

Želvys R.

Vilnius University, Lithuania, Vilnius,
e-mail: rimantas.zelvys@fsf.vu.lt

GLOBALIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION IN POST-SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Globalization is a process which affects all areas of social life, including education. The impact of globalization is widely discussed and there are different opinions whether globalization leads to divergence or convergence of educational systems. The key research question: are we getting closer to each other or are we choosing different trajectories of educational development? The object of our study is the process of educational development in post-socialist countries. The aim of the study is to reveal the impact of globalization on educational change in the region. The method used in the study is secondary analysis of statistical and research data. Our hypothesis is based on the assumption that the process of globalization determined the application of similar reform trends in educational sectors of the nation states. However, different level of educational development and specific historical, social and cultural contexts lead to a growing differentiation of the educational models of the countries in the region. In other words, application of similar approaches led to different outcomes in the domain of education. The data analysis showed that the differences within the post-socialist world are growing and the countries, instead of forming a single group, are moving towards different pre-established educational models. Анализ данных показал, что различия в постсоциалистическом мире растут,

Key words: globalization, systems of education, post-socialist countries.

Желвис Р.

Вильнюс Университетінің профессоры, Литва, Вильнюс қ.
e-mail: rimantas.zelvys@fsf.vu.lt

Жаһандану және постсоциалистік елдердегі білім берудің дамуы

Жаһандану – бұл қоғамдық өмірдің барлық саласын, соның ішінде білім беруді де қамтитын үдеріс. Жаһанданудың әсері кеңінен талқыланады және оның білім беру жүйесінің ыдырауы мен конвергенциялануына әкелетіні туралы әртүрлі пікірлер бар. Зерттеудің түйінді мәселесі: Сіз бір-біріңізге жақындап келесіз бе, әлде білім беруді дамытудың әртүрлі траекторияларын таңдайсыз ба? Постсоциалистік елдердің дамуы зерттеу нысаны болып табылады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – жаһанданудың білім беруге әсерін анықтау. Зерттеу әдістері – бұл статистикалық және зерттеу мәліметтерінің екінші талдамасы. Біздің болжамымыз жаһандану – ұлттық мемлекеттердегі білім беру реформаларының ұқсас тенденцияларын қолдануын анықтайды деген жорамалға негізделген. Дей тұрғанмен, білім беруді дамытудың әртүрлі деңгейлері мен нақты тарихи, әлеуметтік және мәдени контекстер білім беру модельдерінің диверсификациясының өсуіне әкеліп отыр. Басқаша айтқанда, ұқсас тұрғыларды қолдану білім беру саласында әртүрлі нәтижелерді туындатты. Мәліметтерді талдау постсоциалистік әлемнің арасында өзгешеліктердің өсіп келе жатқанын және елдердің бірегей бір топ құрудың орнына алдын ала бекітілген білім беру модельдеріне жылжып бара жатқандығын көрсетті. Олардың кейбіреуі ЕО білім беру саласындағы саясатының жалпы тенденциясына, англо-саксондық, континенталдық немесе нақты бір деңгейде скандинавиялық модельдерге, сол сияқты кейбір басқалардың өздерінің даму жолдарын іздестіріп жатқандығын байқатады. Сонымен қатар, идеологиялық және саяси тұрғыда бөлінген және соған байланысты олардың білім беру саласындағы саясаты дәйексіз, тиянақсыз болатын елдердің тобы да бар.

Түйін сөздер: жаһандану, білім беру жүйесі, постсоциалистік елдер.

Желвис Р.

профессор Университета Вильнюса, Литва, г. Вильнюс
e-mail: rimantas.zelvys@fsf.vu.lt

Глобализация и развитие образования в постсоциалистических странах

Глобализация – это процесс, который затрагивает все сферы общественной жизни, включая образование. Влияние глобализации широко обсуждается. Существуют разные мнения о том, что глобализация ведет к расхождению или конвергенции образовательных систем. Ключевой вопрос исследования: вы приближаетесь друг к другу или выбираете разные траектории развития образования? Объектом исследования является развитие постсоциалистических стран. Цель исследования – определить влияние глобализации на образование. Методы исследования – это вторичный анализ статистических и исследовательских данных. Наша гипотеза основана на предположении, что процесс глобализации определяет применение схожих тенденций реформ образования в национальных государствах. Однако различные уровни развития образования и конкретные исторические, социальные и культурные контексты привели к растущей диверсификации образовательных моделей. Другими словами, применение схожих подходов привело к разным результатам в области образования. Анализ данных показал, что различия между постсоциалистическим миром растут, и страны вместо того, чтобы формировать единую группу, движутся к различным заранее установленным образовательным моделям. Некоторые из них следуют общей тенденции политики ЕС в области образования, приближаются к англосаксонским, континентальным или, в определенной степени, скандинавским моделям, в то время как некоторые другие по-прежнему ищут свой собственный путь развития. Существует также группа стран, которые идеологически и политически разделены, и по этой причине их политика в области образования является размытой и непоследовательной.

Ключевые слова: глобализация, системы образования, постсоциалистические страны.

Introduction

Globalization initially was an economic concept, which, like many other concepts which were formulated and developed in the world of business and economy, was gradually transferred to other areas of social activities, including education. The role of globalization for the functioning of contemporary social life is widely discussed among the social scientists during the last several decades. Definitions of globalization differ, as well as the evaluation of its possible impact on the further development of the knowledge society. International Labor Organization defines globalization as a progressive integration of economies and societies. In other words, globalization is a formation of global market and culture. Some authors consider globalization as a predominant force guiding the development of contemporary world. Others think that the influence of globalization is overemphasized and point out the tendency of mythologizing the global processes (Rees, 2002). Global competition doesn't decrease the importance of local markets, and the international migration is more peculiar to a relatively small number of highly qualified workforce. Majority of less qualified workers continue to live and work in their nation states, therefore the impact of globalization on the labor market is limited. There are also differing opinions whether globalization leads to the convergence of the nation states or, on the contrary,

competition in a free market of production and labor leads to the differentiation of national wealth of the countries. In particular, the theory of dependency suggests that the world is a single capitalist economic system in which different countries perform different roles and functions. "Core", or "developed" countries produce industrialized high-value added products and sell it to "periphery" or "developing" countries that provide low-value raw material to core countries. Therefore, not all countries have the same opportunities to reach the same economic development (Waitzberg, 2007). Economic competition assumes that there always are "winners" and "losers" among the nation states as well as among the different social groups within the countries. There is also an increasing "brain drain" from less developed countries to more developed ones. Critically-minded social scientists, e. g. Wayne Ross and Gibson (2007) claim that globalization, which is closely related with the ideology of neoliberalism, increases exploitation and social inequality.

The continuing discussion has direct implications for educational development. On one hand, one can see similar patterns of educational changes throughout the world, while, on the other hand, there are still significant differences concerning the quality and outcomes of education, structure, governance, etc. The key question is still open: are we getting closer to each other or are we choosing different trajectories of educational development? One

of the possible objects of study in pursuing answers to the research question is the development of post-socialist world. The area of post-socialist countries occupies vast territories of Europe and Asia and currently includes about 30 independent countries. In our study we don't include countries like the People Republic of China, Vietnam Socialist Republic or Laos Socialist Democratic Republic, which at least formally continue to claim socialism as their official ideology. Post-socialist countries can be considered as an interesting case from a comparative perspective, as before the dramatic changes, which took place during the years of 1989-1991, they had very similar or even identical systems of education. Though a more detailed analysis may reveal certain differences between some of the countries, e. g. the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, as well as among the 15 Soviet republics, in general the level of social and economic development was also rather similar. Almost three decades have passed and now we can make assumptions whether due to the process of globalization and, probably, as a result of some other factors, these countries were following the same route of educational development. Researchers working in the field of comparative education think that development of education in post-socialist countries could be an ideal testing ground for validating the contemporary social theories. "Post-socialism provides a unique space to critically interrogate the nature of divergence and difference in the study of globalization in comparative education" (Silova, 2010:4).

The object of our study is the process of educational development in post-socialist countries. **The aim of the study** is to reveal the impact of globalization on educational change in the region.

The method used in the study is secondary analysis of statistical and research data. Our hypothesis is based on the assumption that the process of globalization determined the application of similar reform trends in educational sectors of the nation states. However, specific historical, social and cultural contexts as well as uneven levels of success in a global competition of economies led to a growing differentiation of the educational models of the countries in the region. In other words, application of similar approaches led to different outcomes in the domain of education.

Development of post-socialist education

After the collapse of the socialist system the further development of the region to many social scientists seemed a rather simple and linear. The "underdeveloped" former socialist states had to implement reforms in order to catch up with the

more "advanced" Western world. Researchers based their belief on the assumption that "there is one Western educational model that needs to be replicated in the post-socialist countries and that there is only one way of implementing this model" (Bain, 2010). Western authors mainly described the area as a single region, barely paying attention to the existing historical and cultural differences between the countries. The starting positions for the implementation of reforms were more or less the same and the recipes applied were almost universal. Consultants and donors came also practically from the same global or regional organizations – the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, OECD, European Commission, etc. Countries of the region received similar "post-socialist" reform packages supplemented with only few country-specific modifications. The rhetoric of educational transformation processes has been remarkably similar across the region, signaling a move from socialist education policies to more Western-oriented ones (Silova, 2009). The term "countries in transition" was applied to post-socialist region having in mind the transition from "failed" socialist system to a "superior" model of Western capitalism (Rado, 2001). The term "transition" implies the temporary nature of reforms, which should last until the process of changing one model into another is completed. The final result after the implementation of all expert recommendations was expected to be more or less the same. However, after the three decades of reforms the process of transition is far from over. On the contrary, some countries of the region, e. g., Russia and some of its allies, seem to become disappointed with the results of the transformations and tend to move away from the trajectory of development suggested by the leading countries of the Western world. Why do we observe such turn of events in the post-socialist transition process? One of our assumptions is that the collapse of the previous social and economic model led to a series of crises (Želvys, 2018). The consequences of these multiple crises are felt even nowadays and countries tried to find solutions to various manifestations of crises in their own specific way, determined by the previous historical, cultural and religious heritage, mentality of the people, ways of understanding and interpreting the current global tendencies, etc. Ways of trying to overcome the economic hardships were also different and therefore led to different results. The debates are still continuing whether the fast but painful "shock therapy" or the way of slow and gradual economic transformations was the better option. Judging

from the current perspective, swift and radical transformations, or „shock therapy“, chosen by most of the Central European countries, seem to have been the better option and led to a more successful transition from planned to market economy. Some authors note, that in order to secure smooth economical transformations a kind of „Marshall plan“ was needed for the post-socialist economies – a purposefully targeted massive foreign aid conditioned upon cooperation among the recipient countries that could have encouraged productive investment and regional integration (Ivanova, 2007). However, Western countries were not ready for such enormous investments. Their limited input resulted in funding several aid programs like Tempus, Tacis or Phare, and providing consultancy and expertise in the field of market economy. In fact, nations of the region were left alone to cope with the economic difficulties. As a result vast differences emerged among the former Soviet republics, which during the socialist times constituted a single country – Lithuania with 32 093 international \$ (GDP per capita, PPP) and Tajikistan with 3 180 international \$ (GDP per capita, PPP) (The World Bank, 2017). The difference according to this economic indicator is more than 10 times (Table 1).

Our assumption is that economic difficulties experienced by post-socialist countries had a negative influence on the state of their education. Educational economists, e. g. Carnoy (1999), have indicated the existing relationship between the economic wealth and educational quality. The lower the level of the economic development of the country, the stronger the link between economy and education. In particular, the annual OECD study “Education at a Glance“ reveals the existence of such a tendency. The study indicates the relationship between cumulative expenditure per student and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) reading scores across the countries investing less than USD 50 000 per student. Above USD 50 000 per student, the relationship between performance and cumulative expenditure per student disappears (OECD, 2017). Most of post-socialist countries fall into the less than 50 000 USD category.

Apparently different level of economic development after the collapse of the socialist system resulted in differences of student achievement. Unfortunately, there are few comparative studies which enable us to compare educational outcomes of secondary education in post-socialist countries. One of them is the above mentioned PISA study.

Table 1 – GDP per capita, PPP (purchasing power parity) ranking (The World Bank, 2017)

Rank	Country	International \$
1.	Czech Republic	36,916
2.	Slovenia	34,802
3.	Slovakia	32,111
4.	Lithuania	32,093
5.	Estonia	31,638
6.	Poland	29,291
7.	Hungary	28,375
8.	Latvia	27,598
9.	Kazakhstan	26,410
10.	Romania	25,841
11.	Russia	25,533
12.	Croatia	25,264
13.	Bulgaria	20,329
14.	Belarus	18,848
15.	Montenegro	18,765
16.	Turkmenistan	17,993
17.	Azerbaijan	17,398
18.	Macedonia	15,231
19.	Serbia	15,090
20.	Mongolia	13,000
21.	Bosnia and Hercegovina	12,876
22.	Albania	12,021
23.	Kosovo	10,754
24.	Georgia	10,699
25.	Armenia	9,648
26.	Ukraine	8,667
27.	Uzbekistan	6,865
28.	Moldova	5,698
29.	Kyrgyzstan	3,726
30.	Tajikistan	3,180

Though not all post-socialist countries participate in the study, we can still compare most of the countries and relate the results with the level of economic development. The average score estimated in the PISA study is 500 (Table 2).

Table 2 – Post-socialist countries. 15-year student achievement scores in PISA 2015 study (OECD, 2016).

Rank	Country	Math score	Country	Reading score	Country	Science score
1.	Estonia	520	Estonia	519	Estonia	534
2.	Slovenia	510	Poland	506	Slovenia	513
3.	Poland	504	Slovenia	505	Poland	501
4.	Russia	494	Russia	495	Czech Rep.	493
5.	Czech Rep.	492	Latvia	488	Latvia	492
6.	Latvia	482	Czech Rep.	487	Russia	487
7.	Lithuania	478	Croatia	487	Hungary	477
8.	Hungary	477	Lithuania	472	Lithuania	475
9.	Slovakia	475	Hungary	470	Croatia	475
10.	Croatia	464	Slovakia	453	Slovakia	461
11.	Romania	444	Romania	434	Bulgaria	446
12.	Bulgaria	441	Bulgaria	432	Romania	435
13.	Moldova	420	Montenegro	427	Moldova	428
14.	Montenegro	418	Moldova	416	Albania	427
15.	Albania	413	Albania	405	Montenegro	411
16.	Georgia	404	Georgia	401	Georgia	411
17.	Macedonia	371	Macedonia	352	Macedonia	384
18.	Kosovo	362	Kosovo	347	Kosovo	378

Only three of the countries managed to show the results above the OECD average. The leader of post-socialist group of countries – Estonia - even

managed to get into the “Top 10” club, traditionally dominated by the Nordic nations and Southeastern Asia region (Table 3)

Table 3 – Top 10 countries. 15-year student achievement scores in PISA 2015 study (OECD, 2016). Note: B-S-J-G China refers to the four PISA-participating China provinces: Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Guangdong.

Rank	Country	Math score	Country	Reading score	Country	Science score
1.	Singapoure	564	Singapoure	535	Singapoure	556
2.	Hong Kong	548	Hong Kong	527	Japan	538
3.	Macao	544	Canada	527	Estonia	534
4.	Taipei	542	Finland	526	Taipei	532
5.	Japan	532	Ireland	521	Finland	531
6.	B-S-J-G (China)	531	Estonia	519	Macao	529
7.	Korea	524	Korea	517	Canada	528
8.	Switzerland	521	Japan	516	Viet Nam	525
9.	Estonia	520	Norway	513	Hong Kong	523
10.	Canada	516	Macao	509	B-S-J-G China	518

The three leading post-socialist countries – Estonia, Slovenia and Poland – are also among the leaders judging by the economic indicators (GDP per capita PPP). The three least successful ones – Georgia, Macedonia and Kosovo – have significantly lower economic achievements. The differences in levels of student achievement are evident.

Results and discussion

It's interesting to note that most of the countries were implementing similar educational reforms in accordance with the “recipes” provided by Western experts. Differentiation of curriculum in secondary schools, consolidation of the school network, introduction of national testing and/or maturity examination, external assessment and accreditation of educational institutions, three-levels of studies (Bachelor, Masters, PhD) in higher education, league tables and rankings, participation in international student achievement studies, expansion of the non-governmental and private sector can be named as some of the most evident examples. Principles of new public management: greater autonomy and accountability, result-oriented monitoring and evaluation, performance-related pay, competition and marketing of educational services were also introduced in post-socialist countries without much critical evaluation. They believed that this is the “right” way the capitalist society should operate. Institutions of higher education were encouraged to get involved into provision of paid services and other commercial activities. However, all these initiatives were interpreted and modified in accordance with social, historical and cultural traditions of each country. A variety of interpretations resulted in differences of final outcomes. The socialist period appeared to be too short in order to make these countries similar, and the apparent uniformity, which often misled Western consultants, was rather superficial. It seems that the previous ages of belonging to three major empires – Austro-Hungarian, Russian and Ottoman – made a greater impact than the much shorter socialist period in the 20th century. On the other hand, as we have already stated above, after all these years of transformations the transition period is not over and “post-socialism is not dead” (Silova, 2010:4). Nostalgia for the socialist past directs some of the former soviet bloc countries to look for other ways of development rather than to continue following the route prescribed in the early 1990s. A number of countries tried, though unsuccessfully, to secure the old system and to introduce the new one at the same time. Such parallel models were created both in general secondary and higher education, leaving the

question of compatibility unsolved. E. g., what is the relationship between the old system of candidates and doctors and the new PhDs, when they coexist simultaneously?

Currently we can classify post-socialist states into at least three distinct groups:

- * the new EU member states;
- * states which foresee the possible future EU membership, but are ideologically and politically divided (Moldova, Ukraine, Georgia, etc.);
- * countries which are outside the orbit of the EU education policy and have chosen their own trajectories of development (Russia, Byelorussia, Central Asian republics).

Even among the states of the first group we can observe differing preferences, though their trajectories of development are rather similar. “Different societies follow different trajectories even when they are subjected to the same forces of economic development, in part because situation-specific factors, such as cultural heritage, also shape how a particular society develops” (Inglehart and Baker, 2000: 22). While the Baltic states and Poland are more influenced by the Anglo-Saxon educational model, other Central and Eastern European countries tend to cling to the Continental Austro-Hungarian tradition. Our research showed that even the Baltic states, which are often perceived as a single region, are not choosing identical paths of educational transformations. In order to find differences and similarities between the countries we used the PISA 2012 survey data for our secondary analysis and compared the Baltic states with three “old” EU member countries: UK representing the Anglo-Saxon liberal model, Germany for the Continental corporatist model and Finland as an example of the Scandinavian model. PISA 2003, 2006 and 2009 data were also used for a retrospective analysis of countries' performance. We considered four aspects of the organization of the national school systems: human and material resources in schools, leadership and the level of school autonomy, assessment, school selectivity and ability grouping. We found that three Baltic states do not represent a single Central and Eastern European model. They chose different approaches in organizing their school systems; in particular, Estonia seems to be moving closer to the Finnish educational model when compared with the two other Baltic states (Želvys, Jakaitienė, Stumbrienė, 2017). Different historical, cultural and economical context of the former socialist countries continues to determine the process of divergence within the process of transition of formerly similar education systems.

Conclusions

After the collapse of the socialist system the previously semi-isolated block of countries in the region experienced to the full extent the power of phenomena of globalization. Under the influence of rapid development free market of goods and services countries demonstrated different levels of success in overcoming the economic and social difficulties of the initial phase of post-socialist period. We assume that economic wealth is an important precondition for the creation of quality education system, therefore the growing differences of economic potential of post-socialist countries determined different outcomes of student achievement. Global trends in educational development and universal reform packages recommended by Western experts and consultants evoked similar patterns of reforms throughout the region. However, different historic, social and economic contexts of these countries

led to different interpretations and modifications of reform ideas. At the first glance reform patterns and emerging new structures look similar; however, a more thorough analysis reveals different approaches at the stage of policy implementation. A variety of interpretations resulted in differences of final outcomes. Differences are growing and the countries, instead of forming a single group, are moving towards different pre-established educational models. Some are following the general trend of EU education policy, getting closer to Anglo-Saxon, Continental, or, to a certain extent, Scandinavian models, while some others are still looking for their own way of development. There is also a group of countries which are ideologically and politically divided, and for that reason their education policies are diffuse and inconsistent. The process of transition in education is not over and therefore remains an extremely interested case for comparative education studies.

References

- 1 Bain, O. (2010) Education After the Fall of the Berlin Wall: the End of History or the Beginning of Histories? In: Silova, I. (ed.) Post-Socialism is not Dead: (Re)Reading the Global in Comparative Education. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 27-59.
- 2 Carnoy, M. (1999) Globalization and Educational Reform: What Planners Need to Know. Paris: UNESCO.
- 3 Inglehart, R., Baker, W. (2000) Modernization, Cultural Change and the Persistence of Traditional Values. *American Sociological Review*, vol. 65, no 1, pp. 19-51.
- 4 Ivanova, M. N. (2007) Why There Was No “Marshall Plan” for Eastern Europe and Why This Still Matters. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, vol. 15, no 3, pp. 345-376.
- 5 OECD (2016) PISA 2015 Results (Volume I): Excellence and Equity in Education. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- 6 OECD (2017) Education at a Glance. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- 7 Rado, P. (2001) Transition in Education. Budapest: The Open Society Institute.
- 8 Rees, W. E. (2002) Globalization and sustainability: Conflict or Convergence? *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, vol. 2, no 4, pp. 249-268.
- 9 Silova, I. (2009) Varieties of Educational Transformation: The Post-Socialist States of Central/Southeastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union. In: Cowen, R., Kazamias, A. M. (eds.) *Second International Handbook of Comparative Education*. Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 295-320.
- 10 Silova, I. (2010) Rediscovering Post-Socialism in Comparative Education. In: Silova, I. (ed.) *Post-Socialism is not Dead: (Re)Reading the Global in Comparative Education*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 1-24.
- 11 Wayne Ross, E., Gibson, R. J. (2007) *Neoliberalism and Education Reform*. New York: Hampton Press.
- 12 The World Bank (2017) GDP per capita, PPP (international \$). Available at: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.CD>
- 13 Waitzerg, R. (2007) Are Educational Systems Converging or Diverging? A Cross-Country Empirical Test of Theories on Primary Education Official Curricula. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- 14 Želvys, R., Jakaitienė, A., Stumbrienė, D. (2017) Moving Towards Different Educational Models of the Welfare State: Comparing the Education Systems of the Baltic Countries. *Filosofija. Sociologija*, vol. 28, no 2, pp. 139-150.
- 15 Želvys, R. (2018) Education Systems in Times of Multiple Crises: The Case of Post-Socialist Transformations. *Iranian Journal of Comparative Education*, vol. 1, no 1, pp. 48-67.

