

# **Education and social cohesion**

*Syllabus*

*Mariam Orkodashvili*

## **Course overview**

The course discusses the role of education in building and strengthening social cohesion. Education plays a key role in strengthening social cohesion. Through creating an efficient social capital along with political, economic and social spheres, education contributes to social cohesion significantly.

The course of education and social cohesion stands at the disciplinary crossroads and cross-feeds the education, social and sociolinguistic fields.

On the one hand, perceptions of injustice and lack of trust in the quality of education have been most vividly perceived in the sphere of education. On the other hand, in a number of countries the recent reforms in education have influenced social cohesion and have brought ethnic minorities and low SES communities closer to mainstream societies.

The course assumes that the education sphere has served as a kind of mirror reflection of the socioeconomic and political-cultural developments and transformations that have been taking place in a number of regions over the past decades. This is an on-going dynamic process that overlaps the fields of sociology, social psychology, sociolinguistics, education policy and sociology of education.

During the course theories concerning social dynamics, sociopolitical transformations, chaotic societies and illegal practices, education policies and their influence on ethnic integration will be introduced and analyzed on real-life authentic case studies from post soviet countries.

The students will research and make presentations on individual case studies that illustrate the role of education in strengthening social cohesion through education. They will discuss the challenges that the individual countries have had to face in order to defeat illegalities, corruption, closed elite circles, inaccessibility to information, education quality manipulations and curricula pitfalls.

## **Course requirements**

Critical analysis of case studies 10% of final grade

Presentations 10% of final grade

Midterm 20% of final grade

Paper 25% of final grade

Final 35% of final grade

## **Course Policies**

Students are expected to attend the classes, participate in discussions and prepare reading materials assigned for each session. The students will be asked to research the cases of education policies that influence social dynamics across countries and analyze them critically. Presentations and term paper topics will be based on the cases and the issues discussed throughout the semester.

### **Session 1. Social functions and social benefits of education.**

The session will discuss the role that education plays in strengthening social cohesion. Through creating efficient human capital, and consequently, social capital along with political, economic and social spheres, education contributes to social cohesion significantly. It creates the feelings of belonging to mainstream community among public. It incentivizes the revision of national curricula and the inclusion of histories and interests of all minorities residing in a country. The social function of education is directly related to the discussions on justice, on equal and equitable treatment of all members of society, on transparency and objectivity of assessment and selection criteria to education institutions that affect equal professional and social opportunities for all members of society residing in any given country.

### ***Readings:***

Banks, J. A. and Cherry A. McGee Banks. 2009. *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*, Wiley.

Banks, J. A. (ed.). 2007. *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives*. Jossey-Bass.

- Brilliant, Mark. 2009. "'Intellectual Affirmative Action': How Multiculturalism Became Mandatory and Mainstream in College Curricula," in *Living in the Eighties*, ed. Vincent Cannato and Gil Troy. New York: Oxford University Press, 98-124.
- Labaree, D. 2010. *Someone Has to Fail: The Zero-Sum Game of Public Schooling*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McMahon, W. W. 1999. *Education and development: Measuring the social benefits*. New York and Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Ch., et. al. 1992. *Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition"*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tyack, D. 2004. *Seeking Common Ground: Public Schools in a Diverse Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

**Session 2.** History of public schooling and cohesive functions of public schools.

School is able to develop social cohesion through various tools. Common curriculum could be the first example. It may be used to teach the citizenry a common story about its history, culture, and civic duties.

By creating fair, tolerant, equality-based school climate education carries out a significant function of promoting social cohesion within schools and in wider public. Since the years of Frederick the Great of Prussia, schooling has been used to teach populous a common set of values. The Netherlands followed Frederick's example, and American Horace Mann imported the concept to the US through the Boston Public School System. Mann understood that if every sub-sector of the Boston populous was allowed to teach its own version of civics, history, and culture, there would be no common experience among school children. Creating this shared experience was Mann's main aim, and he believed that a publicly funded and administered K-12 school sector would promote this social cohesion he sought.

**Readings:**

- Goldin, C. and Lawrence Katz. 2008. *The Race Between Education and Technology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Heyneman, S. P. 2000. From the Party / State to Multiethnic Democracy: Education and Social Cohesion in Europe and Central Asia. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol. 22, No. 2*, Summer 2000, pp. 173-191.
- Heyneman, S.P., and Todoric-Bebic, S. 2000. "A Renewed Sense of Purpose of Schooling: Education and Social Cohesion in Africa, Latin America, Asia and Europe and Central Asia." *Prospects, 30* (2) pp. 145–166.
- Mitter, W. 1996. "Democracy and Education in Central Europe," in Oldenquist, A. (ed.) *Can Democracy be Taught?* Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Ravitch, D. 2001. *Left Back: A Century of Battles Over School Reform*. Simon and Schuster.
- Reese, W. 2005. *America's Public Schools: From the Common School to "No Child Left Behind"*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tyack, D., and Larry Cuba. 1995. *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

### **Session 3.** Textbooks, national curricula and nation states

The session will discuss the issues related to textbooks, national curricula, and school program-higher education entry exam alignment. The session will also analyze the ideas of Herder and Rousseau on national education and on cultural and political nationalism.

Through common curriculum schools incorporate the interests and objectives of many different groups and raise awareness of a common citizenship in multiethnic communities.

Sometimes issues have been raised in connection with 'inflammatory' character of certain civics and history curricula that might instigate ethnic confrontations. Sri Lankan and former Yugoslavian cases could serve as examples of providing inflammatory curricula instead of pacifying one.

#### ***Readings:***

- Braslavsky, C. (ed.). 2006. *Textbooks and quality learning for all: Some lessons from international experience*. Geneva: UNESCO/International Bureau of Education.
- Kymlicka, W. 1996. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Podeh, Elie. 2001. *The Arab-Israili Conflict in Israeli History Textbooks 1948-2000*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey, pp. 75-153.

Wiborg, Susanne. 2000. Political and cultural nationalism in education. The ideas of Rousseau and Herder concerning national education. *Comparative Education*, 36, pp. 235 – 243.

**Session 4.** Economics of social cohesion. Economic and social returns to education.

Equitable distribution of education is generally connected with resource allocation and access to those resources that open up educational opportunities to different socioeconomic groups. The question that rises here is: how should equitable resource allocation, and hence equitable education distribution, be achieved in the light of complexities that are usually associated with the issues of equitable educational opportunity, access and quality.

The resource allocation process is intrinsically intertwined with estimating economic rates of return (RORE) to education. Difficulties connected with estimating economic rates of return are major arguments that cast shadow on the accuracy of estimating private and social rates of return of education that would enable the policymakers to claim the precedence of one level of education over another, and hence, fund one level of education more than another. The session will discuss these issues and bring relevant examples and case studies to add empirical grounding and valid flavor to the analysis.

**Readings:**

- Alexander, N. C. (2001). *Paying for education: How the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund Influence Education in Developing Countries*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bennell, P. 1996. Using and Abusing the Rates of Return: A Critique of the World Bank. *International Journal of Education Development*, 16(3), 235–248.
- Heyneman, S. P. 2000. From the Party / State to Multiethnic Democracy: Education and Social Cohesion in Europe and Central Asia. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 2000, pp. 173-191.
- Heyneman, S. P. (1995). The Economics of Education: Disappointments and Potential. *Prospects*, XXV(4), 559–83.
- World Bank. 2000. *Decentralization and the challenge of hard budget constraints*. World Bank Prem Notes.
- World Bank. *Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Department; Europe and Central Asia Regional Operations*, World Bank, (i-iv), pp. 1-36.

## **Session 5.** From social satisfaction to global macrosatisfaction.

The session will discuss WorldValues Survey data, Cronbach alpha and measures of social satisfaction / global macrosatisfaction. Measuring the effect of reliable and valid education-related variables on social cohesion presents a research topic challenging and important for future educators, policymakers and wider public.

World Values Survey conducted across countries provides data on some universally acknowledged values and perceptions that bear importance for studies in cross-cultural and cross-country relations.

One way to estimate the validity and reliability degrees of influencing factors on social cohesion could be through Cronbach  $\alpha$  coefficient calculations. The session will discuss the pros and cons of using Cronbach  $\alpha$  coefficient in measuring social satisfaction / global macrosatisfaction as related to education policies and their cohesive effects.

### **Readings:**

- Carnoy, M. (1998). The Political Economy of Education. In K. Kempner, M. Mollis, & W. Tierney (Eds.), *Comparative Education, ASHE Reader Series* (17-31). Massachusetts: Simon & Schuster.
- Cortina, J. M. 1993. What is Coefficient Alpha? An examination of theory & application. *Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 78, No 1*. American Psychological Association, pp. 98 – 104.
- Green, A. and Preston, J. (2001). Education and social cohesion: recentering the debate. *Peabody Journal of Education, 76* (3&4). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., pp. 247-284.
- Gutmann, A. 1987. *Democratic Education*. Princeton University Press, pp. 138-231.

## **Session 6.** Segregation and Desegregation

The issues of ethnic / racial diversity in education access, the connection of demographic change with educational attainment are the problems that policymakers work on in order to help build a more equal society, since it is from the education that the larger socio-economic, political or cultural layers of society develop.

However, education still remains to be an ‘intrinsically inegalitarian’ domain in Durkheimian sense. For instance, widely debated Affirmative Action has clearly shown that

catering for the interests of all races and ethnicities has turned out to be an almost insurmountable obstacle to overcome. On the one hand, we have an Affirmative Action decision to make concessions for certain disadvantaged groups, however, ‘the most damning charge against affirmative action is that it does more harm than good for the intended beneficiaries, by enticing students to attend colleges where they are unprepared for the competition’ (Kane, 1998), and on the other hand, we have the defenders of universal justice and equality for everybody. Promoting diversity (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 02-241) is beneficial when all the races and ethnicities are considered as equal. Therefore, affirmative action was criticized and reconsidered multiple times since the very day of its inception.

Later, when Proposition 209 was adopted, it was again attacked, claiming it had ‘chilling effects’ (Orfield & Miller, eds., 2000) depriving the minorities of education opportunity.

The session will discuss and critically analyze the above issues.

**Readings:**

- Allen, W.R. 2003. *And the last shall be first: Racial diversity, Distributive justice, and affirmative action*. Presented at the Pullias Lecture Series on the Future of Higher Education on October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2003.
- Ancheta, A. 2005. After *Grutter* and *Gratz*: Higher education, race, and the law. In G. Orfield, P. Marin, & C. Horn (Eds.) *Higher education and the color line: College access, racial equity, and social change* (pp. 175-196). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Bossert, S. T. 1979. *Tasks and Social Relationships in Classrooms*. New York, Cambridge University Press, pp. 21-62.
- Brilliant, M. 2010. *The Color of America Has Changed: How Racial Diversity Shaped Civil Rights Reform in California, 1941-1978*. New York: Oxford University Press, chapter 3.
- Donato, R. 1997. *The Other Struggle for Equal Schools: Mexican Americans During the Civil Rights Era*. SUNY Press.
- Frankenberg, E. and Elizabeth Debray-Pelot (eds.). 2011. *Integrating Schools in a Changing Society: New Policies and Legal Options for a Multicultural Generation*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Grutter v. Bollinger* 2003. Kennedy, J. *Dissenting*, 288 F.3d 732, affirmed.
- Grutter v. Bollinger* 2003. *Brief for Amicus Curiae National Association of Scholars in Support of Petitioners*. No. 02-241.
- Grutter v. Bollinger* 2003. *AERA brief in Support of the University of Michigan*, No. 02-241.

- Horn, C.L. & Flores, S.M. 2003. *Percent Plans in College Admissions: A Comparative Analysis of Three States' Experiences*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Hyun, H. 2007. Falling sky: Trends in minority access to law schools, pre- and post-*Grutter*. In G. Orfield, P. Marin, S.M. Flores, & L. M. Garces (Eds.) *Charting the future of college affirmative action: Legal victories, continuing attacks, and new research* (pp. 105-124). Los Angeles, CA: The Civil Rights Project at UCLA.
- Kane, T. J. 1998. Misconceptions in the debate over affirmative action in college admissions. In G. Orfield and E. Miller (Eds.) *Chilling admissions: The Affirmative action crisis and the search for alternative*. (pp. 17-32). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational publishing Group.
- Karabel, J. 2005. *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Leonhardt, D. 2007. The new affirmative action. In *The New York Times*, September 30, 2007.
- Minow, M. 2010. *In Brown's Wake: Legacies of America's Educational Landmark*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Patterson, J. T. 2001. *Brown v. Board of Education: A Civil Rights Milestone and its Troubled Legacy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Valencia, R. 2008. *Chicano Students and the Courts: The Mexican American Legal Struggle for Educational Equality in America*. New York: NYU Press.

**Session 7.** Discussion of problem issues and topics for final papers. Review. Case Studies. Midterm.

**Session 8.** Higher education: public or private good? Social benefits of higher education.

The session will discuss the social benefits of education such as public integration, social stability, and social cohesion.

The widely debated issue on who should pay for higher education and who actually benefits engendered the discussions on private and social rates-of-return to higher education, where the 'unmeasurable' social benefits are widely debated.

The discussions on public and private benefits of higher education are intrinsically related to the evaluations of private and social rates-of-return to higher education. 'In the early 1970s, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education completed a landmark study that



evaluated individual and societal benefits – and responsibilities – regarding higher education. In June 1973, the commission concluded that in relation to higher education, “the proportion of total economic costs borne privately (about two-thirds) as against the proportion of total economic costs now borne publicly (about one-third) is generally reasonable” (Breneman and Finney, 1997: 30). The commission’s own answer, echoing the success of the California Master Plan, was that higher education benefits not just the individual but society as a whole.

Seville and Tooley (1997) argue that the state should turn higher education into general public good, so that even those who do not have opportunity to go to higher education institutions benefit from the common good created and produced by those who are fortunate enough to go through the higher education experience.

### **References:**

- Albornoz, O. (1996). *Autonomy and Accountability in Higher Education*. In Z. Morsy & P. Altbach (Eds.), *Higher Education in International Perspective* (36-46). New York: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Breneman, D. W. and Finney, J. E. (1997). The changing landscape. Higher education finance in the 1990s. In P. M. Callan and J. E. Finney with K. R. Bracco and W. R. Doyle (Eds.) (1997). *Public and private financing of higher education. Shaping public policy for the future*. American Council on Education. ORYX Press, Series on Higher Education, pp. 30 – 59.
- Gutmann, A. 1987. *Democratic Education*. Princeton University Press, pp. 138-231.
- Heuser, B. (2008). Academic social cohesion within higher education. *UNESCO Prospects*, Springer.
- Heyneman, S. P. and Fägerlind, I. (Eds.) (1988). University examinations and standardized testing. Principles, experience and policy options. World Bank Technical Paper No 78. *Proceedings of a Seminar on the Uses of Standardised Tests and Selection Examinations*. (Beijing, China, 1985). Washington, D.C.
- Heyneman, S.P. (2007). Higher education and social cohesion: a comparative perspective. In Phillip G. Altbach and Patti McGill Petterson (eds.) *Higher education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: global challenges and innovative ideas*, 55-78. Rotterdam (Netherlands): Sense Publishers (2007).
- Hovey, H. A. (1999). *State spending for higher education in the next decade. The battle to sustain current support*. The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

- Institute for Higher Education policy. (2005). *The Investment Payoff: A 50-State Analysis of the Public and Private benefits of Higher Education*. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy. [www.ihep.org](http://www.ihep.org)
- Kezar, A. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27 (4), 429-459.
- Martin, M. and Sauvageat, C. 2011. *Constructing an indicator system or scoreboard for higher education. A practical guide*. UNESCO, Institute for Statistics, pp. 16-87.
- Seville, A. and Tooley, J. (1997). The debate on higher education. Challenging the assumptions. *Studies in Education No 5*. IEA Education and Training Unit.
- Sporn, B. (1999). *Adaptive university structures. An analysis of adaptation to socioeconomic environments of US and European Universities*. Higher Education Policy Series 54. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London and Philadelphia.
- Task Force on Higher Education and Society. (2004). Moderated discussion: The Task Force on Higher Education and Society. *Comparative Education Review*, 48(1), 70–88.

## **Session 9.** Political graft, corruption and education.

Corruption in education distorts cohesive function of education.

The session will discuss corruption, academic misconduct, and power abuse in education. The most vividly perceived practice in this respect is blame-game, i.e. the opposing sides always blame each other in corruption and dishonest practices; power struggles involve revealing corrupt practices of opposing sides, when each cartel itself is involved in corrupt practice.

Struggle for power, resource redistribution and decision making authority have often affected education field. Political graft in education has been most effectively processed through coercion and manipulations with rules and regulations. Self-complacency of cartel members: the principle of ‘earn and let others earn’ in order to feel secure in the closed vicious circle of ‘fellow co-thinkers’ might be at work here. Officials in government might receive shares from different cartels as an extra income. In return, they offer to lobby the interests of those cartels during decision-making process. This is especially true while appointing rectors and leading academic personnel in the education institutions.

## **References:**

- Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., & Whitelaw, M. J. 1994. *The Academic Profession: An International Perspective*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Broadman, H. G. and Recanatini F. 1999. *Seeds of Corruption: Do Market Institutions Matter?*
- Campos, J. E. and Pradhan, S. 2007. (Eds). *The many faces of corruption. Tracking vulnerabilities at the sector level*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Hallak, J. & Poisson, M. 2007. *Corrupt schools, corrupt universities: what can be done?* UNESCO, IIEP Publishing.
- Heyneman, S. (2004). Education and Corruption. *International Journal of Educational Development* 24 (6): 637–48.
- Heyneman, S. (2007). Buying your way into heaven: the corruption of education systems in global perspective. *Perspectives on Global Issues, Vol. 2, Issue 1*, New York: New York University.
- Heyneman, S. (2008). Three universities in Georgia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan: The struggle against corruption and for social cohesion. *UNESCO Prospects 37(3)*, Springer, pp. 305-318.
- Heyneman, S.P., Anderson, K. H., and Nuraliyeva, N. (2008). The cost of corruption in higher education. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 52, No. 1. Published by Comparative Education Society. The University of Chicago Press.
- Heyneman, S. P. (Ed.) (2009). *Buying your way into heaven. Education and corruption in international perspective*. Sense Publishers, Rotterdam / Taipei.
- Karabel, J. 2005. *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Houghton Mifflin.
- McClintick, D. 2006. How Harvard lost Russia. *Institutional Investor Magazine*, Americas and International Editions.
- Orkodashvili, M. 2010. Higher Education Reforms in the Fight against Corruption in Georgia. *Demokratizatsiya: The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization*, Heldref, 18 (4), forthcoming.
- Orkodashvili, M. 2010. Leadership Challenges in the Fight against Corruption in Higher Education in Georgia. In *The John Ben Sheppard Journal of Practical Leadership, Volume 5, Issue 1*, The University of Texas of The Permian Basin, UTPB Publication, pp. 26-44.

- Orkodashvili, M. 2011. Corruption, collusion and nepotism in higher education and on the labor market in Georgia. *European Education: Issues and Studies, Volume 43, Number 2*, M. E. Sharpe, pp. 32-54.
- Orkodashvili, M. 2012. The Changing Faces of Corruption in Georgian Higher Education: Access Through Times and Tests. *European Education: Issues and Studies, Volume 44, Number 1*, Spring 2012, M. E. Sharpe, pp. 27-45.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. 1975. The economics of corruption. *Journal of Public Economics* 4 (February), pp. 187-203.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. 1978. *Corruption. A Study in Political Economy*. Academic Press. A Subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. 1998. Bribes and gifts. In A. Ben-Ner and L. Putterman (Eds.). *Economics, Values, and Organization*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 296-328.
- Transparency International. 2011. Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2006. Press Release. [www.transparencyinternational.com](http://www.transparencyinternational.com)  
[http://www.transparency.org/policy\\_research/surveys\\_indices/cpi/2011](http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2011)
- World Bank. 2000. *An Anticorruption Strategy for Revenue Administration*. World Bank Prem Notes.

**Session 10.** Fighting corruption through testing and standardization.

The session will discuss the issues of testing, standardization: issues of quality, transparency, assessment criteria. Fair treatment of students is one more way education contributes to social cohesion. Fair and transparent tests could provide a good example of this objective of education that would lead to equality of educational opportunity.

The session will discuss such issues as adherence to particularistic politics, favoring certain nationalities and ethnicities over others; this is especially vivid in the assessment process during entrance examinations to higher education institutions or during the selection process at the job places. The students will generate strategies and ideas on how to conduct tests and examinations in the most objective, transparent, fair, unbiased and efficient way.

**References:**

- Anderson, P. and Morgan, G. 2008. *Developing Tests and Questionnaires for a National Assessment of Educational Achievement*. The World Bank.

- Baker, D. P., Goesling, B., and Letendre, G. K. (2002). Socioeconomic status, school quality, and national economic development: a cross-national analysis of the “Heyneman-Loxley Effect” on mathematics and science achievement. *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 291-312.
- Black Sea Conference on University Admission and Exams. *Promoting fairness and equity in access to higher education*. Georgia, 19-20 September, 2006.
- Coleman, J. S., et al. 1968. *The equality of educational opportunity report*. Washington D. C., U.S. Printing Office.
- Douglass, J. 2007. *The Conditions for Admission: Access, Equity, and the Social Contract of Public Universities*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Eckstein, M. A.; Noah, H. J. (1992). *Examinations: comparative and international studies*. Oxford, UK, Pergamon.
- Gamoran, A. & Long, D. 2006. Equality of educational opportunity: a 40-year retrospective. In R. Teese (Ed.), *Macrosocial Perspectives on Educational Inequality*.
- Greaney, V. and Kellaghan, T. 2008. *Assessing National Achievement Levels in Education*. The World Bank.
- Heyneman, S. P. (1987). Uses of examinations in developing countries: selection, research, and education sector management. *International Journal of Education Development*, Vol.7, No. 4 (1987), pp. 251-263.
- Kellaghan, T., et al. 2009. *Using the Results of a National Assessment of Educational Achievement*. The World Bank.
- Lemann, N. 1999. *The Big Test: The Secret History of the American Meritocracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.
- Noah, H. J., & Eckstein, M. A. 1992. The Two Faces of Examinations: A Comparative and International Perspective. In Eckstein & Noah (Eds.) *Examinations: Comparative and International Studies* (147–171). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Orkodashvili, M. 2011. From equity of access to international quality standards for curbing corruption and closing achievement gaps in post – soviet countries. In *The Impact of International Achievement Studies on National Education Policymaking, International Perspectives on Education and Society Series, Vol. 13*, UK: Emerald Publishing, pp. 181-206.

**Session 11.** Ethics, codes of conduct in academic institutions and social cohesion.

The session will raise the issue of the importance of ethical behavior of students, academic and administrative staff in education institutions and its influence on social cohesion. The cases of academic misconduct and unethical behavior may include: offering and accepting bribes for grades; nepotism, favoritism in admission and hiring selection process; plagiarizing, abusing power, and inappropriate use of university funds and premises. All these cases could be the causes of the loss of public trust in education institutions, that engender the perceptions of injustice, and consequently, lead to the weakening of social cohesion.

**References:**

- Aristotle. 350 BC. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by W.D. Ross.
- Browne, K. E. and Milgram, B. L. (Eds.) (2009). *Economics and Morality. Anthropological Approaches*. Altamira Press. A division of Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Heyneman, S. 2010. "The Concern with corruption of ethnics in higher education," in Tricia Bertram Gallant (Ed.) *Creating the Ethical Academy: a Systems Approach to Understanding Misconduct and Empowering Change* New York: Rutledge and Kegan Paul.
- Machiavelli, N. 1974. *The Discourses*. Penguin Classics.
- The Essential Writings of Machiavelli. 2007. The Modern Library, New York.

**Session 12.** Politics of language and education .

The session will raise the issues related to politics of language, language categories, stereotypes, categories in societies, communities and groups. Cohesive power of language will be discussed in the framework of language policies, minority language issues, ethnic and linguistic integration.

**References:**

- Blanton, C. 2004. *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education in Texas, 1836-1981*, Texas A&M Press.
- Cardinal, L. 2004. "The Limits of Bilingualism in Canada," *Nationalism & Ethnic Politics* 10, 79-103.

- Comer, J.P. 1988. Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American*, 29(5), 42-48.
- Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind.* The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. 2004. *Don't Think of an Elephant. The essential guide for progressives.* Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Lakoff, G. 2008. *The Political Mind.* Viking.
- Taylor, S. G. 2002. Multilingual societies and planned linguistic change: New language-in-education programs in Estonia and South Africa. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(3), 313-338.
- Verschueren, J. 2011. *Ideology in language use.* Cambridge University Press.

### **Session 13.** Human capital, trust and social cohesion.

Education institutions are considered as creators of public goods through the production of human capital that is realized through knowledge enhancement and skill mastery. The human capital, in its turn, directly and indirectly, i.e. through social capital (networks, norms, trust), produces and strengthens social cohesion. The session will discuss organizations and social cohesion: social organizations, political organizations, economic organizations, educational organizations.

Another way how education contributes to social cohesion is teaching students about accepted social rules that create a sense of belonging to a community and adhering to common norms. The effects of this practice is a common understanding of rules, a concept of fairness, a comprehension of the consequences for illegal activity, and a greater participation in the political process among those who are schooled. Thus, adjudication of unequal treatment and of a feeling of “strangeness” is another contribution of education to social cohesion.

#### **References:**

- Brown, R. 2000. *Group Processes. Dynamics within and between groups.* Blackwell Publishing.
- Coleman, J.S. 1988. “Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital.” *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, pp. 95 - 120.
- De Soto, H. 2000. *The mystery of capital. Why capitalism triumphs in the west and fails everywhere else.* Basic Books.

- Fukuyama, F. 1999. *The great disruption. Human nature and the reconstruction of social order.* The Free Press.
- Fukuyama, F. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity.* New York : Free Press.
- Heyneman, S. P. 2005. Introduction to This Special Issue on Organizations and Social Cohesions. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 80 (4), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 1-7.
- Lakoff, G. 2006. *Whose Freedom?* Picador, N.Y.
- MacIntyre, A. 1988. *Whose justice? Which Rationality?* University of Notre Dame Press.
- Olson, M. 1965. *The logic of collective action: Public goods and the theory of groups.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. 1971. *A theory of justice.* The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. 2001. *Trust, Honesty and Corruption: Theories and Survey Evidence from Post-Socialist Societies.* Paper prepared for the Workshop on Honesty and Trust in Post-Socialist Societies at Collegium, Budapest, pp. 1-47.

**Session 14.** Presentations. Further Case Studies.

**Session 15.** Discussion of problem issues. Review. Submission of final papers.

**Final exam**