environment. Which are the independent variables that particularise the actor that favour migration?

Social research did not find too many variables relevantly correlated with the propensity to migrate. The most important, always found result is that emigration selects persons from the group of the young adults (the exact interval depends on historical period and geographical location) (Petersen, 1961; Eldridge, 1964). For current day Romania, it is the 20 – 35 years age group (Sandu, 1999). Different studies tried to prove that either those with a higher intellectual and occupational potential emigrate or those with a lower one are more tempted to emigrate (Hofstee, 1952; Lee, 1966). The first of the two hypothesis is based on the fact that the more intelligent ones are able to react faster to opportunities, while the second theory holds that those with a higher potential succeed in realising a good social position at the place of origin while the lesser gifted ones have to search for their luck otherwise. Different migrational flows seem to conform to one or the other of the theories. Rural-urban migration typically are of the first kind, while urban-rural remigrations of the second kind.

The theoretical variable considered to relate to highest degree with motility is the intensity of personal attachment to the place of origin. Even if hard to operationalise, and as such, to measure, this value can be theoretically correlated with objective variables such as nationality, mother tongue, etc. I found that a way to approach this latent variable is also the positive-negative view of the general development of the country

and the optimism regarding individual and collective fate. Another variable that has been mentioned in emigration research was called "spirit of adventure". (Cuceu Branda e.a., 1997)

There are as such a series of favouring factors and certain particularities of the social environment and of the contact of the individual with this environment that converg towards the act of emigration. I will in the following try to introduce two hypotheses that I will name the "weak hypothesis" and the "strong hypothesis".

**Weak hypothesis.** Migrations are socio-economically determined. Geographical mobility is actually an attempt at social mobility. The emigrant or the person that determines the emigration of a group finds a gap between the possibilities of social and economical progress in the area of origin and the area of destination. Her/his insertion in the reference group in the country of origin are viewed as being less satisfactory as the opportunity offered by the destination of migration. The geographically mobile individual, as the socially mobile one, tries to reach a better level of social and economical integration. The improvement of social insertion, although almost never realised, appears very often in the rationalising of emigration. This discourse is, especially for the highly educated ones, centered on the lack of social recognition, a lack of recognition that is more often then not generalised from the individual person to a generational or occupational group.

The proof of success of the emigration strategy is on the other hand almost always the achievement of superior income.

A special case is represented by emigrations that are caused by deficient social insertions determined by a form of restriction of civil rights. In this case, the opportunities in the origin country are limited by status and social mobility can indeed take place after the lifting of the barriers. The limitations can be formal as were for instance the laws that limited Jewish involvement in certain economical activities in war-time Romania, or informal as are the limitations in the occupational alternatives in the Roma minority today.

**Strong hypothesis.** The potential emigrant lives according to a value system that is not adequate to the preponderent value system of the social environment she/he lives in (Sloeterdijk, 1999). Realising to a certain degree this imperfect socialisation, the individual projects his own value system in an outside space which he identifies with the destination of the migration. Emigration is then a search of self, or more exactly a search for the proper environment for the self; an environment in which the



personal value system corresponds to the values and norms of the majority. The inadequacy of the potential emigrant in his place of origin produces a state of insecurity interpretable as a lack of an adequate social project. Emigration is then a deviational strategy resulted from an incompatibility of value systems and an opportunity.

The hypotheses above are not two basically different explanations of emigration, but two explanations at different levels of analysis. Let us justify the names of weak and strong hypothesis. A strong hypothesis is generally considered a hypothesis that is sufficient to prove all propositions of a given theory. In particular, all the possible weak hypotheses would have to result as conclusions of a strong hypothesis. The weak hypothesis on the other hand will have to be able to explain some of the propositions involved in the theory, but not necessarily all of them. In particular, the strong hypothesis could not be a consequence of the weak one. Let us see if the upper propositions could fit this theoretical framework. I will test for this purpose only the logical relation between the two hypotheses.

Let us suppose that the weak hypothesis is true and see if the strong hypothesis could be resulted of it. That would mean that the weak hypothesis would imply the strong hypothesis. In other words, either the negation of the weak hypothesis or the strong hypothesis is true. To prove that this is not the case is equivalent with proving that the weak hypothesis and the negation of the strong one could be true in the same time. That is, that there could exist situations in which the actor chooses emigration from economical reasons even if his value system was perfectly adequate to the home country. Such a statement could be considered as logically consistent as long as the strong hypothesis is not proven, even more in countries, or social groups within countries in which emigration is positively valued, as is the case, according to the survey results, in the Romanian higher education sector.

Let us see if the strong hypothesis implies the weak one. Let us then consider a potential migrant that according to the strong hypothesis has a value system inadequate to his social environment. In this case, his social insertion is at least in some degree deficient. Even if he is not necessarily a deviant, the respective individual will consider its position as being unsatisfactory. If he would decide to make the step to emigrate to find the environment fitting his values system, he will also do it to correct the unsatisfactory social insertion. So, emigration could at a more superficial level of explanation be considered as being according to the weak hypothesis.

### **3. Particularisation of the Hypotheses**

In the following section I will try to see what relevance the two upper hypotheses have in my particular case, that of the Romanian higher education sector.

The weak hypothesis has evidently a clear relevance to the case of the Romanian higher education sector. The bad economical situation of Romanian academics is not only a case of perception and the opportunity for a better economical situation in the case of emigration is obvious, even if a certain loss of social standing can result from the possible exit from the academic world. In the discourses that justify the choice to emigrate of academics, I could also sense this motivation in a veiled form as "the lack of recognition of the social importance" of the profession or of research, or "the lack of horizon of scientific development". Both motivations can in fact be translated into the bad financing of the education and research sector. Knowing that the generational group that has the relevantly higher propensity to emigrate is facing a bi-generational system in which, even if larger in numbers it holds almost no decision making positions at all, it is easy to find the motivations by professional as well as generational lack of recognition. Recognition is expected both from the institutional as from the national leadership.

This is also supported by the fact that, according to our survey, over 50% of academics consider that their professional position would be better abroad, while almost 80% that their material position would be better.

A much more interesting problem would be to realise if the strong hypothesis could have standing in the context of the Romanian higher education system. It is the case that to as much as one quarter of the sample there exist other reasons to emigrate beside the economical ones. And this quarter includes as good as all those that intend to emigrate. Have indeed these academics a different value system then others? It is the case that academics have passed through a different socialisation then others. The disciplinary structures they belong to have imposed on them a specific socialisation, while the profession of higher education teacher promotes certain values common to all disciplines or to groups of disciplines. Scientific disciplines have admission requirements in their ranks, that include formal educational steps as well as the acquisition of a language of the discipline, a way of thinking, a research methodology and not least a value system. Each discipline has an at least partially personal point of view of what is well-done, value-holding research.

Primary values of disciplines are sometimes very different. While some rate positively pragmatism, rigourosity, etc., other prefer relevance, originality, or beauty. Constantin Noica considers that each of the sciences as well as the arts, languages, etc. are in fact nothing else then subsets of a comprehensive value system that is a certain culture (Noica, 1993). Of course, there also exist values common to the academic profession determined by the character of the specific academic activities (teaching and research). An interesting sketch of the academic value system was constructed by Burton R. Clark (1983). These values seem not to be discrepante from the values of the majority of the population. If I would have to explain the increased proportion of emigrating academics as compared to the populational average I would mainly refer to the much higher number of opportunities academics have. Nevertheless, it is not a comparison between academics and the rest of the population that I intend but a comparison within the academic field. In such a case a difference between value systems of the more or less tempted to emigrate could be sensed if the strata of the academic population of different motility or of different emigration ideology would have consistent differences in measurable elements of their value systems or measurable variables that are known to be value system forming, as are the scientific disciplines, as well as the socio-demographical origin, gender, etc.

#### **4. General Results of the Sample Survey**

I will present some direct results of the sample survey as these give the overall image of the ideology on emigration that is dominant in the Romanian higher education sector. The perception of academics has been tested with a series of questions related to emigration and to those who emigrate.

54.5% of the sample consider that the best graduates are emigrating, while less then 3% think the best stay in Romania. This might or might not be the case, but the positive selection that emigration seems to represent increases its valuation in the academic sector. Obviously, the best of the graduates are the more visible ones to their professors. Nevertheless, these data have to be considered perceptions, as it is not usual to Romanian higher education to conduct graduate surveys.

On the other hand, more then half of those questioned consider that a young researcher could do more good in another country. This question

was intended to be ambiguous, the meaning of “good” not being explained in more detail. The intention was to get an indication, along with other following questions on the value system of the responding academic. So, the question partly intended to find out what academics consider a more important “good”. According to the distribution of results, the greater value is granted in academia to the scientific relevance of their work, it is here that the possibilities of the mentioned “young researcher” would be better abroad. Only 10% of those questioned have considered that more “good” can be done outside the higher education sector than inside. This is a clear indicator of the mistrust academia has for the real economy and extra-university research. On the other hand, it is an indicator of the regained Humboldtianism of Romanian higher education and the valuation of the “truth” rather than the “service” academics can produce.

So, the best graduates emigrate and should do so because that is where they could do more “good”. But, do they succeed? Romanian academics say that most do. The maximal choice in the success question (“succeeded in life and gained recognition of their adoptive country”) was selected by almost 40% of those answering, while only 3.4% considered that those emigrating from Romania did not integrate in their host societies.

The overall image of the ideology on emigration in Romanian higher education should be completed with a few more results. One quarter of academics teaching currently in Romania are regretting, according to my study, not to have emigrated. Maybe the strongest result is that 17.2% of the sample declares positively that it would advise its child to emigrate, while 46.6% more consider it possible.

In what direct steps toward emigration are concerned, the results are not so clear. A composite variable, named motility has been computed from a series of five questions regarding the propensity to emigrate. According to these computations, the highest possible rank (value 5) has obtained for only 1.5% of the sample, while 16.2% are in the upper half of the scale (values 3 to 5, on a scale from 0 to 5). Nevertheless, 10% of the sample declare that they intend to emigrate in the year to come and even more (13.7%) have started some administrative action towards emigration. The percentage of those that have sought information on the conditions to emigrate is much higher, reaching 43.6%. Most academics have also direct information on emigration, as good as 90% having emigrants among their friends and relatives and most of these (90%) having incidental or even regular contacts with them. Another question

that asked on the country of destination in the case of emigration found that only 30% consider it in fact completely impossible to emigrate.

An important result in the context of my following results is the fact that academics are much more optimistic in what regards their personal future as well as the future of the country than the rest of the Romanian population. Only one third of the academics consider that the direction of the development of Romania is wrong, compared to over 60% in the total Romanian population (Sandu, 2000). Only 12% consider that their situation will get worse in the future year, while almost 40% consider that it will improve. On the other hand, only 23% of the total population of the country is as optimistic (Metro Media Transilvania, 2000).

## **5. Operationalisation and Testing of the Hypotheses**

My intention to relate motility and emigration ideology with value systems had to be translated in more directly testable forms. If an inadequate value system is the one that determines an increased motility, certain variables that are either value system forming or determined by the value system have to be sought after. I have tried to identify such variables that are relevant in the academic context. The probable system of values of academics has obviously a smaller variance than that of the national population. Still my research intends to find differences and relevant elements of distinction within the academic population and not between academics and the rest of the national population. In this context, discriminants within academia are to be found.

The most important theoretical discriminant in higher education is the disciplinary culture an academic belongs to. Disciplines can be considered as the building blocks of the academic world. The effect of disciplinary culture on value system is clear and supported by research (Becher, 1989). It can actually be considered at the two basic levels of definition of a discipline. These would be the subject and the method. Subject-related values are maybe less evident than method related ones. Nevertheless, differences between the human sciences and natural sciences are generally known. Such is the valuation of relevance-related-truth rather than proof-related-truth. An interesting case is the different sense the value of beauty has in mathematics and cultural studies for example. Methodology and formalisation in special also promote different context-related values.

The correlation of motility and discipline would not necessarily validate the strong hypothesis. Belonging to a scientific discipline means not only a certain particularity of value system but also the belonging to a network of scientific co-operation of different amplitude, a group of different cohesion and not least, different opportunities on the labour market (to compare only computer science with Romanian literature). All this would nevertheless increase the plausibility of a positive correlation between motility and discipline. My results have shown that this is not the case. Motility is not related to discipline. The opinions and the valuation of emigration nevertheless are. It is interesting that this result occurs in conditions in which motility and valuation of emigration are highly positively correlated. Still this correlation can only be sensed in problems that relate to the ideology on emigration and not directly to the intention to emigrate. (The Kruskal-Wallis test on the motility coefficient separated on groups of disciplines resulted in a chi-square of 9.377, df 6 that is smaller than the critical value 12.59.)

I have related questions that indicate particular emigration ideology with disciplines. A sign of consistency of disciplinary coagulations of ideologies is the similar structural tendency resulted from all these questions as well as others. In what the positive selection of emigration is regarded, the hard sciences seem most clear-cut. 75.7% of the academics in natural sciences and engineering say that their best graduates emigrate, while only 15% of the academics in economical sciences and law and 33% of those in social sciences and humanities declare the same. As regards the valuation of activities abroad ("where can a young researcher do more good") medical sciences and engineering consider to more than 60% that these activities are more important than those that could be conducted in Romania. Again, the social sciences, the humanities, economical sciences, and law are less positive to emigration than the average. A third in the group of variables selected in this presentation enquires on the intention to advise its child to emigrate. In this regard, the natural sciences academics lead with an incredible 81.1% (certain and possible) while slightly above average values also can be found in engineering (62.3%) and medicine (63.2%). In this case, the social sciences and humanities are at average, the lowest value being in the economical sciences (only 35%). Overall, it could be found that the differences between groups of disciplines are statistically relevant and that even if certain differences exist in the way disciplines relate to the different questions a certain categorisation can be made. The grouping

of disciplines according to their emigration ideology would include on the one hand the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering and agricultural sciences and humane and veterinarian medicine in the group of those basically positive towards emigration. On the other hand the economical sciences, law, social sciences, humanities, arts and sports can be considered as negative to emigration or at least under average favorable.

This separation into groups of disciplines seems to be related with a latent variable we could name "belief in the universality of knowledge" (Nowotny, 2000). This variable is discipline specific, and its value is absolute in the mathematics for example. It is easy to realise that the first group of sciences can be considered as having a high belief in the universality of knowledge in their field, while all the disciplines in the second group are having a low belief in universality of knowledge. Let me note that in economical science this is particularly evident in the case of Romania.

It can also be noted that these two groups fit relatively well upon a classical separation in hard and soft sciences. Considering the "hard"-ness of a science in its degree of formalisation we can of course realise that certain disciplinary groupings are not homogenous in this respect. It is a case that the economical sciences range from a high level of formalisation to a low one, while the same can also be said of agricultural sciences. Nevertheless, the two groups of disciplines above seem to include in the first one mainly the hard sciences, while the second one includes soft sciences. The separation according to belief in universality of knowledge within a discipline solves the problem of "hard"-ness of economical science leaving open the problem in the categorisation of the agricultural sciences.

All the same, a relation to results on academic mobility and disciplines that will be presented later is consistent. Even more, this result is consistent with the results on integration of academic disciplines (Boudon, 1998). It is indeed the case that in the hard sciences the invisible college seems to be stronger in its cohesion than in the soft sciences. Two of Boudon's arguments fit my case very well. The groups of disciplines with the higher professionalisation and technicisation are those that are more positive towards emigration. The third element of integration that Boudon finds is that of the potential politisation of the discipline. It should be noted that in the Romanian context and not only, this potential politisation strengthens the national ties of a certain discipline, and integrates it not

in the international disciplinary context but more in the national-institutional one.

Continuing with the investigation of the strong hypothesis, let us step back from the level of higher socialisation of the scientific discipline and consider the basic elements of socio-demographic origin, that are basic determinants of the value system of any individual. I have considered usual independent variables: gender, religion, historic region, urban/rural area, highest level of education of parents. I could consider these as a "nature and nurture" complex determined by the socio-demographical origin. Nationality, even if an important variable in general in social research could not be tested in its correlation as the size of the groups of other nationalities are very small in Romanian higher education. The results found as in the previous case that the ideology on emigration depends on a series of these variables but that none of these correlate significantly with motility if age is controlled. Interesting to note that gender is the only one that has absolutely no impact on emigration ideology either. On the other hand, I have to realise that both the urban/rural distribution and the highest level of education of parents are strongly age correlated, the younger generation of academics coming from urban and highly educated families in a relevantly higher degree than the older generation. The more positive emigration ideology of these can also be sensed in these correlations. It is to note that in what regards advice given to children on emigration, of those academics that originate from families with higher education more are certain to advice their children to emigrate (22.9%) than those whose parents had only highschool education (5.3%). On the other hand, these are much more in the group that considers it possible to offer the advice.

Similar to these results academics of urban origin are more positive to emigration than those of rural origin. Nevertheless, differences cannot be considered at all questions related to emigration ideology. There are no differences in the advice these would give to their children and also in their opinion regarding the value of graduates that leave the country related to those who stay. Nevertheless, in what regards the opportunities of young researchers, the chi-square test finds a relevant difference, 35.8% of those with urban origin considering that a better start in the career can be reached abroad as related to only 18.9% of those of rural origin (the significance error level is 0.09). The activity abroad is more highly valued than the one in the country by 53.3% of those with an urban origin and



only by 37.8% of those with rural origin. The difference in statistical distribution is relevant with an error level of 0.01.

Relevant results exist in respect to historical region of Romania as well. These can be related to similar findings obtained on a national sample (Sandu, 1996). As in these studies, I found that Transylvania and Banat are less favourable to emigration than the country average, while Southern Romania is most favourable to emigration. 28.4% of academics from this area will certainly advise their child to emigrate, while only 10.7% in Transylvania and 10.4% in Banat. Results to other questions related to the valuation of emigration are similar.

Religion also makes a difference. Due to the sizes of groups of different religions, I concluded in testing only the relation between the Romanian-orthodox and those of other religion. The overall distribution of the sample is 78.9% Romanian orthodox, 7.4% catholic, 2.5% protestant, 2.0% neoprotestant, 9.3% declaring no religious affiliation. Generally the opinions of Romanian orthodox academics towards emigration are less favorable than those of those of other religion or of no religion. This result can be easily related with a theoretical element often used in migration studies, that is the intensity of personal attachment to the place of origin. It should be noted that Romanian orthodoxy has in Romania a standing of quasi-official religion, representing a strong element of majority ideology. All other religious affiliations as well as being of no declared religion are clearly in a minority position. If during the long period of Communist regime Communist ideology has largely taken the place of religion, in the 90s a reverse phenomenon has brought Romanian orthodoxy to take the place of Communist ideology.

A third group of correlation variables that are important as elements to influence the individual value system, being also easy to question are those that determine the individual experience related to emigration and the level of information. I have built a composite variable that includes the duration of the longest visit abroad, the number of visits in the last five years, the number of international scientific co-operations, the existence of emigrants among friends and family and the frequency of contacts to these. This variable called level of information did not include the result of the question if information upon emigration conditions has been thought after, because I favored a certain passivity of this information level in what direct emigration problems are concerned. Nevertheless, the level of information correlates positively with motility (Pearson correlation value 0.162 significant at the 0.05 error level). Those

that have more contacts abroad are also more likely to emigrate. I could of course revert the logical construct and suppose that those that intend to emigrate have maintained more international contacts.

All three operationalisation of the strong hypothesis that I presented above relate motility and emigration ideology with variables that are formative for the individual value system. All these variables have also many other effects on the development of personality and its social projects. Even if the hypotheses above would all have been empirically validated this would not have directly led to more than the fact that variables that are formative to the value system are also influencing emigration ideology and motility. I have also tried to go one step farther in my investigation; that is, I have collected data that are more directly symptomatic to the individual value system. A similar construct was previously used to relate the ideology on migration with opinions on the reforming of Romanian society (privatisation and democratisation) (Sandu, 1996). The results can be summarised as follows: "Opinions on privatisation are directly influential upon the intention to migrate. The opinions upon democratisation favour, on the other hand, the intention to emigrate only mitigated by their influence upon the ideology of migration". The direction of correlation is that the support for reforms is increasing motility.

My intentions to relate motility with specific elements of the higher education system and of the status of the academic will impose another set of correlation variables than that related to political and economical reforms. If reformism is, or at least was for a relatively long time an important separation factor in Romanian society, in the current university field opinions related to the co-ordination of the system seem to be those that imply a largely similar complex. The beginning of the 90<sup>ies</sup> have known a period of almost unanimous acceptance of democratisation and privatisation at declarative level but a much more nuanced palette of opinions reaching real controversies and including clear rejection when the concepts were decomposed in individual problems. A similar issue in the academic sector was that of university autonomy and of academic freedom. At beginning the two concepts have often been identified and sometimes even mistaken for one another. They were always considered as a basis for the reorientation of Romanian higher education on its "natural path". Still, they were rarely understood correctly in all their implications. Even the Education Law gives an insufficient and ambiguous definition of the terms. Nowadays in the name of reform, the Ministry of Education imposes on the universities various measures overstepping university

autonomy not long ago considered as the fundamental element of the reform of the system. The diverse buffer organisms created in the last years that deal with accreditation, evaluation, funding, etc. have also brought in the meantime a relativisation of the concept of university autonomy.

An immediate analogy with reformist – conservative categories would lead to the definition of autonomist – centralist categories. We will of course rarely find pure exponents of centralism, nevertheless various levels of support of autonomy can exist when the concept is decomposed in individual questions.

What is then university autonomy? A very simple definition would be that in the case of university autonomy decisions related to the functioning of the university are taken within the university. Autonomy is not a dichotomic concept. Between the full *laissez-faire* and absolute centralism there exist many different shades of autonomy dependent on the number and importance of decisions that are taken locally and centrally. No higher education system known to me can be localised at any of the extreme situations. Even the private universities in the United States are controlled (by means of evaluation, accreditation and even market-like forces); while even in the conditions of communist totalitarianism there existed certain decisions that were not taken centrally. Still a certain hierarchy of decisions according to their importance seems to exist and a threshold, or a series of thresholds that determine a scale of university autonomy are also more or less supposed to exist. Finding questions that relate to such potential thresholds, that are system and moment specific, could position individual opinions on a scale of level of autonomism.

A general remark has to be made at this step. Decisions in the higher education systems are not taken at only two levels of the system, but at four or even more (Becher, Kogan, 1992). These would be in my case: the level of the higher education system (or national co-ordination structure), the level of specialised buffer organisations (in Romania, these deal with accreditation, funding, research, etc.), the level of the institution, the level of the subunit (faculty, department, chair, etc.) and the level of the individual decisions taken by academics. Decisions at institutional level and at the level of its functional subunit are those that are considered to be the object of university autonomy, while those taken at individual level are those that represent academic freedom. It is known that generally the farther decisions are taken from their point of implementation, the more general these decisions are, needing more particularisations in their

implementation. A conclusion of this observation is that decisions taken closer to their point of implementation are more efficient. But from the same observation, one can lead that such decisions restrict the individual freedom to act of the person supposed to implement them. Autonomisation of universities, lowering the level at which many decisions are taken from the central/national level to that of the institution and its subunit can as such lead to a reduction in academic freedom understood as the freedom to teach and study ("Lehr und Lernfreiheit") rather than an increase. A syllabus that is set by the national authority will be difficult to control, offering much more space to innovate to the teacher than a syllabus set by the head of the department. The choice of a research program at national level will be general enough to accommodate more freedom to the researcher than a research subject decided upon by the head of a research group. The autonomisation of universities has actually put the decision making power in the hands of the academic oligarchy (Clark, 1983).

Far from being positively correlated academic freedom and university autonomy seem not to support each other in an international comparison as well. It is now easy to sense that the Pembroke model in which the academic is more bound to the search of truth than to its institution, leads to weak institutions dependent of external authority (in the beginning religious later political patrons). Academic freedom is here the supreme value, institutional autonomy being limited in scope. In the case of the Bologna model the educational institution has had no external co-ordination body, its autonomy being almost total, still academics had very little academic freedom. Following the historical development of these models we find indeed that the Central-European Humboldtian universities offered, and partly still offer a very high value to academic freedom, insisting less on institutional autonomy. The American universities, as well as the French grand ecoles are generally strong, highly autonomous institutions, reducing significantly academic freedom in a model nowadays also named corporatist.

Another problem related to institutional autonomy had to be solved in all Central and Eastern European higher education systems in their steps of democratisation. Once institutional autonomy is fully installed, the national co-ordinating body finds itself almost in the impossibility to reform the system. Indeed, after granting de facto autonomy to all higher education institutions in 1990 the Romanian ministry realised that it is unable to co-ordinate. Practically all reform steps that were taken in the

1990 – 1992 period were taken at institutional level, according to the model of “grass-root innovations”. The 1992 – 1994 government restricted autonomy, which was actually not granted *de jure*, to start system level reforms. Another point of view reaching similar conclusions is that there existed a strong pressure for change in the first years after 1990 and that led to reforms in condition of autonomy. The current leadership structures in the autonomous universities are those that reached a satisfactory status quo and became as such resistant to change (Miroiu e.a., 1998).

One can as such imagine two different positions interested in the restriction of university autonomy. On the one hand there are usually younger academics having no leadership position in the university that find themselves restricted in their academic freedom by the oligarchy that has taken over the power in the university as the central co-ordination has stepped back. On the other hand there exist persons that are unsatisfied with the delay in reforms that can be explained by the natural conservatism of autonomously led educational systems. To these one can add naturally those that have lost the power game within the university.

I have devised a set of questions to be able to discriminate between subjects according to their level of support of institutional autonomy. The questions had to satisfy two non-trivial conditions. The first is that of describing a theoretically acceptable discriminant, and the second is that of being as easy to answer as possible. I have used the following:

1. Would you agree with the elimination of entrance examinations to higher education?
2. Would you agree that the salaries of academics in your department be dependent of the evaluation of their activity?
3. Would you agree to the existence of common national syllabi for each specialisation?

All questions address sensitive issues currently under discussion in Romanian higher education and can represent elements in setting the level of support of institutional autonomy of a certain person.

The rise of current autonomy can take place through the taking over of decisions related to the salary level of academics by the institution or even its subunits. An immediate decrease in autonomy in the name of reform would be the total elimination of the entrance examination system, setting as such the decision on who studies in a certain institution outside the institution, at the level of pre-university education. Finally, a correlation of syllabi at national level has entered discussion since the

“group of major universities” has introduced a system of transferable credits after ECTS model.

Let us see how the opinions of Romanian academics generally are in these questions. The elimination of entrance examination to higher education (in the meantime strongly promoted by the Ministry of Education) is considered as a good idea by as much as 30.9% while 56.4% do not agree to it. The resistance is to be related mainly with the lack of confidence in the relevance of the Bacculaurea that would become only entrance condition.

The most positive opinion is that on the differentiation of salaries according to the evaluation of activity. Almost 90% of academics agree to it, while only 2% are against it. This result seems to us to be relateable with the overall optimism that academics share as well as with the very good self-image that also results from the prospects academics consider that they would have abroad.

The most balanced results are on the other hand in what regards the acceptance of national syllabi. 38.7% agree to it while 50.5% are against it.

I have not considered these questions as being ordered in any way. According to the answers, I have constructed an ordinal scale (from 0 to 3) determining the level of autonomism. One point each was granted for a “no” at the first question, a “yes” for the second and “no” for the third question. The sum of these represents the individual value for the interviewed.

My results have found that only 3.8% are total centralists in the sense of the above-described construct (value 0), while 26.5% are total autonomists (value 3). The mode of the distribution lies at 2 with 47.5%, while the value 1 was attained by 22.1% of the sample.

The tests have shown that motility is not correlated with the level of support of institutional autonomy (Pearson  $-0.100$ ), but there exist relevant relations between emigration ideology and support of autonomy, that can in fact also be considered as an ideological construct.

The stronger academics support autonomy the more they value the internal institutional opportunities, and the more negative are their opinions on emigration. A young researcher should start its career in another country according to 40% of those that are at value 0 and 1 of the autonomist coefficient, 33.3% of those with value 2 and 25.9% of those with value 3. The same result can be found related to the positive selection character

of emigration. 80% of those that are at autonomist value 0 consider that the best graduates emigrate, while for level 1 the proportion 64.4%, for level 2 51% and for level 3 50%. Regarding their intention to advice their children to emigrate, the difference can be sensed only between those with the highest level of support of university autonomy, of which only 11.1% would certainly advice its child to emigrate and all other academics of which 20% would do the same. All these results support the idea that a certain consistence of the opinion structure of academics seems to be the case. Values related to autonomy can be considered as representing an indicator on the integration power of the institution while valuation of emigration relate to the integration power of the discipline. A hypothesis that could be considered would be that the two elements of the Clark matrix might be negatively correlated. This is supported very much by the fact that the support for autonomy is not correlated with age to a relevant degree, while age is strongly correlated with the holding of a decision making position.

The results above have tried to relate both motility as well as emigration ideology with variables that are either considered as creators of value system or symptoms of the value system. All these are relationable with the emigration ideology. Still the impact of all these mental constructs upon motility seems to be to weak to support statistically the strong hypothesis of my research. Even more, I could declare that at a relevant level of statistical analysis the only direct relation between motility and individual value system lays the relation of motility and emigration ideology. The more positive opinions academics have upon emigration the more likely it is that they emigrate. Or the other way around.

Predictably, all variables strongly correlated with age are also correlated with motility. I have studied in this context academic degree and year of employment in higher education next to age. It is interesting to note that academic degree is the best predictor for motility (the Kruskal-Wallis test gave chi-square 16.626 with df 5 that has an asymptotic significance at an error level of 0.005 while age gave at the same test chi-square 9.978 with df 4 that has an asymptotic significance at an error level of 0.041). I have tested also other variables relatable with age and have generally found that academic degree is in the Romanian higher education a more important element of group cohesion then age and year of employment in higher education (a significant for the generations). It should be noted that it is the *asistent* position that represents the mode of motility. The lowest position has a somewhat lower motility average,

while the higher one gets in academic position the lower gets the level of motility.

As motility seems to have so few direct relevant correlations it is important to mention that one of the variables strongly correlated with a high motility is a low level of optimism towards personal as well as social conditions. A composite variable named optimism was calculated including the image individuals have on their own prospects as well as on the development of the country. As I have already mentioned academics are in this sense more optimistic than the overall population of Romania. The correlation between optimism and motility was found to be significant at a 0.01 error level. Of course, low optimism cannot immediately be considered as a predictor for high motility as the determination might also be the other way around. A person with a high propensity to migrate could evaluate its chances at the place of origin less optimistically than other.

## 6. Individual Strategies

The issue of emigration in the academic field is naturally related to another important phenomenon in academia, that is mobility. Both are actually changes of residence from one country to the other, still the differences lie not only in the duration of the change of residence but also in much more subtle and important elements.

**Academic mobility** has become a fashionable subject of research in the last years of the ninth decade, when the European Union launched a series of programs to support study and research trips, as well as joint projects between European universities. I generally understand by academic mobility, travel in the interest of teaching or research activity of academics from one country to another for well-determined periods of time. In the following, I will try to describe the size and importance of this system for Romanian higher education in particular and for European higher education in general. I will then compare academic mobility with the emigration of academics as essentially distinct individual strategies that still have certain common elements. It is obvious that these two strategies can hardly be considered as the only ones in any higher education system, still they are worth to be compared as they both seek validation outside the national system.



***Academic Mobility. Classical Model and Contemporaneity***

The concept of academic mobility, so important at the end of the millennium, seems to be consubstantial to the medieval and Renaissance experience of academic life. One of the most prominent mobility programs of the European Union was not incidentally named Erasmus. The scholar from Rotterdam, following the model of an academic career of his time, lived and studied not only in the Netherlands, but also in England, Germany, Switzerland, France and Italy. On a similar parallel, there also exists a scholarship system named Goliard (at Rice University) after the French name of the wandering students of the Middle Ages.

At the beginning of European higher education systems the meaning of the word "faculty" was that of a group of scholars, a meaning preserved in some English speaking countries. Groups of such travelled often between different locations. The creation of universities, starting with the one in Bologna in 1066 also meant the creation of a common group of the scholars and their students ("universitas") and the settling in a clear location of the educational act. The later mobility of academics and students between existing universities can as such be perceived as the continuation of an older model. Practically, higher education knew a relatively continuous geographical rigidisation during its history up to the rediscovery of mobility in the recent years.

The functions of mobility have obviously changed along with the changes suffered by the higher education system as a whole. Still these changes are much more superficial than they might seem at first. If in the Middle Ages students and scholars travelled to study certain books and documents and consult with the famous professors of the period, the initiation character of *peregrinatio* was also valued. The end of the travelling student (Wanderstudent) has to be obviously related to the generalisation of printing and the rise in the number and size of libraries, still the functions of the rediscovered mobility are not very different.

Declared functions of academic mobility can be found in the official documents of the EU, politicians' declarations, educational managers' goal-settings, etc. I will present these as the European Union (Kehm e.a., 1997) enumerates them:

- Improvement of the professional knowledge of the mobile person
- Improvement of the activities related to:
  - teaching

- research
- administration

at the level of the home institution as well as at the visited institution.

Even if the items above realise the differences between individual and social effects and relate to all three areas of academic activity they seem to us very scarce next to the multitude of secondary effects of great importance that mobility creates, for the mobile person as well as for the groups she or he belongs to. Eluding the separation already made between individual and group effects, I will have to mention another possible classification between effects of the professional experience (well covered by the official items) and effects of the cultural experience. From this point of view, the wandering student of the Middle Ages or the Renaissance, even if headed on a much more dangerous adventure than his present counterpart, encountered a more homogeneous higher education world. Universities might have differed considerably in the way they were organised and led, in their financing and autonomy, still the teaching language was the same (Latin) and the departmental structure was also similar in all Western higher education institutions. The curriculum was the same, starting with the *studium generale*, followed by the three basic liberal arts of the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric and logic), and the *quadrivium* of the superior courses (arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy), to study then the fine arts, the sciences, law, medicine or the queen of them all, theology. The major books that were studied in the Western European universities were basically the same and the institution of the wandering student itself maintained close contacts between universities and scholars. Even more, no national boundaries existed in the sense of the modern ones. Cultural effects of modern academic mobility have to be understood not only from the point of the mobile person (indeed the most affected) but also from the point of the host department<sup>1</sup> and institution as well as, even if in lesser degree, of the home department and institution.

It is useless to definitely set if the present rediscovers the Wanderstudent, interprets a modern situation according to a classical model, or views the classical case through the current experience. All these points of view hold a certain truth. What is more important is the fact that academic mobility is a central element in the policies of reduction of ethnocentrism and the creation of a European identity.

### ***Uniting Europe through Higher Education Co-operation***

Let us describe the academic mobility system in its institutional framework and size, with special reference to the Romanian case.

Academic mobility has included a large number of European students through the ERASMUS program, created by the Council of the European Community Decision from the 15<sup>th</sup> of June 1987. The ERASMUS mobility scheme involved in the 1987 – 1999 period a number of 640.000 students and over 200.000 academics from the countries of the European Community (and later European Union). The creation of a critical mass of young persons protected against an exclusive, xenophobic nationalism was a declared priority of systems such as this. The ERASMUS experience was very rich and represented the basis for a series of studies on student and academic staff mobility conducted by the Kassel research center under the supervision of Professor Ulrich Teichler.

East – West mobility of academic staff was supported mainly by the TEMPUS program that tried even more to connect the Central East European higher education systems with those of Western Europe, and with exceptional status some extra-European institutions. The TEMPUS experience can as such allow for analogies between mobility and migration in the East – West relation of higher education systems.

The TEMPUS program was also the main collaboration system of Romanian higher education with other European countries in the 1990 – 1998 period. TEMPUS was created by the Decision of the Council of the European Community of the 7<sup>th</sup> of May, 1990 (Kehm e.a., 1996). A part of the Phare program, TEMPUS ended up including all Central and East European countries in subsequent expansions during the following few years. Academic mobility was supported in the TEMPUS framework by different systems.<sup>2</sup> Asked during the evaluation of the TEMPUS program in 1996, 72% of the participants considered that student exchange and 80% that staff exchange were important or very important goals of the TEMPUS cooperation (Kehm e.a., 1996). This puts academic staff mobility on the first place in a poll of perceived importance of the goals of the TEMPUS program. Starting with 1998 TEMPUS ended its activity in Romania, its place being taken by the SOCRATES program. SOCRATES actually took the place of TEMPUS in a group of Central and Eastern European countries that were considered as being more advanced in the correlation of their higher education systems to the European Union (the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia, next to which

Cyprus was also included). SOCRATES is a complex program that implements in the East – West relationship the older academic mobility scheme of the European Union, ERASMUS that has now become a part of SOCRATES.<sup>3</sup> The impact of the SOCRATES program on Romanian universities has remained significantly lower than that of the TEMPUS program mainly because of the scarcer funding of mobility that has led to the primary participation of very young academics. (Web Page of the XXII Directorat of the EU)

Another European Union program having mobility implications and also active in Romanian tertiary education is LEONARDO. LEONARDO is specially oriented towards tertiary vocational education and had a somewhat lesser influence at the level of the determination of individual strategies of academics due to the lower level of funding and the restricted scope.

Next to programs of the European Union, other mobility schemes of lesser volume should also be mentioned. Such are the different programs financed by the Foundation for an Open Society, the DAAD<sup>4</sup>, Humboldt, Fulbright scholarships, Oxford Colleges Hospitality Scheme, and others. The Romanian Ministry of Education also offers scholarships through the ONBSS (Oficiul National al Burselor de Studii in Străinătate – National Office for Study-abroad scholarships) created on the 5<sup>th</sup> of January, 1998 and the CEEPUS program (Central European Exchange Programme for University Studies), explicitly created for academic mobility between Central and Eastern European countries (Austria, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Croatia, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, and in the near future Macedonia) and also active starting with the 1998/99 academic year. (Web Page of the Romanian Ministry of National Education)

The sample used in the empirical part of the present research has included almost 90% persons that did travel abroad in the last 5 years. 27% had more than 6 trips in the mentioned period. Romanian academics seem to travel much more than the rest of the population (Sandu, 1999). Some differences within the sector could also be sensed. Higher-ranking academics have more trips, while younger academics are the ones that have had longer periods abroad. More than 15% of the sample have stayed more than one year abroad and have returned to Romania.

All these have profited from the efforts of different organisations that mostly have to be related with the generous idea of a functional unification

of European higher education systems. Even more than that, a theory of European unification by university co-operation has gained some audience in the last years (Kehm e.a., 1997). An important result in this sense is the development of a European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). Created after the successful British model (CATS – Credit Accumulation and Transfer System), ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) intends to create the possibility for the recognition of study-abroad periods at the level of curricular unit between European universities. ECTS has started to be introduced in Romania in 1998 in a group of universities, a generalisation of the system following progressively. The major problem faced by such developments is the non-existence of a unique European higher education model. Even within the European Union, the diversity of higher education systems is very large. Although ECTS has more or less succeeded in correlating different curricula, discrepancies remain large in matters of the structures of higher education systems. This leads to differences even in the definition of higher education and to problems in comparing basic indicators of the system such as student numbers for instance (Maiworm e.a., 1995).

Differences most evidently existing between the value systems promoted by the specific models of European higher education systems have also to be mentioned. It is enough to take a superficial look to realise that the, in Romania, much talked about “European higher education” or even worse “Western higher education system” does not exist in practice. The Humboldtianism of the German system, the Napoleonic *grand ecoles*, and British pragmatism are hard to be considered belonging to the same value system regarding the mission of the higher education establishment. Still, all these are within the higher education systems of member states of the European Union. If I take a look at the level of diversification of the higher education systems, the variance becomes even larger. Academic structures within the European Union are very different and the developments of the last decade did not bring them closer together. On the one hand, the British system has made the step to unification of the two types of higher education (the transformation of Polytechnics to universities) and the German system made steps towards the reduction in differences between the two types of higher education (granting the Fachhochschulen the right to organise research and doctoral studies). But on the other hand, the Dutch system has consolidated the HBOs through their coagulation, while in France a new diversification was introduced as late as the 70<sup>th</sup> and developed in the subsequent years (the

IUTs). A structural unification of all European higher education systems seems not to be plausible in the near future. In fact, a very influential work by Burton R. Clark analysis the contagion of academic structures by international transfer and discovers an undesirable colonialism of the "great" systems (Clark, 1983), According to his results, systems shaped by international transfer of structures have more often then not led to graduates of discrepante expectations and un-fit socialisation towards the society they would have to activate in. Clark studied specifically the cases of Japan as well as Latin American and African countries. Another important study by James S. Coleman leads to similar results in the case of African univerisities (Coleman, 1977), Even if in the European framework the use of these results seems not to be natural they sociologically test a concern long existing in the Romanian society as well, that of the "content-less shapes" ("forme fără fond").

What remain essentially adaptable and transferable between higher education systems remain of course knowledge, information, and also the individuals that are in the system, students, as well as academics. Unification by higher education will have to be then understood as a unification of the human capital of higher education systems.

Research upon academic mobility as a way to realise this unification of the academic labour market has led to some interesting and important results that I will present in the following paragraphs.

The first of these results concerns the passage of the active role in academic mobility from the Western European countries to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. In the framework of the programs of the European Union that implied co-operation between the former political blocks that divided Europe the active role was initially held by the Westen European higher education institutions. At the start of TEMPUS, Central and Eastern European institutions were not even permitted to hold the coordinator and contractor positions in co-operation projects. This limitation had both practical as well as theoretical reasons. The practical ones included the underdevelopment of Central and Eastern European banking systems and the administrative instability of the first years of the 90s, while the theoretical reasons were rooted in the main goal of the program that of trasmitting the expertise especially in the field of educational project management from the West to the East. When the program was initiated, the idea also existed that the democratic higher education systems of Western Europe would be basically different from those of Central and Eastern Europe and that the latter ones should be

oriented towards the first. The myths of the organisational superiority of Western systems as well as of the wide gap between the systems have mostly fallen in the meantime. The motivations of the European Union in including the Central and Eastern European countries in the system of European academic cooperation also included the need to promote economical and political democratisation of the former real-socialist countries through a kind of contagion effect. The evaluation studies of the TEMPUS program have proved that the coordinator and contractor positions guaranteed not only the possibility to manage the resources but practically also to decide upon the ways these are spent and to organise the project activities in detail. As such, the barrier that was imposed to the Central and Eastern European partners proved to influence negatively their satisfaction with the outcomes of the projects. Starting with the 1991/92 academic year partners from certain Central and Eastern European countries were permitted to take over the role of the coordinator and later (after 1992/93) also of contractor. In the following few years all participants to TEMPUS could hold any of the positions. After a period of getting used to the system that probably also included the maturing of the banking systems of the respective countries, the percentage of Central and Eastern European coordinators and contractors becomes overproportional as compared to the number of Central and Eastern European partners in the program. In TEMPUS II (1994/95 – 1995/96) 75% of JEPs have been coordinated by Central and Eastern European partners, while these only represented 38% of the total number of partners. It is worth mentioning that Romanian universities have also been very active in this respect. In the 1990/96 period 7% of all JEPs were coordinated by Romanian partners, while only 5.5% of partners in JEPs were from Romanian universities. In 1995/96 the rise in importance of Romanian involvement led to 15% of JEPs being coordinated by Romanian partners, Romanian participation existing in 16% of JEPs and the Romanian partners being 8.3% of the total. This concludes that almost all TEMPUS II JEPs with Romanian participation were coordinated by Romanian partners (Kehm e.a., 1996b).

Another result of the research upon European Union mobility programs is the proof that participation to mobility is dependent upon age and scientific discipline. If the influence of the age of the mobile persons only confirms results widely known and accepted for more or less similar situations, the influence of scientific discipline has to be studied and commented in more detail. The results of the TEMPUS, TEMPUS II,

ERASMUS and ECTS implementation evaluations find a larger participation and an evident overvaluation of mobility compared to averages in the humanities, ecological and agricultural sciences and arts. On the other hand, an undervaluation of mobility and an under average participation in mobility can be sensed in the cases of economical sciences and law. All other disciplines do not relevantly differ from the average (Kehm e.a., 1997; Maiworm e.a., 1993; Maiworm e.a., 1995a; Maiworm e.a., 1995b).

Preferential mobility flows could also be realised. If we consider these from the point of view of the Central and Eastern European academics, we find that Albanians prefer Italy and Greece, Hungarians Germany and Romanians France. The other countries of the region do not have statistically relevant differences in their choices of destination countries (Kehm e.a., 1997; Maiworm e.a., 1993; Maiworm e.a., 1995a; Maiworm e.a., 1995b).

### ***Inclusion and Exclusion in the International Experience of Academics***

The belonging of the academic to the invisible college (Clark, 1983) includes her/him in a group that transcends international borders, a group that also becomes a reference group to many of its members. Still, the international experiences of academics cannot elude the existence of exclusion owed not only to national barriers, but also to more or less geographical particularities of paradigm in the practice of the discipline. In other words, even if scientific disciplines generally share a knowledge base and methodology, they are not perfectly homogenous as regards their value systems and also have more or less national characteristics in methodology, just to mention the sociological schools for instance. The exclusion felt by a Romanian academic in an international research group could as such be determined not only by cultural, or ethnic matters, but might be motivated by characteristics of the scientific interplay.

Empirical studies of the European Union mobility schemes can give certain information in this field as well. The problems mobile academics encountered at their home as well as host institutions have represented elements of interest to the evaluators of all these programs. According to research upon East – West mobility (Kehm e.a., 1997) only 61% of the sample of TEMPUS participants had any kind of difficulties. These were primarily related to the home institutions:



- replacement of the mobile personnel (23%)
- linguistic competence of the mobile person (21%)
- finding persons to engage in mobility (16%)

Difficulties related to the host institutions were reported as following:

- receipt of necessary papers (15%)
- preparation of the cooperation before the visit (10%)

Contact problems related to cultural differences, different teaching style and personal attitudes of the host have been mentioned by 10% of the interviewed. This result has nevertheless to be related with the positive valuation of the results of mobility at the quasi-totality of participants as well as the knowledge of the interviewed of the motivation of the survey. As such, there exists the possibility that certain contact problems have not been mentioned and an amount of self-censorship has functioned. Nevertheless, the percentage of those that encountered the mentioned type of difficulties was remarkably small. This was also probably the case because of the open-hearted acceptance of the Western academic community of academic mobility programs.

Even if relatively unbalanced as a frequency distribution the existence of both inclusion and exclusion in the international experience of academics deserves a closer look. One cannot easily extrapolate this characteristic from the degree of integration of the discipline or its level of cohesion. Next to this integration determined by the invisible college, the integration resulted by institutional determinations have also a high importance, bringing us back to Clark's matrix (Clark, 1983). These two types of integration: international-disciplinary and local-institutional cannot be determined from one another and have also no fixed sum even if certain previous results of this study could promote the existence of a certain negative correlation. The relation between a group of academics of a department having as such the same integration structure with an external, the mobile academic, will be generally determined by the inclusion of the disciplinary integration and the exclusion of the institutional integration. As I already mentioned the degree of integration on disciplinary basis depends to a certain extent on the discipline itself. The institutional integration also seems to differ according to types of institutions, national as well as intra-national differences existing. So, for example, Boudon finds that in France the IUTs are more integrated than the universities, while Boys determines that in the United Kingdom polytechnics used to have a higher degree of cohesion than universities.

According to these results, one might conject that the degree of integration is reversly related with institutional autonomy. Still, such a deduction is relatively daring and has up to the current date no statistical backing.

### ***Mobility and Migration***

If in the pre-modern period no difference between academic mobility and migration can be considered, currently the two phenomena have to be regarded as essentially different strategies of individual progress in the academic field or even leaving it. Let us first mention that the Romanian academic field is much more favourable to the organisation of careers according to the model of strategies as compared to the free labour market. The large stability of workplace as well as the existence of a clear line of academic positions that have to be mastered, the practical non-existence of demoting make academic careers predictable as compared to careers in the market economy. The personal success would then be the as fast as possible run through academic steps up to that of full professor. In reality, the few possibilities of formal careers give in the university field a greater importance to content-related elements only partly related to the formal academic positions. The recognition of the invisible college of peers, the gains in prestige and scientific notoriety are the more important. Many of these can hardly be measured, as the quality of a scientific paper cannot be marked and depends in large degree on its social value, that is the value given to it by the community of scholars of the respective discipline. An effect of this situation is the importance granted in many countries to citation indexes as compared to the simple count of the numbers of published articles and books. These effects are external to the formal academic hierarchy but highly correlated with it. A way to increase the visibility of a scientist and as such the chances for his recognition by the invisible college is also the leaving for a longer or shorter period of the home institution or even country.

To be able to judge fairly the importance of mobility as an individual strategy I will also have to mention that academic mobility represents a method to develop prestige, an important currency in the academic market (Lindblom, 1980). The accumulation of prestige also knows a positive feedback effect that is of high importance. International relations developed through mobility most often lead to new collaborations, publications, research and consulting contracts and finally more scientific

and intellectual prestige. All these also have their favourable effects on the financial side as well. Mobility makes the activity of an academic more visible in the international context creating the prerequisites necessary for its publication in international reviews or at international publishers, which again increases the chances to be cited.

The models of emigration and of academic mobility both imply the stay for certain periods of time abroad. Next to this commonality, I have to enumerate a series of differences. From the point of view of higher education research, a significant difference is the fact that emigrating academics tend to leave the higher education sector in a larger proportion than academics involved in mobility.

The functions of individual strategies in the academic field can be divided in functions of satisfying of financial needs and functions of scientific prestige accumulation. Reconsidering my hypotheses (strong and weak) introduced before I can realise that mobility could be a form of partial solution of both the problems. The fact that this solution has a partial character also results from the main difference of the strategies. The partiality of solution of both the financial and the scientific problem of Romanian academics through mobility has to be understood as an unending of the project. I will say that mobility is an open solution, while emigration is a closed solution. The closed character of emigration related to the openness of academic mobility represents in fact the essence of their difference. Maybe paradoxically, the existence of a fixed duration of the travel in the case of academic mobility lends the system the open character. And this because the clear limitations of the mobility act make it repeatable and promote it as a long-term individual strategy. Mobility is in fact a strategy due to its repeatability and the positive feedback effect it has upon the accumulation of prestige and even material capital.

Still, what is in this context open and what is closed? Let me allow for a short mathematical analogy. In mathematical topology, there exists a rigorous formalisation to the concepts of open and closed set, formalisation that can represent an interesting model in the given case as well.

Simplifying mathematical definitions a bit I can say that a closed set is a set that contains its own boundaries, while an open set does not contain its boundaries. The topological analogy is easy to use in domains in which territories can be easily defined (such as politics, domains of knowledge, social groups, etc.). In the case of my open and closed strategy constructs, I can realise that these are in fact algorithmical models. A

strategy, as an algorithm is a series of steps to be taken, including eventually decisions and loops, to reach a certain result. The closed strategy is limited in time and can reach or not the envisaged result. The open strategy will in fact never end. It will have a cybernetic character, permitting corrections determined by the always-partial results of the individual mobility acts. In this sense, open strategies are investigative in character while closed strategies are bureaucratic. Generally seen, the formal academic career climbing the ladder from “preparator” to full professor is a closed progression, while the development of scientific prestige and international recognition in the peer group are open ones. As economical accumulation also is.

The construction of mobility strategies is necessarily related with the opening and closure of the West to the East, legally and academically as well. Legally, as viewed by the barriers existing in most of the countries against emigration and the programs also existing in many countries that encourage academic mobility. The Western world seems to be mostly closed to emigration but open to academic mobility. Apparently, I have now used the words open and closed with a different meaning than before. Still this is not the fact if we realise that the openness and closeness of the West to the East are even more direct transfers of the topological model.

Within the conducted sample survey, I also intended to determine the part of the academic population that has chosen some form of mobility strategy. Considering only the number of visits in the past years, the essential indicator of the strategy, I found that 8.3% of the sample had more than 10 visits abroad in the last 5 years. I can as such estimate that this 8% of Romanian academics are pursuing a form of mobility strategy.

I could of course not investigate those that have already emigrated as the sample was constructed to be relevant to the population of academics currently employed in Romanian higher education. Still the percentage of those that declare that they intend to emigrate could be determined. 10% of the sample declared that it intends to emigrate in the following year. A very important result is the fact that the group of the mobile is distinct from the group of those that intend to emigrate. A single person belongs to both groups. This aptly supports my theoretical basis that the two strategies are basically different.

I tried to find correlations between these choices and other characteristics. My most important hypothesis intended to see if there exists a connection between the open and closed strategies and openness

and closure in disciplinary cultures. It is of course not possible to determine a value of openness of a discipline. Still, the groupings resulted according to the propensity to emigrate and the propensity to academic mobility could enable some considerations.

So, what is openness and closure in scientific disciplines? By itself, the nature of scientific knowledge is open while its methods pass from periods of relative closure to periods of relative openness. According to Thomas Kuhn the openness and closure is related to the historical development of paradigms (Kuhn, 1962). The fluctuations between provisional and definitive in knowledge, between information and truth, but first of all between the premanence of paradigms has as effects the existence of cycles of closure (rigidisation) and opening of the scientific disciplines. Another point of view on the open/closed character of sciences would result from the definition James S. Coleman gives to an open system. This would be a system in which actors from within the system have transactional interests with actors from outside the system, or in other words if transactions take place over the boundaries of the system (Coleman, 1990). From this point of view, scientific disciplines almost lead us into a vicious circle. Any actor involved in a system of a scientific discipline also has transactions outside of the system. The problem is if these transactions are relevant to the system. Which such transactions are connected to his belonging to the scientific community system, his individual strategy within the system and which are not is the actual problem. Let us consider a strategy to accumulate prestige in the disciplinary community. In this case, the recognition of a transaction as relevant depends on the social group underpinning the system of the scientific discipline. If such a group were "open" to accept transactions exterior to the system, then it would be open in Coleman's sense as well. If I restrict the scope to transactions on the knowledge market, the situation becomes more interesting. In this case, transactions with the outside of the system would in fact mean transactions with other domains of knowledge and/or other methodologies of research. A scientific discipline would be as open as much it would accept the accumulation of prestige on basis of interdisciplinary activities.

One could also mention sciences that are basically more closed than others. According to Thomas Kuhn strongly paradigmatic sciences are more closed, while weak paradigmatic sciences are more open (Kuhn, 1962). And not only knowledge but scientific practices as well as the social cohesion of the scientific disciplines know periods of closure and

opening. Evidently, the scientific disciplines, in their tribal organisation know different levels of acceptance of the other, levels that position the disciplines on a continuum between open and closed rather than setting it in one of the two categories. (Becher, 1989). Let me also mention an interesting result based on an empirical research in British universities intending to evaluate among others the degree of cohesion of different disciplines (Boys e.a., 1988). From the investigated group of disciplines studied in a series of universities, the highest level of cohesion was to be found in history, physics, and the economical sciences while the minimum level of cohesion in English languages studies. In this case, cohesion was defined to be the cohesion of the group of academics of the respective discipline. A similar concept introduced by Boudon and also mention before was named degree of integration of the discipline. The following three variables have been found by Boudon to correlate positively with the degree of integration (Boudon, 1998).

- Level of profesionalisation of the discipline
- Level of technicisation of the discipline
- Level of possible politisation of the discipline

Although primarily individual, the two strategies I have discussed differentiate even more radically in their agregate effects. It is what Boudon names perverse effects, unwished results of individual acts repeated by a large number of persons of the same group (Boudon, 1998). So, if a large number of persons choose to emigrate, following in fact the improvement of their economical situation, as well as their scientific development, their exit (in Hirschman's sense) will lead to a certain underpopulation of the source system. Even more, this under-population will mainly affect the younger group, as this has the highest motility. The source system of emigration will have to regenerate the group of young academics, as the need for education will have no reason to recess. Even more, it might increase if this, as predictable, happens on a trend of positive valuation of emigration. The possibility of a career abroad due to a certain qualification can raise the interest for the respective discipline. Such is nowadays the case of computer science and telecommunications in Romania. The exit of the young opens the access to academic positions to persons that would otherwise not have had this possibility and might eventually reduce to a certain degree the quality of the educational act. Academic emigration has to some extent also an element of social contagion (Tarde, 1890). The need to reduce cognitive dissonance of the

emigrant will produce in most cases the positive valuation of the taken step almost regardless of results and will lead to supplementary post-factum rationalisations. All these will result in an image of success of the strategy. The existence of a critical mass of emigrants within a discipline or an institution (the basic communities to which an academic belongs to according to the Clark matrix) will make emigration a more eligible strategy than otherwise.

The aggregate and mass effects of mobility also include certain elements of contagion. Still in this case the side effects are evidently thought after by the institutions that promote mobility. If the mass effects of emigration are generally considered as negative, those of mobility are mostly valued positively.

In statistical calculations upon my survey results, I tried indeed to relate the number of visits abroad in the last five years, as an indicator of those that have chosen the mobility strategy with disciplines. If the proportion those that have chosen a mobility strategy is 8.3% of the whole population, in engineering disciplines it is as high as 14.8%. Values that do not relevantly differ from the average can be found in arts and sports, natural sciences and mathematics and the social sciences and humanities. The mobility strategy has no or as good as no representatives in the economical sciences, law, and the medical sciences.

Let us now see how the same disciplinary distribution is to be found at the 10.3% that declared positively its intention to emigrate in the following year. The highest percentage, relevantly higher than the average is to be found in the case of the natural sciences with 16.2%, while values close to average can be found in almost all other disciplines. Less potential emigrants are in the arts, sports, and surprisingly in medicine. Nevertheless the sizes of these sub-categories are very small not representing a good basis for statistical inference. The fact that remains statistically relevant is that the two disciplinary groups with the highest positivation of emigration ideology lead the ranks in the two strategies, engineering academics seeming more tempted with the mobility strategy while natural sciences and mathematics academics seem more tempted to emigrate. All other cases are not sustainably different from the average.

What other elements particularise the selection of the two strategies. I will try to offer a comparative table according to the relevant results I could find. Let us mention again that the two groups in discussion are almost completely distinct and have sizes that are not relevantly different (one common person, sizes 8.3% and 10.3%)

	Mobility group	Emigration group	Total
% women	17.6%	42.9%	38.7%
% urban	88.2%	85.7%	80.9%
% Romanian orthodox	64.7%	71.4%	78.9%
% under 39 years	52.9%	90.5%	55.1%
% Moldova	11.8%	19.0%	15.7%
% Lecturer or lower	53.0%	100%	67.6%
% decision making position	23.5%	4.8%	18.6%

The differences between the two groups are very clearcut. The mobility strategy seems to be, as already shown before, the prestige strategy. It is selected by relevantly older males holding higher academic positions and being more likely also to hold decision-making positions. It is of course impossible to determine if in this case mobility only helped the accumulation of prestige or that mobility was more easily accesible to those with higher prestige. Some further comments should be made. The gender distribution in the mobility group is very unbalanced. Only 17.6% women clearly shows an underrepresentation even within the group determined by age and academic position. A very possible explanation would be related to the still traditional model of Romanian family that reduces the potential mobility of the wife to a large degree. On the other hand, the higher percentage of women in the emigration group is consistent with the percentage of women in the respective age and academic position group. Another important element is the 5 times greater probability of a member of the mobility group to be holding a decision making position than a member of the emigration group. Again, the values have to be related to the age and academic position structure but still remain relevant.

I want to note that both strategies include an overrepresentation of those of urban origin and those that are not Romanian orthodox. To be noted that the mobility group includes to an even larger degree persons of other religious affiliation than the emigration group. This could be related to a certain degree to the easier possibility of minorities to build up relations abroad.

The only relevant difference in regional distribution is the more often appearing choice for emigration then for mobility in Moldova. We should note that Moldova is economically a more underdeveloped region than the rest of the country. This can easily lead to a larger proportion of



academics preferring emigration. The mean motility coefficient was also somewhat higher in Moldova (1.28) than the populational average (1.17).

I also tried to relate mobility with emigration ideology, to realise if the ideological constructs of the adepts of mobility differ from the populational average. None of the questions that imply a valuation of emigration did produce relevant differences, while on the other hand motility has been shown to correlate relevantly to all these questions.

## **8. Final Remarks**

The most general and important remark is the fact that motility seems not to be dependent of any of the major determinants of value system, individual experience or socio-demographical factors, except those very strongly correlated with age. Emigration ideology is on the other hand highly correlated with motility, and dependent of different factors that can indeed be considered as relevant to the totality of individual ideological constructs of the person.

This result can justify the rejection of the strong hypothesis. The value system of the individual academic has nevertheless an impact upon emigration ideology through disciplinary culture, relation to university autonomy as well as other elements. Lack of optimism and good information on emigration are positively correlated with motility as well as with a positive emigration ideology.

Another important result is the high relevance of academic degree in the Romanian higher education sector. Academic degree is more relevant than age in a series of its implications upon opinions.

The relation between academic mobility and emigration has led to relevant results. Two distinct groups could be found. The mobility group proved to be the one that included persons of higher age average, academic rank and a 5 times greater probability to hold decision making positions than the emigration group. Another element is the very radical underrepresentation of women in the mobility group.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> I used the term department, in its meaning generally accepted in UE documents. This actually includes structures like the chairs in the Romanian higher education system.
- <sup>2</sup> On the one hand I should mention the inter-institutional collaboration programs named JEPs (Joint European Projects), while on the other hand there also existed grants directed only for mobility. These have also known two forms, that of the IMGs (Individual Mobility Grants) in the first part of the program (TEMPUS I, 1990 – 1994) and that of the Youth Exchange and MJEPs (Mobility JEPs) of TEMPUS II. The JEP system, complex networks formed by many Eastern and Western institutions of higher education and having diverse, sometimes highly ambitious goals, has represented the core of the TEMPUS program. JEP goals have included in 53% of cases academic mobility next to development of the infrastructure, curriculum, new study programs and others. Still, practically all JEPs had expenses related to academic mobility, even if this was not a declared goal of the project. 95% of higher education institutions participating in JEPs have sent academics abroad. In total in the 1990 – 1996 period 23,295 students and 29,923 academics have traveled for study or research from Central and Eastern European universities to Western Europe. Of these 3141 students and 4162 academics were from Romania. The total size of the Romanian academic staff was 19,991 in 1996. Next to these, 3924 students and 21,017 academics have traveled from Western European institutions to Central and Eastern Europe, while 133 students and 657 academics traveled between different Central and Eastern European countries. To all these mobilities that have taken place in the framework of JEPs and IMGs I will have to add 351 Youth Exchange projects involving 10,387 persons.
- <sup>3</sup> The place of JEPs is taken in the SOCRATES/ERASMUS program by ICPs (Interuniversity Cooperation Programs). The goals of SOCRATES mobility are specially directed towards students from terminal years and young academics. In 1998/1999 SOCRATES mobility included a number of 199,102 students and 34,831 academics. Of these East-West relations involved only 5595 students travelling from East to West and 4092 from West to East. 2912 academics traveled from East to West and 2297 from West to East. 889 students have visited Romania in the framework of SOCRATES and 1551 have traveled from Romania to another country. 958 Romanian academics participated in mobility and 719 academics visited Romania.
- <sup>4</sup> The DAAD has supported academic mobility for 1805 persons during the last ten years.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANDERSON, Theodore R. (1955) [Intermetropolitan Migration: A Comparison of the Hypotheses of Zipf and Stouffer], in *American Sociological Review* no. 20
- APPLEYARD, R.T. (1964) *British Emigration to Australia*, Weidenfeld & Nicholson, London
- BECHER, Tony (1989) *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes
- BECHER, Tony, Kogan, Maurice (1992) *Process and Structure in Higher Education*, Routledge, London
- BOUDON, Raymond (1998) *Efecte perverse și ordine socială*, Eurosong & Book, București
- BOYS, Chris J., Brennan, John, Henkel, Mary, Kirkland, John, Kogan, Maurice, Youll, Penny (1988) *Higher education and the preparation for work*, Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London
- CLARK, Burton R. (1983) *The Higher Education System. Academic Organisation in Cross-National Perspective*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London
- COLEMAN, James S. (1977) "The Academic Freedom and Responsibilities of Foreign Scholars in African Universities", in *Issue no. 7*
- COLEMAN, James S. (1990) *Foundation of Social Theory*, Bellnap Press, Cambridge Mass.
- CRNJANSKI, Milos (1992) *Migrațiile*, Editura de Vest, Timișoara
- CUCEU Branda, Alina, Voudouris, Monica (1997) "Intellectualii români din lume văzuți acasă", in *Revista 22*, Decembrie 1997
- DE JONG, Gordon, Dumitru Sandu (1998) "Political Change, Ideology and Migration Intention", in *Romanian Journal of Sociology*.
- DE WINTER Hebron, Chris (1993) "In the 'Education Business', Who Owns What?" in *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol.XVIII, no.1
- ELDRIDGE, Hope T. (1964) "A Cohort Approach to the Analysis of Migration Differentials", in *Demography* no.1
- HOFSTEE, E.W. (1952) "Some Remarks on Selective Migration", in *Research Group for European Migration Problems Publications*, no.7, Nijhoff, The Hague
- KEHM, Barbara, Friedhelm Maiworm, Albert Over, Robert D. Reisz, Ulrich Teichler, (1996) *Evaluation of the First Phase of TEMPUS 1990/91 - 1993/94*, Commission of the European Union, DG XXII, contract 95-0401.00
- KEHM, Barbara, Friedhelm Maiworm, Albert Over, Robert D. Reisz, Ulrich Teichler, (1996) *Evaluation of the First Two Years of TEMPUS II 1994/95 - 1995/96*, Commission of the European Union, DG XXII, contract 95-0997.00
- KEHM, Barbara, Friedhelm Maiworm, Albert Over, Robert D. Reisz, Ulrich Teichler, (1997) *Integrating Europe through Co-operation Among Universities*, Higher Education Series 43, Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London

- KUHN, Thomas (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago University Press
- LEE, Everett S. (1966) "A Theory of Migration", in *Demography*, no.3
- MAIWORM, Friedhelm, Wolfgang Steube, Ulrich Teichler (1993) *Erasmus Student Mobility Programmes 1989/90 In The View of Their Coordinators - Erasmus Monographs no.16*, WZ 1 Werkstattberichte, Kassel
- MAIWORM, Friedhelm, Ulrich Teichler (1995) *Erasmus Student Mobility Programmes 1991/92 In The View of Local Directors - Erasmus Monographs no.19*, WZ 1 Werkstattberichte, Kassel
- MAIWORM, Friedhelm, Wolfgang Steube, Ulrich Teichler (1995) *The First Years of ECTS in the View of the Students - Erasmus Monographs no. 20*, WZ 1 Werkstattberichte, Kassel
- MAUSS, Marcel (1993) *Eseu despre dar*, Institutul European, Iasi (Forst ed. 1925)
- MIROIU, Adrian (coordinator), Pasti, Vladimir, Codiță, Cornel, Ivan, Gabriel, Miroiu, Mihaela (1998) *Învațământul românesc azi. Studiu de diagnoză*, Polirom. Iasi
- NOICA, Constantin (1993) *Modelul cultural european*, Humanitas, București
- PETERSEN, William (1961) *Population*, Macmillan, New York
- REISZ, Robert D. (1994a) "The Generation Gap. Academics in Romania", in *Sfera Politicii*, no. 20
- REISZ, Robert D. (1994b) "Curricular Patterns Before and After the Romanian Revolution" in *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 29 no.3
- ROSSI, Peter H. (1955) *Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility*, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill.
- SANDU, Dumitru (1996) *Sociologia tranziției. Valori și Tipuri Sociale în Tranziție* Staff, București
- SLOTERDIJK, Peter (1983) *Kritik der zynischen Vernunft*, Suhrkamp Verlag. Frankfurt am Main
- STOUFFER, Samuel A. (1940) "Intervening Opportunities: A Theory Relating Mobility and Distance", in *American Sociological Review*, no.5
- TARDE, Gabriel (1890) *Les lois de l'imitation* (Plon, Paris)
- TROW, Martin (1984) Leadership and Organisation, in Rune Premfors (ed.) *Higher Education Organisation*, Almqvist & Wiksell
- UNITED NATIONS. Department of Social Affairs (1949) "Problems of Migration Statistics" in *Population Studies* No.5, United Nations, New York
- UNITED NATIONS. Department of Social Affairs (1953) "The Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends: A Summary of the Findings of Studies on the Relationships Between Population Changes and Economic and Social Conditions" in *Population Studies* No.17, United Nations, New York
- WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel (1995) *After Liberalism*, The New Press, New York
- ZIPF, George K. (1949) *Human Behavior and the Principles of Least Effort: An Introduction to Human Ecology*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.