

BABEȘ-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTY OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WORK

„GHEORGHE DIMA” MUSIC ACADEMY CLUJ-NAPOCA
THEORETICAL FACULTY

**BARRIERS OF LEGITIMACY IN THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF
MUSICAL HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN ROMANIA**

- PhD Thesis -

SUMMARY

PhD Candidate
Adriana Daniela ȘERBAN

Scientific Supervisors:

Professor **Petru ILUȚ** PhD
Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj – Napoca

Professor **Gabriel BANCIU** PhD
„Gheorghe Dima” Music Academy, Cluj – Napoca

2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pag.
Lists of tables, figures, appendices and acronyms	1
Motivation	5
Introduction	8
Chapter I. THEORETICAL FRAME OF RESEARCH	15
I.1. Methodological and epistemological frame	15
I.2. Methods and research instruments	22
I.2.1. The method of content analysis	22
I.2.2. The method of comparative analysis	31
I.2.3. The method of secondary data analysis	35
I.2.4. The case study	37
I.2.5. The questionnaire – an instrument of sociological enquiry	39
I.2.6. The interview	40
I.2.7. Importance and utility of using complementary research methods	45
I.3. Research design and sampling	47
Conclusions	54
Chapter II. SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND ARTISTIC CREATION – theoretical perspective	56
II.1. Scientific research and artistic creation – conceptual proximity and delineations	56
II.2. The cultural capital and the field of cultural production in Pierre Bourdieu’s theory	68
II.2.1. The fungibility of the forms of capital as structuring element of the social field	68
II.2.2. The scientific, artistic and academic fields – constituents of the field of cultural production	75
Conclusions	93
Chapter III. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS – a consequence and an instrument of academic competitiveness	96
III.1. Brief history of quality assurance and assessment in higher education	96
III.2. A look over the European and national context of higher education	101
III.3. Psychosocial consequences of the ranking of higher education institutions	107
III.4. Quality assurance of higher education at European and national level, within the frame of the Bologna Process.	115
III.4.1. The evaluation of quality assurance processes for higher education at European level	115
III.4.2. Quality assurance in the Romanian academic environment	122
III.5. The insertion of university graduates on the labour market – social problem/quality indicator	128
Conclusions	144

Chapter IV. THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF MUSICAL HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN ROMANIA	147
IV.1. Document analysis: Education Law nr. 84/1995	148
IV.2. Document analysis: Methodology for external evaluation, standards, standards of reference, and list of performance indicators of the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, 2006	150
IV.2.1. The analytic course	150
IV.2.2. Results of document analysis	161
IV.2.3. Comparative analysis of specific standards elaborated by the ARACIS speciality commissions	165
IV.3. Document analysis: The methodology for allocating amounts for basic funding from the budget to higher education institutions in 2011	172
IV.3.1. The analytic course	172
IV.3.2. Results of document analysis	181
IV.4. Document analysis: Education Law nr. 1/2011	187
IV.5. Document analysis: Methodology for external evaluation, standards, standards of reference, and list of performance indicators of the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education. Project, 2011	190
IV.6. Other documents referring to the quality assessment of higher education institutions in Romania	192
Conclusions	195
Chapter V. CASE STUDY: “Gheorghe Dima” Music Academy Cluj-Napoca	198
V.1. Succinct introduction to the institution	199
V.2. Sociological enquiry	201
V.2.1. Target population, sampling, and sources used in elaborating questionnaires	201
V.2.2. Results of the analysis of data collected by questionnaires	205
V.2.3. Conclusions of the sociological enquiry	240
V.3. Research activity within the "Gheorghe Dima" Music Academy in Cluj-Napoca – examples	245
Conclusions	261
CONCLUSION	264
References	275
Appendices	289

SUMMARY

Key-words: *higher education, evaluation of quality, research, artistic creation, musical, Bourdieu, habitus, legitimacy*

Introduction

In the pragmatic society of recent decades, higher education has been marked by important changes, which generated multiple and complex challenges: the creation of an European academic area (the Declaration of Sorbonne, 1998); the application of the “Bologna Process” for restructuring higher education institutions towards compatibility (the Declaration of Bologna, 1999); the increase in importance of educational activities and of academic research, in particular (Lisbon, 2000); the appreciation of the role played by the quality assurance process for higher education institutions (Salamanca Address, 2001); the generation of competition in this environment, in the context of significant efforts to internationalise the academic medium and open it up towards a larger range of people (The Communicate of Prague, 2001).

An important event was the meeting of European ministers responsible with higher education, which took place in Berlin in September 2003 and initiated a series of measures subscribing to the decisions adopted at Lisbon and Bologna. Research activity was declared a major priority in higher education, within an Europe that aimed at having the most dynamic and competitive economy in the world by 2010. Also, it was decided to systematically evaluate three main directions of academic reality: quality assurance, the organisation of study cycles and politics for diploma and title recognition.

In March 2004, a group of specialists was designated to follow the three aspects mentioned. The group presented detailed reports at conferences of ministers in charge of higher education, held in Bergen (May 2005), London (May 2007), Leuven (April 2009) and Bucharest (April 2012). Following conclusions presented in 2005 in Bergen, the employability of higher education graduates was considered an aspect worth evaluating in future studies, as a measure of higher learning institution efficiency. The Bologna Working Group defined the graduates employability as being „the ability to gain initial meaningful employment, or to become self-employed, to maintain employment, and to be able to move around within the labour market.” (Rauhvargers et al., 2009, p. 43).

The great transformation taking place in European higher education also concerns academic institutions with artistic profile, a class for which quality evaluation poses specific problems, particularly concerning the creative process. In these institutions, the border between the academic and professional spaces is finer and more flexible, as is the case for any vocational field. This confers some characteristic aspects to the academic domains of learning and research.

The problem of evaluating the results of research and of artistic creation in academic institutions with an artistic profile is one that calls for debates and controversies on different planes and at the level of many forums. Following the conference of Berlin, in April 2003, Vienna was home to a conference organised by the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA) and the European Association of Conservatoires (AEC) titled *European Dialogue on Bologna in the Arts*. Both organisations are independent institutions with assisting the artistic academic medium in fulfilling the Bologna process as one of the main concerns. Also, both organisations have members from around the world, including Romania.

The European context for quality assurance in higher education has put a big pressure on many European countries, particularly on those with a communist past, one of which is Romania. Our country was one of the first to sign both the Declaration of Sorbonne and that of Bologna. In consequence, it has assumed the realisation of the modifications mentioned by these important documents, reinforced by the fact that on the 1st of January 2007, it became a member of the European Union.

In Romania, as in many other European countries, the evaluation of the quality of academic institutions with artistic profile is subject to present debate. The AEC conference in September 2009 marked the beginning of a collaborative agreement between the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education - RAQAHE (Agenția Română de Asigurare a Calității în Învățământul Superior - ARACIS) and AEC. In virtue of this agreement, the evaluation of study programs provided in higher education institutions with musical profile is performed by RAQAHE with the participation of international experts, acknowledged by AEC. This agreement was concretised in 2010, with visits from ARACIS at the „Gheorghe Dima” Music Academy in Cluj–Napoca and at the National Music University in Bucharest, each with the participation of two international experts, evaluators specialised in the musical field.

Psychologist Daniel David considers that in Romanian higher education there exists a tension between the scientific and vocational fields concerning the process of evaluating research activity and artistic creation, respectively; a tension which generates a „fundamental and pressing” problem (David, 2006B, p.2).

From these mentioned above, it follows that the phenomenon of quality evaluation in higher education institutions with artistic profile is one of great actuality, both at a national and at a European level. Specific aspects of the creative activity and its results raise a complex of problems concerning applied measures and evaluation, which we consider to necessitate a more careful analysis. The way in which specific aspects of this academic environment in Romania are approached, in terms of Bourdieu's theory offers a still untapped perspective. Also the comparative analysis on the perception of the representative social actors - teachers and students - is a possible basis for empirical investigation of what constitutes the concept of student-centred education.

The present work, structured in five chapters, constitutes a sociological study on the phenomenon of evaluation of the results of artistic creation in higher education institutions, in particular those with musical profile. The assumed theoretical perspective over the social field is that of Pierre Bourdieu.

Bourdieu starts from the Marxist notion of a capital which is accumulated and reproduced as a result of the social segregation which takes place function of the position with respect to the means of production. He identifies three forms of capital: economic, social and cultural (1986A) whose fungibility is the foundation of strategies for capital reproduction, which are, simultaneously, strategies for deciding the legitimacy of capital transmission.

The social space presents itself as a force *field*, an ensemble of power ratios acting on everything that enters the respective field and deciding its structure. Social fields represent spheres of human activity, like the economic, politic, cultural, artistic, scientific, academic, etc. (Bourdieu, 1984B), where the „fight” is aimed at accumulating and/or controlling a more significant part of the capital specific to the field. The economic and power fields permeate all other social fields.

Any social field presents three major levels, that of „the dominating” (which possess the largest amount of capital), that of „the dominated” (which lack capital) and the neutral area

(including agents that possess a small amount of capital but lack the power to decide the structure of the field). By virtue of the power and advantages that they possess, the dominating decide the rules and legitimacy of belonging to the field; they decide on definitions, criterions and limits of legitimacy (Bourdieu, 1986A, 2007).

Positions occupied by various social agents within a field are determined by the characteristics of the capital which they possess, and the actions that they undertake, *position taking* as Bourdieu says (2007), are based on their *dispositions* – the accumulation of their previous life experiences. The system of dispositions, intrinsically in the form of manifestations, constitutes the *habitus* of a social agent, an objective fundament for the conduits constantly adopted, but lacking a subjective intentionality towards some specific purpose (Bourdieu 1986B). Bourdieu (2001, 2007) considers that there exists a *habitus* specific to every field: scientific, artistic, academic, etc., determined by social status and professional trajectory of social agents.

In „The Rules of Art”, Bourdieu (2007) asserts that in the analysis of cultural works three levels of social reality must be addressed: (1) the position held within the field of power by the field that produced the work, (2) the internal structure describing this field, therefore, of the mode in which the specific capital is shared between positions and (3) the dispositions systems, meaning the *habitus* of social agents within the field. In the investigation undertaken here, we took into consideration Bourdieu’s comments concerning higher education institutions with musical profile and the results of research and artistic creation activities taking place within this field.

Following these, *this research aims at*:

1. identifying the position, within the academic field, held by higher education institutions with musical profile;
2. determining the structure within the academic field of musical orientation;
3. outlining the habitual characteristics of representative agents – teachers and students – in this field.

The research questions were:

- What is the meaning of quality for higher education and how can it be assured and evaluated?

- Who, how, and to what purpose evaluates the quality of higher education institutions, in particular, those with musical profile?
- How do the representative social agents of this field – teachers and students – relate to the methods and results of evaluation?

Chapter I – Theoretical frame of research – presents the methodological and epistemological considerations that outline the frame within which the research activity is conducted. The study ascribes to a perspective sphere which is qualitative, ethnographic, more exactly, ethnomethodological, aiming to reveal specific contextual, ideographic aspects. We sought to describe in a phenomenological manner – also shining light on the distinction between emic - etic (Iluț, 1997, Chelcea, 2007) – the position of teachers and students at the “Gheorghe Dima” Music Academy in Cluj-Napoca (GDMA) concerning the importance given to the creative process, compared to teaching and research, as well as the methodologies currently in use in Romania for evaluating the results of this activity.

The research strategy is of ethnomethodological nature, integrating the qualitative and quantitative perspectives in a manner that can be positioned in the perimeter of Grounded Theory. The framing of the research task models a “funnel” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983, cf. Silverman, 2004), progressively narrowing down on the nucleus of the research – the assessment of results of artistic creation activities taking place in musical higher education institutions. The epistemological frame is outlined by the conceptual binomials mentioned by Iluț (1997), particularly on the emic – etic axis, but also objective – subjective (symbolic), macro – micro, global – local, universalism – contextualism, nomothetic – idiographic, theoretical (reflective) – empirical (concrete), the approach being close to a phenomenological one.

The mode in which the research was designed is based on the strategy of triangulation:

- at data collection level - reports, legislative documents, methodology employed by forums at national and/or European level, all concerning quality assurance and evaluation in higher education institutions;
- at the interpretation level - the theory of Bourdieu, the perspective of Griswold and other specialists (philosophers, aestheticians, psychologists, musicians), concerning the artistic and creative phenomenon;

- at the methodology level – document analysis, comparative analysis, secondary analysis of data, case study, sociologic enquiry based on questionnaires, individual and group interview, complementary integration of theories.

The manner in which sampling was performed, for both the analysed and compared documents and the subjects for interviews and questionnaires are meant to assure the validity of construct and of content. Also, the modality of analyses and comparison, the manner in which the results of applying these methods and the data collected by interview and questionnaire are processed were conceived so as to eliminate, as much a possible, errors that affect the validity of the conducted research.

In the **Chapter II, SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND ARTISTIC CREATION – theoretical perspective** I have explored, at a theoretical level, the similarities and conceptual boundaries between scientific research and artistic creation. In terms of Pierre Bourdieu's theory, I approached the problem of the position that the music higher education institutions as well as their faculty members have in the academic field and on a power field.

Comparing the opinions and studies of important members of the cultural society - philosophers, aestheticians, musicians, psychologists, sociologists – one can draw the conclusion that the scientific approach and the creative one do have certain similarities. They are both processes that require logic and intuition, however, the delimitation and the relation between the two lies in an area with varied characteristics. The two can be clearly set apart in the initial and final stage, specifically when it comes to intention and results. At an academic level, the evaluation is focused on the results rather than the actual process. The latter can only be assessed taking into consideration the development conditions, given that at this stage, the results cannot be predicted with certainty. Translating the evaluation from the results towards the process that has generated them, granted that the results are the strengths of visibility, is at the very least inadequate, if not impossible.

According to Bourdieu, the legitimacy issue is linked to the idea of recognition, meaning the symbolic power on one hand and, on the other hand, the principles defining the boundaries set by the dominants of a field. Symbolic violence (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990) consists of a mixture of recognition (*reconnaissance*) and misrecognition (*méconnaissance*). Thompson

(1984) points out an important distinction between these two aspects, namely that recognition determines legitimacy, while misrecognition generates domination, thus symbolic violence constitutes a mechanism of social reproduction, of preservation and strengthening of the existing order.

Studying the music higher education institutions in relation to Bourdieu's theory, it becomes apparent that they belong, simultaneously, to the academic, scientific and artistic fields (which are constituents of the field of cultural production), borrowing each of their specific structure and laws. The academic field especially, but also the scientific field have a very stable structure in time, with strong coding, while the artistic one permits more flexibility in its boundaries and laws, thus being more prone to change.

This position is twice or even thrice dominated in both the power and the economic field, since there is less scientific production, production which represents an important source of symbolic and economic capital. Furthermore, another important source of economic capital, the number of students, is consistently low. Bourdieu considers this to be a positive aspect because a growth in this department could lead towards "a superfluous proliferation of the artistic production outside the institution and even against it" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 252), which can in turn be responsible for a rift between the institution and its traditions and demands.

In the cultural production field, the music higher education institutions themselves establish the *nomos* and the principles of legitimacy for the limited production of the artistic area, its laws and boundaries, thus situating them in a dominating position (Bourdieu, 2007). However, it is very difficult to find the middle ground between the internal principles of evaluation – thus, those of specific consecration – and the external principles of evaluation because of their affiliation as social agents to the three areas. This can negatively affect the subfield's autonomy level. The application of inadequate legitimating principles creates the phenomenon called *allodoxia* (Bourdieu, 1984A) - term of Greek origin: allo-doxeo (αλλο-δοξέω) = "penser autrement (qu'il ne faut)"/ to think otherwise (than as it should); allo – doxia (αλλο-δοξία) = „autre opinion"/a different opinion; „le fait de prendre une chose pour une autre"/ taking one thing as another; „pensée fausse"/ erroneous thinking (Georgin, 1961). In this case, it materialises in the evaluation based on criteria unsuitable with reality, its negative consequences

manifesting themselves at the social identity level of the field in question (the academic field in this case).

The position of each member of faculty is set at the crossroads between three different structures, each of their respective economies developing according to their specific logic. As mentioned before, Bourdieu (2001, 2007) argues that there is a specific *habitus* for each position that an agent occupies as well as for the characteristics of the field it adheres to, determined by its social status and professional development. Therefore, the *habitus* of each teacher from an academic institution with artistic profile presents three facets. In case of *allodoxia* occurrence, this can increase indeterminacy at social identity level. In order to bypass these situations, it is necessary to identify the so-called *effective variables*, those variables whose variations are associated with the real variations of the studied phenomenon and which capture the specific characteristics for each field's activity (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990).

The scientific and artistic symbolic power can only be recognised by equals, by those who can identify it and perceive its value (Bourdieu, 2007, 2001, 1986C). Also, the degree of autonomy of a certain field is generated by the subordination ratio between the external and internal ranking principle. A field loses its autonomy degree when the internal principles of symbolic power accumulation become subordinate to the external ones. In case we are dealing with the reversed ratio or if there is no subordination relation whatsoever, the respective field is autonomous.

When it comes to higher education institutions which do not have a vocational profile, therefore research represents the calibrator of the professional activity, these two principles are superimposed, being the ones specific for the scientific production field. Thus, this area of the academic environment it is an autonomous subfield.

In the institutions with musical profile, the internal evaluation principles, therefore the ones that assure the specific consecration are fundamentally different – typical for the artistic creation field – than the principles used in the external evaluation. These apply to the entire academic environment and constitute a series of principles that the institutions are forced to abide by, thus cementing a subordination relation. Hence, higher education institutions with musical profile become a subfield with a high degree of autonomy in the artistic field and a low degree in the academic field.

Chapter III, titled QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS – a consequence and an instrument of academic competitiveness, covers the first research question: What is the meaning of quality for higher education and how can it be assured and evaluated?

A brief history of quality assurance and evaluation in higher education reveals the fact that the notion of quality has proved to be a complex one, which can be looked upon from multiple angles and perspectives (Harvey, 1999, Nica, 2004, Ilieș, 2003), the result being a wide palette of concepts. In time, especially after 2003, these concepts were modified and, at present, universities proclaim their value and performance firstly through research accomplishments, a phenomenon which is closely linked with the process of globalisation and massification in higher education (Sadlak, 2007).

In these conditions, changes occur in the institutional role of universities, reflected in the very mission of the system of education. From an elitist structure, with specific, well contoured mission, the university becomes the source for an economy of knowledge (Altbach, 1998, cf. Usher, 2008).

As a result of increased competition, methodologies were formulated for classification and/or ranking of higher education institutions; rankings were conceived as instruments for guaranteeing quality but have evolved into powerful levers of global competition, generating effects of psychosocial relevance. They have become means for accumulating capital, having a powerful impact over all those involved and interested with higher education (Mărcuș, 2009, Hazelkorn, 2007). This aspect, corroborated with the increased importance given to research, generates a context in which the preoccupation for didactic activities is lowered, especially concerning the first study cycle. (Chun-Mei, 2007, Dill & Soo, 2005).

The results of ranking are also felt in the ranks of direct and indirect beneficiaries of the education services: employers prefer graduates of the most prestigious institutions, under the consideration that, added to their good professional training, they can bring a boost of image (Clarke, 2007); the perspective of a better job, with higher income, is one of the most powerful criteria considered by future students and those choosing to continue their studies (Hossler et al., 1999).

A look upon the results of the classification and ranking of higher education institutions at both global and European levels reveals the fact that higher education institutions with artistic profile do not reach high positions within the charts, which means that they do not achieve the standards solicited by the present evaluation methodologies. The comparative analysis that I realised of six of the best known ranking methodologies shows that, as claimed by Hazelkorn (2007), the importance given to research is amplified to the extent that some of the methodologies take it in consideration exclusively – it follows that the respective rankings hold no information on the study programs and didactic activity. Furthermore, conceived in this way, they definitely block higher education institutions with artistic profile in proclaiming their performance.

In Romania, the first try to order universities on performance criteria dates from the year 2000 and belongs to Professor Panaite Nica (Nica, 2000). He proposed a ranking system based on 7 composite criteria, each with a specific weight, considering aspects belonging to the input, the process and the output. By 2011 an official ranking – under an enactment – in the Romanian academic environment has not been realised. Based on the National Education Law nr.1/2011, in September 2011, a threefold classification of higher education institutions was introduced: a) universities centred on education; b) universities for education and scientific research or universities for education and artistic creation; c) universities for advanced research and education. Also, the evaluation of graduate studies was realised, the result being the ranking of institutions within a classes of excellence (A, B, C, D and E).

The documents of the European Council and the European Comity define the process of quality assurance as a generic term referring to a continuous process and comprising of evaluating, monitoring, assuring, maintaining and improving the level of quality of a system, program, or institution of higher education. The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (EAQA) asserts that providing a definition for quality assurance is a cumbersome task, on one hand because the term covers a number of complex elements and, on the other hand, because each national education system has adopted its own views and definitions of these elements (Standards and Guidelines..., 2005).

Because the concept of quality fulfils so many important roles, a preoccupation for the quality of the evaluation methodology itself, the level of efficiency, adequacy and opportunity of

the employed instruments is natural. Harmonising the systems for quality evaluation, both with the existent reality and among themselves, is a real challenge and a great opportunity for the global higher education system (Kohler, 2008). It follows that the quality assessment in higher education constitutes both a consequence and an instrument of increased competition within the academic environment.

The comparative analysis of reports concerning the application of the Bologna Process presented at Bergen (2005), London (2007), Leuven (2009) and Bucharest (2012) shows that four criteria were used for evaluating the quality assurance process at national level, (each made operational by introducing gradual performance indicators):

1. the process of internal quality assurance
2. The process of external quality evaluation
3. The level of implication that students have in the quality assurance process
4. The level of international participation and collaboration in quality assurance.

It follows that the external evaluation of quality is part of the quality assurance process, and not exterior to it. In the report presented in 2012 in Bucharest, the indicators specific to external quality evaluation concern the following aspects: 1) teaching-learning; 2) support services for students; 3) the internal system for quality assurance/management. Also, one important point was the stage of implementation of *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the EHEA (ESG)*, a function of which, national agencies for quality assurance were, in turn, evaluated.

To evaluate an academic institution is to measure the extent to which its performances match certain criteria (Rocki, 2005). The glossary of terms elaborated by RAQAHE (2007) defines quality evaluation in the academic environment as the „general critical and systematic analysis process that leads to conclusions and/or recommendations concerning quality in a higher education institution or study program.” (p. 34).

The European context for quality assurance in higher education has put a big pressure on many European countries, particularly on those with a communist past, one of which is Romania. Our country was one of the first to sign both the Declaration of Sorbonne and that of Bologna. In consequence, it has assumed the realisation of the modifications mentioned by these important

documents, reinforced by the fact that on the 1st of January 2007, it became a member of the European Union.

In Romania, as one of the countries that have signed both the Sorbonne and the Bologna declarations and as a member of the European Union since 1st of January 2007, the quality assessment and evaluation has become increasingly important. The National Council for Academic Evaluation and Accreditation (NCAEA) has operated between 1993 – 2005. In 2006 the RAQAHE was established, which in 2009 became a full member of The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education – ENQA, listed in The European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education - EQAR. In its activity, the RAQAHE collaborates with other institutions like The National Research Council (CNCS) and The National Council of Higher Education Financing (CNFIS), two structures with an advisory role for the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research, having responsibilities in the budget allocation of funds towards Romanian higher education institutions.

After 2003, especially, Romania has restructured the national educational system by adopting and modifying numerous legislative documents. This included quality assurance as well as assessment, which the European authorities reported as an obvious progress, based on the mentioned analysis of the four reports. However, the data contained in the reports on the state of the Romanian educational system elaborated by the Ministry of Education, in 2007 and 2009 underline a series of major shortcomings, thus, leading to the conclusion that the enforcement of the previously mentioned regulations was a faulty one. Consequently, in order to be able to paint a more realistic picture, one could determine, alongside the quality assessment of the Romanian's higher education institutions standard specifications and structures, also the manner in which these regulations have been enforced and, respectively, their level of functioning.

The European authorities consider that one of the most important aspects, as a social phenomenon as well as a quality indicator of the educational process, is the integration on the labour market of the young graduates – “graduates employability”. In terms of sociologists Rubington and Wienberg (2003), this particular phenomenon has all of the four characteristics which define a social problem: (I) the situation constitutes an issue, one which is constantly in the population as well as the media's attention, (II) it goes against the social norms and values,

(III) it affects a significant part of society (IV) in order to improve the problem, a number of actions are taken.

In the absence of concrete information, at European as well as national level, it is very hard to determine the extent of this phenomenon. When it comes to Romania the indicators used by both the Ministry of Education and RAQAHE aren't in sufficient harmony. Rigorous data concerning education continuity and employment (in what way it constitutes a fructification of the education provided) is non-existent. Also, a number of questions might arise: Can an indicator which is so much dependent on the socioeconomic context (labour market dynamics, laws referring to retirement conditions, laws and regulations regarding women's condition, etc.) on one hand and the diversity of the perspectives and concepts that define it on the other hand, be utilised as an evaluation tool for the higher education system? Mainly, in what circumstances, a social problem can develop into a real quality indicator of the education efficiency? Is it possible to find the reconciliation area between the two aspects of graduates' employability?

Chapter IV, THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF MUSICAL HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN ROMANIA, is centred on the second research question: who, how and to what end assesses the quality of the higher education institutions, in particular, the ones with a musical profile? I have resorted to the analysis of the legislative and methodological documents referring to the quality assessment of higher education institutions, in order to identify the extent to which the uniqueness of the activity of music type institutions is portrayed in their contents.

In the pre-analytical stage, for the construction of the paper's body, (Moscovici and Buschini, 2007), we have identified the institutions who evaluate or refers to the quality assessment of Romanian higher education institutions. These are: The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (RAQAHE), The National Council of Higher Education Financing (CNFIS) and The National Research Council (CNCS). The evaluation criteria as well as its purpose is listed in the methodological documents developed and enacted buy these resorts. These documents comprise the body of the analytical report and are developed according to the national education bill. Taking into account the previously mentioned facts, as well as the

substantial modifications made, in 2011, to the national education law, the sample was set to the following eight documents:

- The Education Law no. 84/1995 and The Law of National Education nr.1/2011;
- The evaluation methodology developed by RAQAHE in 2006 as well as the project of the new methodology, elaborated in 2011 (which has not yet been adopted);
- The methodology documents developed by CNFIS for the funding of higher education institutions – the one developed in 2011, to be applied starting 2012, as well as the previous one;
- The methodology used by CNCS in order to evaluate research - the construction of the quality indicator IC6, included in CNFIS's methodology applied in 2011 (devised in 2010) and the methodology upon which the classification of higher education institutions as well as the ranking of the Master's level study programs was developed in 2011.

Also, the specific standard evaluation sets used by the 12 RAQAHE expert committees to assess the quality of higher education institutions, for the fundamental academic areas, have been comparatively analysed.

An unsurprising aspect is brought to light by the analysis of all of these documents. Substantially more importance and attention is granted to the research activity as well as its results than to the teaching process and the education results, regardless of the academic field. Higher education institutions are rather viewed as training units for the next generation of researchers, the teaching-learning process gaining a less important position. The evaluation is focused mostly on the elements relating to the members of the teaching staff and their scientific achievements

The Education Law nr.84/1995 makes no reference to the artistic creation. The methodology devised by RAQAHE in 2006 creates a general frame that permits the academic specificity to manifest itself, however, it ignores the creative side of the academic activity, regardless of its field. Even the term creation/creativity is absent from the contents of this document. According to its text, the sole distinctive element, in national context, of the institution's mission is "education and scientific research" (The Evaluation Methodology...2006, p. 69). The adaptation and flexibility of the evaluation policy is absolutely necessary. This can be

done through the application of field specific standards, developed by RAQAHE experts in different areas.

In the arts field (in this case, the music area), the RAQAHE committee mentions that the artistic activities can, in fact, be assimilated with scientific research. However, the line is drawn between the obtained results, specifying that the ones related to the research area should be fructified by scientific papers presented at conferences and symposiums, organised in Romania or abroad, published in journals.

The CNFIS methodology does refer, to a certain extent, to the artistic creation activity, through the IC6 indicator, developed by CNCS for the assessment of the research activity. Here, the relevance and visibility of the research's results is awarded 50 % of the importance (in the case of institutions from the artistic and architecture area: participation in international field specific events, monographic and synthesis works published by renowned national publications, retrospective exhibitions, movies and author shows, author/personal concerts, author or performer records – LP, CD – edited by prestigious national firms, national interest projects or monumental works), while 25% is allocated for the capacity to attract funds intended for scientific research purposes.

The Law of National Education no. 1/2011 brings a series of modifications in the academic environment, but the quotes related to the artistic creation activities are inconsistent and in many cases ambiguous. According to this document, the research activity can be done through artistic creation AS WELL and it includes it. These inconsistencies are also present in the documents devised according to Law nr.1/2011. Thus, we suspect there is a high probability that these anomalies will be sensed when it comes to practical application.

The project of the new RAQAHE methodology refers consistently to the creation activity only in its section dedicated to postgraduate studies. The other sections (dedicated to undergraduate and doctoral studies) are developed inconsistently from this point of view.

The ranking methodology that CNCS devised in 2011(used as a basis for developing an evaluation of the universities and the higher education study programs with the purpose of creating a classification of the universities and a hierarchy of the study programs) was not based on the specific evaluation guide for artistic creation activities, reducing the respective activity to its minimum level of complexity. The aforementioned guide was conceived by the specialists

involved in ENEC (which unfortunately remains, to this day, an exercise). The two variables used, *National Events* and *International Events* are not perceived as *effective variables* (Bourdieu, 1984A).

The new CNFIS methodology states that the funding of scientific research activities in advanced fields will constitute a priority. Another priority will be the affiliation with a certain excellence group – resulted from the application of the ranking methodology. These two variables will affect the total sum awarded. Therefore, in the artistic field, the financial decisions will be made based on the two vague and irrelevant variables.

The fact that unlike documents previous to The Law of National Education no. 1/2011, the new documents also mention artistic activities is definitely an improvement. Still, the regulations and methodologies used at this time in Romania to evaluate the creation activity carried in higher education institutions with artistic profile are insufficiently and/or inadequately drafted for the specificity of this academic environment.

Chapter V: CASE STUDY: “Gheorghe Dima” Music Academy Cluj-Napoca – outlines the position of GDMA’s teaching staff, as well as its students, on the way in which the higher education institutions with a musical profile are assessed, from a quality point of view. It also presents these subjects’ opinions regarding the importance of the creation activity as opposed to the research and teaching process, investigating, as well, their views on the insertion of young graduates on the labour market.

This case study includes an opinion enquiry achieved by means of a questionnaire. This enquiry was based on numerous documents developed at national and international level, specialized articles and the results provided by individual, pre-investigation interviews, applied March through May 2011¹. The subjects of the interviews were eight professors, three inside GDMA and five outside the institution. The five teachers outside GDMA belong to a comprehensive university and the areas which they come from - mathematics, chemistry, psychology, literature and theatre - were selected to provide a wide range of information as well

¹ The time frame during which the interviews were conducted is relevant due to changes set by the National Education Law no. 1/2011, the EAQAHE, CNFIS and CNCS methodologies, undergoing the modifications in May 2011.

as to serve the purpose. The fact that the interviewed in this phase of the investigation belong to several academic areas was aimed to increase the power of analysis regarding the emic-etic axis in the study (Iluț, 1997).

Withal, a series of five post-investigation, individual interviews were conducted with members of GDMA's faculty and a *focus group* with students of the institution was organized. In order to provide examples and support the research activity conducted in GDMA, the summaries of four professional and scientific PhD thesis have been analytical presented.

The contents of the questionnaire devised for the faculty members regard the following aspects:

- the subjects' view on how adequate the RAQAHE and CNCS evaluation methodologies (concerning the assessment of the creation activity) are;
- how important the subjects consider their own research activity in relation to their creative and teaching one;
- the subjects' opinion concerning the importance they feel students give to the research activity they conduct themselves, as future artists, in relation to the creation activity;
- how much the subjects consider that their students value research done by specialists from the music field;
- the subjects' opinion in regards to the future graduates' employability;

The aspects pursued in the questionnaire applied to the students are as follows:

- how important the subjects consider their own research activity in relation to the creative one;
- how much they value research done by specialists from the music field;
- the level of importance that the subjects, from a disciple's point of view, grant to the researcher/teacher/artist role of those who train them;
- the subjects' opinion regarding their own employability, as future graduates.

The statistic population is formed from the 92 permanent members of the faculty staff of GDMA², and student wise, from the 370 soon-to-be-graduates of the undergraduate/Bachelor

² Data concerning the number of teachers in GDMA were collected in February 2012

program (253) and the graduate/Master level (75) as well as the 42 PhD candidates (33 of whom are pursuing a professional PhD thesis and 9 a scientific one)³.

At an early stage, the data gathered from the questionnaires addressed to teaching staff was processed for the Academy as a whole. Later, I have decided to split the results into two groups, “practitioners” – 76 teachers from different departments that include the musical performance, show arts, composition and conducting specializations – and “theorists” – the 16 members of staff from the “Musicology and Music Didactics Department”. The academic degrees have been separated into two levels: the first one containing, teaching assistant, assistant lecturer and senior lecturer, the second one: associate professor and professor.

I used the same data processing manner for the students, meaning that, after an initial stage of processing the data for the whole academy, I have decided on a first group that comprises students in their final year of undergrad and postgrad practical study programs – music performance, composition, conducting – as well as the PhD candidates (professional PhD) and a second group that includes graduating students from the theoretical department – musicology and music pedagogy plus the candidates for a scientific PhD. I have also investigated, for this subpopulation, the possibility that certain differences may arise from the study level.

The interpretation of the results aimed to outline the subjects’ dispositions, their habitual dynamic, thus the generalization approach is an analytical one (Yin, 2005), directed towards the conclusions emerged from Bourdieu’s theory and presented in Chapter II. Furthermore, the data was used in order to better refine the results obtained in regards to the structure of the musical academic field and to the position that it holds in the cultural production fields, in relation to the academic one. The data collected on the GDMA graduates’ “employability” has been compared to some aspects of Bourdieu’s theory, as well as to some results gathered from the analysis of the assessment methodologies.

Because the music higher education institutions belong to the academic field, through the nature of their activity, but at the same time, also to the scientific and artistic field, certain

³ Data concerning the number of students in GDMA were collected in November 2011

habitual characteristics of its representative agents – teachers and students - are developed. According to Bourdieu (2007, 1986B), these attributes are shaped by the entire previous experience and professional track of the social agents. The results produced by the questionnaire show some differences, mainly due to the two independent variables – speciality and didactic degree and level of studies, respectively. For both of the populations in question, we find that the differences associated with the speciality are more frequent and/or more emphasised than the ones brought by the didactic degree or level of study. Also, it becomes apparent that, for the student population, these differences are more blurred and inconsequential than in the case of the teachers. Practitioner teaching assistants, assistant lecturers and senior lecturers are the most oriented towards the creative activity, while the theoreticians with the highest degrees (associate professor and professor) set as their top priority scientific research. The other groups of the teaching staff population value the teaching activity the most.

The results of this sociological investigation have shown that, when comparing the data from the two populations, including data related to the graduates' employability perspectives, the perceptions, opinions and priorities of GDMA's teaching staff are very similar to those of its students. This discovery leads to a possible interpretation in terms of Bourdieu's theory, specifically, for the term *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1986B; 1984A). Taking into account that, on one hand, any form of capital is transferable one way or another and that, on the other hand, the relation between positions and dispositions goes both ways (Bourdieu, 2007), certain questions arise, which we plan to investigate thoroughly in the future. These questions are: How and to what extent do GDMA's teachers influence the *habitus* of its disciples? And is the reversed phenomenon taking place?

From another point of view, according to Bourdieu's theory, the artistic production field is dominated in the economic field, which could damage the art graduates' employability. However, at the time when these questionnaires were completed, out of the 147 students, 63 (43%) have stated that they work on a labour and/or service providing contract (29 % from the undergraduate level, 54 % of the postgraduate students and 17 out of the 20 PhD candidates who answered to this enquiry). GDMA's employability reaches high values - 85% in 2010 and 92% in 2011. One might justifiably question whether there is a link between the employability of the students from different higher education institutions on one hand, and, on the other hand, the

superposition of the students' and teachers' hopes and expectations in general, combined with the resources offered by the respective institutions. Or is it possible that this is a specific characteristic of smaller institutions, in which the distances between the dominants of the power field and those of the cultural field are small and in which the teaching-learning process takes place in a context that enables a more substantial level of closeness and familiarity? This could alter the perspective that a higher number of students automatically leads to more successful activities, quality wise. We believe this to be a very plentiful area for further research.

Extending this idea, the questions asked previously is restated for consideration: Is there a neutral area between the two aspects of graduates' employability (quality criteria for education efficiency/social problem)? Given that GDMA's students, as well as its faculty members consider the teaching activity to be the most important, a new question arises. Is this not the reconciliation area mentioned before? In the event of a positive answer, reinstating the teaching-learning process to top priority status in the academic environment should help improve the employability figures.

The subjects of both populations – students and teachers alike – consider quantity (number of classes) and quality (lecture contents) to be the most relevant criteria in evaluating the teaching process. At the other end of the scale resides students' participation and results in competitions and their own lecture evaluations, since both populations consider these to be the least relevant. Also, another criteria considered to have a low degree of relevance is quality assessment of the teaching staff through the number of PhD titles awarded at institution level.

Teachers share the students' view on their own employability. The fact that students feel ready to tackle the labour market and are optimistic in this area – especially “practitioners” – is backed up by the data concerning graduates' employability and the percentage of undergraduate students who already work in their field of choice.

The members of the teaching staff from GDMA consider the criteria and indicators used in the evaluation methodologies of higher education institutions to be inadequate in assessing institutions with an artistic profile, since these have their own specificity. Furthermore, the subjects feel that, alongside the contents of these documents, the application methods also have an effect. By studying the number of points that the teachers awarded to the different variables used in university evaluation and ranking, it becomes apparent that they favour the creation

activity, without ignoring or minimising the research one (the “Book published by an international publishing company” variable received the highest average mark).

In order to provide examples in this case study, I have decided to present the summaries of four PhD theses – two professional and two scientific ones, elaborated from members of GDMA’s teaching staff:

- PhD scientific thesis titled "Rhetoric and affect in Mozart’s musical discourse for piano", dated 2006, by Adriana Bera (pianist), professor, Faculty of Musical Performance, Department of Keyboard Instruments and Instrumental Ensembles
- PhD scientific thesis titled "The Romanian Requiem", dated 2000, by Adrian Pop (composer), professor, Theoretical Faculty, Department of Composition and Conducting
- PhD professional thesis titled "The conductor’s approach as a factor in the fulfilment of the performing conception", dated 2003, by Ciprian Para (conductor), associate professor, Theoretical Faculty, Department of Composition and Conducting
- PhD professional thesis titled " Proportional structures, symmetrical structures in my personal compositions", dated 2007, by Cristian Misievici (composer), professor, Theoretical Faculty, Department of Composition and Conducting

Without intending a thorough examination, the purpose of this analysis is to identify the steps taken in the scientific research, in relation to the contents of the National Education Law nr.1/2011 on scientific and professional doctoral thesis and the perspectives offered by John Dewey and the Frascati Manual.

In „Art as Experience” (1934/1980), Dewey states that a scientific approach follows a logical route, connecting what was previously done with what is still to be done, thus being a cause-oriented thought process. The artist follows the same lines in the creation process, but, from a technical point of view, he thinks in sound, dynamic and colour. The final meaning is above logic, portrayed just through the process of integrating all of the elements into a whole. The Frascati Manual states: “Research and experimental development (R&D) comprise creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications”. (Frascati Manual, 2002, p. 30).

The four doctoral papers presented, constitute examples for the different specific research methods applied in the artistic field. They also include all of the elements presented by Dewey in his perspective on research activity, as well as the more specific ones mentioned in the definition given by the Frascati Handbook. Three of the four works (the one by Mr. Adrian Pop belongs to the area of musicology) have as a final result of the investigation creative musical acts (audio and video recordings). The actual text has the sole role of describing, justifying and providing examples of the thought process that went behind the respective artistic act.

An interesting theme for future research thus arises: the possibility of defining and conceptualizing a new notion - “artistic research”.

Conclusions.

The importance granted to the research activity changes the structure of the academic field, as well as its ranking and legitimacy principles. The current *nomos* seems to be “Competing through research!”, a *nomos* that reads similar to the one belonging to the scientific area. The results obtained through scientific research seem to become the measure for all professional activity. This fact produces an ambivalent effect on the affiliation to the academic teaching staff. The institutions of musical higher education are at the crossroads between three cultural production fields – academic, scientific and artistic. The dominant positions within this area are determined by the usage of inadequate and insufficient criteria and indicators, therefore, the distribution range of the cultural capital thus evaluated is quite narrow. As a result, the elaboration of a correct ranking (based on value) is detained and the accumulation and multiplication of symbolic capital is negatively affected. The consequences are visible in the volume of the economic capital as well.

The scientific and artistic symbolic power can be recognised and adequately assessed only by those who possess the necessary perceptive categories (Bourdieu, 2007, 2001). By comparing the contents of the ENEC guide for the evaluation of creative activity – developed by field specialists - with the contents of the other documents presented in chapter IV we can conclude that the methods used for the evaluation of the said activity - starting with the elliptic wordings present in the methodological and legislative document and continuing with the

inadequate contents of the evaluation criteria and indicators - form legitimacy barriers forced upon the musical higher education institutions, thus affecting the institutions' possibility to affirm its quality and performances.

The manner in which these legislative and methodological documents have been elaborated seems to represent a progress from the mechanisms of discrimination authorization by building space for negotiation (Bhabha, 2002). However, the mechanism of preservation and strengthening of the existing order that it proliferates appears to be what Bourdieu calls symbolic violence - imposing a cultural arbitrary (in the sense of univocal imposing) (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990) – through which, as Thompson emphasizes (1984), the recognition (reconnaissance) determines legitimacy and misrecognition (méconnaissance) generates domination.

For GDMA's teaching staff and students, the internal evaluation principles (teaching and creation activities) gain more importance than the external evaluation principle (based on research activity), however, without minimizing their significance. The *position* (caused by the multiple specific habitual *dispositions*) that GDMA's teachers take – manifested exteriorly – are meant to aid in the overcoming of the barriers of legitimacy in the academic field. The extension of this study to include the investigation of the academic institutions with a different artistic profile is a future research lead as well.

The presence of the *allodoxia* (Bourdieu, 1984A) phenomenon is obvious, together with its consequences: elements concerning the problems in identifying the characteristics of the social identity of the field in question. The external evaluation principles forced upon the institution and the large discrepancies between them and the internal evaluation principles negatively affects the institution's autonomy.

It is very difficult to change the current state with just the internal sources and resources of the artistic academic subfield because, as Bourdieu (2007) mentions, the external environment – which penalizes any change – has the role of providing the resources for the establishment of a new order, and, the active one does not favour art. A more advantageous situation for the higher education institutions with artistic profile could be the placement of its cultural and symbolic capital in other cultural fields. This could be achieved through experience exchange and mobility

and would benefit the institution by generating profit (on the account of the initial investment) and enriching its social capital.

In conclusion, the creation activity can be the rough equivalent of the research one only because they both represent prestige and visibility sources and resources, thus accumulating symbolic capital for higher education institutions. In order to allow the institutions from the artistic academic field to assert themselves, a different and integrative approach of the evaluation policies is necessary. These should differentiate the results of the creative activity from the results produced by the research activity, granting each of them a very well structured identity, while the methodologies should include just and rigorously elaborated criteria. Hence, the aforementioned institutions could accumulate symbolic capital, which would lead towards an increase of autonomy for the subfield they belong to, the elimination of possible *allodoxia* effects and the lifting of the barriers of legitimacy in the academic field.

REFERENCES

A. BOOKS

1. Agabrian, M. (2006) *Analiza de conținut*. Polirom, Iași
2. Agabrian, M. (2004) *Cercetarea calitativă a socialului*. European Institute, Bucharest
3. Bălan-Mihailovici, A. (2001) *Istoria culturii și civilizației creștine*. Ed. Oscar Print, Bucharest
4. Bera, A. (2006) *Retorică și afect în discursul pianistic mozartian*. PhD Thesis. GDMA, Cluj-Napoca
5. Berger, P. L., Luckmann, T. (1999) *Construirea socială a realității. Tratat de sociologia cunoașterii*. Ed Univers, Bucharest
6. Bernat, S. E. (2003) Predarea centrată pe student. In Bernat, S. E., Chiș, V. (coord.) *Noua paradigmă universitară: centrarea pe client*. Cluj University Press
7. Bhabha, H. K. (2002) *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, London
8. Biggs, J. (2004) *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. SRHE & Open University Press, Trowbridge
9. Bughici, D. (1978) *Dicționar de forme și genuri muzicale*. Ed. Muzicală, Bucharest
10. Bourdieu, P. (1984A) *Homo academicus*. Les Editions de Minuit, Paris
11. Bourdieu, P. (1986C) *Economia bunurilor simbolice*. Ed. Meridiane, Bucharest
12. Bourdieu, P. (2001) *Science de la science et reflexivite. Cours du college de France 2000 – 2001*. Raisons d'Agir Editions, Paris
13. Bourdieu, P. (2007) *Regulile artei. Geneza și structura câmpului literar*. IInd edition. Grupul Editorial Art
14. Bourdieu, P. (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature*. Columbia University Press
15. Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J. C. (1990) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Sage Publications, London
16. Chelcea, S. (2007) *Metodologia cercetării sociologice. Metode cantitative și calitative*. IIIrd, Ed. Economică, Bucharest
17. Chun-Mei, Z. (2007) Building World-Class Universities: Some Unintended Impacts of University Ranking. In Sadlak, J., & Liu, N. C., (eds.) *The World-Class University and Ranking: Aiming Beyond Status*. Cluj University Press, p.320-331

18. Clark, B. R. (2000) *Spre o universitate antreprenorială*. Paideia, Bucharest
19. Clark, B. R. (2004) *Sustaining Change in Universities. Continuities in case studies and concept*. Open University Press
20. David, D. (2006A) *Metodologia cercetării clinice. Fundamente*. Polirom, Iași
21. Denzin, N. K. (1994) The Art and Politics of Interpretation. In Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications. New York, pp. 500 – 544
22. Dewey, J. (1934/1980) *Art as Experience*. The Berkley Publishing Group, New York
23. Durkheim, E. (2002) *Regulile metodei sociologice*. Polirom, Iași
24. Evans, M. (2004) *Killing Thinking: the Death of the Universities*. Continuum, London
25. Călinescu, G. (1968) *Principii de estetică*. E.P.L., Bucharest
26. Georgin, Ch. (1961) *Dictionnaire grec-français. Nouvelle édition augmentée*. Ed. Hatier, Paris
27. Giddens, A. (2003) *Sociologie*. All, Bucharest
28. Hegel, G. W. F. (1979) *Despre artă și poezie*. Vol I-II, Ed. Minerva, Bucharest
29. Hofstede, G. (1996) *Managementul structurilor multiculturale. Software-ul gândirii*. Ed. Economică, Bucharest
30. Hossler, D., Schmit, J., Vesper, N. (1999) *Going to college: How social, economic and educational factors influence the decisions students make*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore
31. Ilieș, L. (2003) *Managementul calității totale*. Dacia, Cluj-Napoca
32. Iuț, P. (1997) *Abordarea calitativă a sociumanului*. Polirom, Iași
33. Kant, I. (1788/1969) *Critica rațiunii pure*. Ed. Științifică, Bucharest
34. Mahoney, J., Rueschemeyer, D. (2003) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press
35. Marga, A. (2007) *Relativism and Its Consequences/Relativismul și consecințele sale.*, Cluj University Press
36. Marga, A. (2006A) *University Reform Today*. Cluj University Press
37. Marga, A. (2006B) *The Cultural Legitimacy of the European university*. Cluj University Press

38. Marga, A. (2004) *Die Kulturelle Wende. Philosophische Konsequenzen der Transformation/Cotitura Culturală. Cosecințe filosofice ale tranziției*. Cluj University Press
39. Marga, A. (2002) *Ieșirea din trecut*. Alma Mater, Cluj- Napoca
40. Mărcuș, A., (coord.) (2009) *Ghidul Competitivității și Calității*. Cluj University Press
41. Miroiu, A., Brătianu, C. (2000) *The Quality Assurance Policy in Higher Education*. Paideia, Bucharest
42. Misievici, C. (2007) *Structuri proporționale, structuri simetrice în componistica personală. PhD Thesis*. GDMA, Cluj-Napoca
43. Morar, V. (2003) *Estetica. Interpretări și texte*. Bucharest University, <http://ebooks.unibuc.ro>, accessed on 04.06.2011
44. Moscovici, S., Buschini, F. (2007) *Metodologia științelor socioumane*. Polirom, Iași
45. Mucchielli, A. (coord.) (2002) *Dicționar al metodelor calitative în științele umane și sociale*. Polirom, Iași
46. Nica, P. (2004) *Managementul calității în instituțiile de învățământ. Suport de curs pentru programul „Management Educațional”*
47. Nica, P. (2000) *Managementul calității și ierarhizarea universităților românești*. Paideia, Bucharest
48. Pânișoară, G., Pânișoară, I. O. (2005) *Managementul Resurselor Umane. Ghid practic*. Polirom, Iași
49. Para, C. (2006) *Aspecte ale scriiturii pentru orchestră și muzică de cameră în muzica contemporană. PhD Thesis*. GDMA, Cluj-Napoca
50. Pop, A. (2000) *Recviemul românesc. PhD Thesis*. GDMA, Cluj-Napoca
51. Popescu, S., Brătianu, C. (2004) *Ghidul calității în învățământul superior*. Ed. Universității Bucharest
52. Popper, K. R. (1934/1981) *Logica Cercetării*. Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, Bucharest
53. Popper, K. R. (1998) *Mitul contextului*. Ed. Trei, Bucharest
54. Rotariu, T., Iluț, P. (2006) *Ancheta sociologică și sondajul de opinie. Teorie și practică*. Polirom, Iași
55. Rubington, E., Weinbweg, M. S. (eds.) (2003) *The Study of Social Problems. Seven Perspectives*. Oxford University Press

56. Sadlak, J. (2007) Developments in Higher Education and How They Stimulate the University Rankings' Phenomenon. In Sadlak, J., Cai, L.N., (eds) *The World-Class University and Ranking: Aiming Beyond Status*. pp. 75 – 86, Cluj University Press
57. Sălcudean, N. (2012) *Politici Culturale și Construcții identitare în Contextul European*. PhD Thesis. BBU, The Faculty of European Studies
58. Silverman, D. (2004) *Interpretarea datelor calitative. Metode de analiză a comunicării, textului și interacțiunii*. Polirom, Iași.
59. de Singly, F., Blanchet, A., Gotman, A., Kaufmann, J. C. (1998) *Ancheta și metodele ei: chestionarul, interviul de producere a datelor, interviul comprehensi*. Polirom, Iași
60. Strauss, A., Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of Qualitative Research. Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Sage Publication, New York
61. Thompson, J. B. (1984) *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Polity Press, Cambridge
62. Vianu, T. (1982) *Studii de Filozofia Culturii*. Ed. Eminescu, Bucharest
63. Vlăsceanu, L., Grünberg, L., Pârlea, D. (2007) *Glosar de termeni și definiții în asigurarea calității și acreditare în învățământul superior*. RAQAHE, Bucharest
64. Weber, M. (1946) India. The Brahman and the Castes. In Gerth, H. H., Mills, C. W. (eds.) *Essay in Sociology*. Oxford University Press, New York
65. Yin, R. K. (2005) *Studiul de caz. Designul, analiza și colectarea datelor*. Polirom, Iași

B. Articles and papers

1. Bennett, D. (2009) Academy and Real World. Developing realistic notions of career in the performing arts. In *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*. Vol. 8 (3), pp. 309 – 327
2. Bode, C. (2008) Internationalization – Mobility, Competition and Co-operation. Paper for the *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education in the Europe Region: Access, Values, Quality and Competitiveness*, 21-24 May 2009, Bucharest.
http://www.cepes.ro/forum/pdf/Bode_Internationalization.pdf, accessed on 17.11.2009
3. Bourdieu, P. (1976) Le champ scientifique. In *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*. Vol. 2, June 1976, pp. 88 – 104
4. Bourdieu, P. (1977) Sur le pouvoir symbolique. In *Annales. Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*. No. 3, 1977, pp. 405 - 411
5. Bourdieu, P. (1979) Les trois états du capital culturel. In *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*. Vol. 30, November 1979, pp. 3-6

6. Bourdieu, P. (1980) Le capital social. In *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*. Vol. 31, January 1980, pp. 2-3
7. Bourdieu, P. (1984B) Espace social et genèses des „classes”. In *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*. Vol. 52 - 53, June 1984, pp. 3-14
8. Bourdieu, P. (1984C) Classes and Classification.
<http://www.marxist.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/bourdieu.html>, accessed on 17.10.2011
9. Bourdieu, P. (1986A) The Forms of Capital.
<http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/fr/bourdieu-forms-capital>, accessed on 17.10.2011
10. Bourdieu, P. (1986B) Habitus, code et codification. In *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* Vol. 64, September, 1986, pp. 40 – 44
11. Bourdieu, P. (1987) Agregation et Segregation. In *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*. Vol. 69, September, 1987, pp.2 - 50
12. Bourdieu, P. (1997) Le champ économique. In *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*. Vol. 119, September, 1997, pp. 48 – 66
13. Burris, V. (2004) The Academic Caste System: prestige Hierarchies in PhD Exchange Networks. In *American Sociological Review*, Vol.69, April, pp. 239 – 264
14. Cervantes, M., Guellec, D. (2002) The brain drain: old myth, new realities. In *OECD Observer*, no. 230, January 2002,
http://www.oecdobserver.org/news/fullstory.php/aid/673/The_brain_drain:_Old_myths,_new_realities.html, accessed on 08.09.2009
15. Clarke, M. (2007) The Impact of Higher Education Rankings on Student Access, Choice, and Opportunity. In *Higher Education in Europe*. Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 59-70
16. Connor, H., Burton, R., Pearson, R., Pollard, E., Regan, J. (1999) Making the Right Choice: How Students Choose Universities and Colleges (Executive Summary). London: Universities UK,
<http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/Publications/Documents/MakingTheRightChoice-Summary.pdf>, accessed on 08.09.2009
17. Coumans, A. (2003) Practice-led research in Higher Education. In *On the move. Sharing experience on the Bologna Process in the arts*. ELIA, http://www.elia-rtschools.org/publications/archive_2#2003 accessed on 12.09.2010
18. David, D. (2006B) Confuzia criteriilor în știință și artă.
<http://cercetare.ubbcluj.ro/index.php?pagina=dezbateri&sidecol=coldr>, accessed on 08.06.2010

19. David, D. (2006C) Despre cercetare științifică și cercetări.
<http://cercetare.ubbcluj.ro/index.php?pagina=dezbateri&sidecol=coldr>, accessed on 08.06.2010
20. David, D. (2007) Și totuși rămâne elita – știința între elită și masificare.
<http://cercetare.ubbcluj.ro/index.php?pagina=dezbateri&sidecol=coldr>, accessed on 08.06.2010
21. van Dijk, T. (1985) Semantic Discourse Analysis.
<http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Semantic%20discourse%20analysis.pdf>, accessed on 13.09.2012
22. Dill, D., Soo, M. (2005) Academic Quality, League Tables, and Public Policy: A Cross-National Analysis of University Rankings. In *Higher Education in Europe*. Vol.49, No. 4, pp. 495-533.
23. de la Fuente, E. (2007) The New Sociology of Art': Putting Art Back into Social Science Approaches to the Arts. In *Cultural Sociology*. 2007 (1), pp. 409 - 425
24. Griswold, W. (1987) A Methodological Framework for the Sociology of Culture. In *Sociological Methodology*. Vol.17, 1978 pp. 1 – 35
25. Guarino, C., Ridgeway, G., Chun, M., & Buddin, R. (2005) Latent Variable Analysis: A New Approach to University Ranking. In *Higher Education in Europe*. Vol. 30, No. 2, 147-165
26. Harvey, L. (1999) *Quality in Higher Education*. Paper at Swedish Quality Conference, Göteborg, November 1999, www.shu.ac.uk/research/crea/publications/gotebor.pdf, accessed on 17.10.2009
27. Harvey, L., Green, D. (1993) Defining quality. In *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Vol. 18 (1), pp. 9 - 34
28. Hazelkorn, E. (2007) How Do Rankings Impact on Higher Education? In *IMHE Info*. www.oecd.org/dataoecd/8/27/39802910.pdf, accessed on 02.09.2010
29. Holdridge, L., Macleod, K. (2003) Practice-based research: a new culture in Doctoral Fine Art practice. In *On the move. Sharing experience on the Bologna Process in the arts*. ELIA, http://www.elia-rtsschools.org/publications/archive_2#2003, accessed on 06.09.2009
30. Keith, B., Babchuk, N. (1998) The Quest for Institutional Recognition: A Longitudinal Analysis of Scholarly Productivity and Academic Prestige among Sociology Departments. In *Social Forces*. June, 1998, 76(4), pp. 1495-1533
31. Kohler, J. (2008) Quality in European Higher Education. Paper for the *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education in the Europe Region: Access, Values, Quality and Competitiveness*. 21-24 May, 2009, Bucharest, Romania,
http://www.cepes.ro/forum/pdf/Kohler_quality.pdf, accessed on 17.11.2009

32. Kohn, M. L. (1987) Cross – national Research as an Analytic Strategy. In *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 52, 713 – 731
33. Liu, N., Cheng, Y. (2005) The Academic Ranking of World Universities. In *Higher Education in Europe*. Vol. 30, No. 2, 127-136
34. Long, J. S. (1978) Productivity and Academic Position in the Scientific Career. In *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 43, December 1978, pp. 889 - 908
35. Long, J.S., Allison, P.D., McGinnis, R. (1979) Entrance into the Academic Career. In *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 44, no. 5, October 1979, pp. 816 – 830
36. Marga, A. (2008) Values of the Universities. Paper for the *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education in the Europe Region: Access, Values, Quality and Competitiveness*. 21-24 May 2009, Bucharest, Romania, http://www.cepes.ro/forum/pdf/Marga_Values.pdf, accessed on 17.11.2009
37. Marginson, S., van der Wende, M. (2007) To Rank or To Be Ranked: The Impact of Global Rankings in Higher Education. In *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Vol. 11, No. 3-4, pp. 306-329
38. Mayring, Ph. (2000) Qualitative Content Analysis. Volume 1, No. 2, Art. 20 – June 2000 <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2385>, accessed on 01.02.2010
39. Merton, R. K. (1968) The Matthew Effect in Science. In *Science*. Vol. 159, January, no. 3810, pp. 56 - 63
40. Mills, M., van de Bunt, G., de Bruijn, J. (2006) Comparative Research: Persistent Problems and Promising Solutions. In *International Sociology*. Vol. 21, No. 5, 619 - 632
41. Ragin, C. (2006) How to Lure Analytic Social Science Out of the Doldrums: Some Lessons from Comparative Research. In *International Sociology*. Vol. 21, No. 5, 633 - 646
42. Rihoux, B. (2006) Recent Advances and Remaining Challenges for Social Science Research. In *International Sociology*. Vol. 21, No. 5, . 679 – 706
43. Rocki, M. (2005) Statistical and Mathematical Aspects of Ranking: Lessons from Poland. In *Higher Education in Europe*. Vol. 30, No. 2, 173-181
44. Rughiniș, C. (2003) Mize și strategii ale cercetării comparative. In *Sociologie Românească*. Vol. I No. 1-2, pp. 129 – 143
45. Scott, P. (2008) Access in Higher Education in Europe and North America. Trends and Developments. Paper for the *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education in the Europe Region: Access, Values, Quality and Competitiveness*. 21-24 May 2009, Bucharest, Romania, http://www.cepes.ro/forum/pdf/Scott_access.pdf, accessed on 17.11.2009

46. Srikanthan, G., Dalrymple, J. (2002) Developing a Holistic Model for Quality in Higher Education. <http://mams.rmit.edu.au/ntne8d1uyvz21.pdf>, accessed on 19.11.2009
47. Tynan, J., New, C. (2009) Creativity and Conflict: How theory and practice shape student identities in design education. In *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*. 2009, No. 8, pp. 295 – 308, accessed on 15.07.2011
48. Usher, A. (2009) Ten Years Back and Ten Years Forward: Developments and Trends in Higher Education in Europe Region. Paper for the *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education in the Europe Region: Access, Values, Quality and Competitiveness*. 21-24 May 2009, Bucharest, Romania
http://www.educationalpolicy.org/publications/pubpdf/0905_UNESCO.pdf, accessed on 17.11.2009
49. Usher, A., Savino, M. (2007) A Global Survey of University Ranking and League Tables. In *Higher Education in Europe*. Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 5-15
50. Vangelis, K. (2011) Composition: Inspiration or Technique? (A Critique on the Musical Composition System). In *Studia UBB. Musica*. LVI, 1, 2011, pp. 17-21
51. Winckler, G. (2008) Competitiveness of European Higher Education: An Institutional Issue, and Also a System Issue. Paper for the *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education in the Europe Region: Access, Values, Quality and Competitiveness*. 21-24 May 2009, Bucharest, Romania, <http://www.cepes.ro/forum/Winckler.pdf>, accessed on 17.11.2009
52. Wray, K.B. (2009) Kuhn and the discovery of Paradigms. In *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*. 2011, 41/3, pp. 380 – 397, accessed on 10.07.2011

C. Documents

1. The role of the universities in the Europe of knowledge, February 2003. European Council, http://europa.eu/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2003/com2003_0058en01.pdf, accessed on 06.05.2007
2. Bologna Process Stocktaking Report 2007. Report from a working group appointed by the Bologna Follow-up Group to the Ministerial Conference in London, May 2007. European Commission, http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/WGR2007/Stocktaking_report2007.pdf, accessed on 25.10.2009
3. Bologna Process Stocktaking Report from a working group appointed by the Bologna Follow-up Group to the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, Bergen, 19-20 May 2005. European Commission, http://www.bdp.it/lucabas/lookmyweb/templates/up_files/Processo_Bologna/Stocktaking%20Bergen%202005.pdf, accessed on 25.10.2009

4. Crosier, D., Purser, L., Smidt, H. (2007) Trends V. Universities Shaping the European Higher Education. EUA,
http://www.eua.be/fileadmin/user_upload/files/Publications/EUA_Trends_V_for_web.pdf,
 accessed on 25.10.2009
5. Cultural Statistics. (2011) EUROSTAT, <http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/statistics/culture>,
 accessed on 09.06.2012
6. Exercițiul Național de Evaluare a Cercetării (ENEC). Ghid specific. Arte și Arhitectură. (2011) CNCS, http://www.ecs-univ.ro/UserFiles/File/Ghidul%20specific%20al%20evaluatorului%20pentru%20Arte%20si%20Arhitectura_creatie_24.05.2011.pdf, accessed on 02.05.2012
7. Frascati Manual. Proposed Standards Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development. (2002) OECD,
http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/OECDFrascatiManual02_en.pdf, accessed on 18.10.2011
8. Ghidul activităților de evaluare a calității programelor de studii universitare și a instituțiilor de învățământ superior. Partea a III – a, Evaluarea externă a calității academice din instituțiile de învățământ superior acreditate. (Evaluarea externă instituțională). (2006), RAQAHE
9. Gordon, J.C., Beilby-Orrin, H. (2007) International Measurement of the Economic and Social Importance of Culture. OECD
10. Government decision no. 1357/2005. info.uoradea.ro/attachment/0e4acd64bb, accessed on 20.05.2010
11. Government decision no. 1418/2006. Monitorul Oficial al României, part I, no. 865, 23 October 2006
12. Government decision no. 681/2011. Monitorul Oficial al României, part I, no. 551, 3 August, 2011
13. Law no. 87/2006, MECTS,
<http://www.uaic.ro/uaic/bin/download/Academic/ServiciulCalitate/Law87.pdf>, accessed on 12.11.2009
14. Law no. 76/2002. MECTS,
http://www.leru.ro/LEG%20PRL%2076%202002%200_Mayn.html, accessed on 21.05.2010
15. Law no. 128/1997. MECTS, www.edu.ro/index.php/legaldocs/561, accessed on 24.05.2010
16. Law no. 172/1998. MECTS, www.legestart.ro/Law-172-1998-ratif.., accessed on 12.11.2009

17. Law no. 88/1993. MECTS www.uaic.ro/uaic/bin/download/Academi..., accessed on 12.11. 2009
18. Law of National Education no. 1/2011. MECTS, Monitorul Oficial al României, part I, no. 18, 10 January 2011
19. Education Law no. 84/1995. MECTS, www.edu.ro/index.php/legaldocs/562, accessed on 12.11. 2009
20. Law no. 69/2011. MECTS, <http://www.lex.ro/Law-69-2011-112644.aspx>, accessed on 23.09.2012
21. Metodologia de alocare a fondurilor bugetare pentru finanțarea de bază și finanțarea suplimentară pentru anul 2012 pentru studenții înmatriculați până la 1 octombrie 2011. (2011) CNFIS, [http://www.uad.ro/storage/Dataitems/metodol%20finantare%20tranzitoriu%202012\(1\).pdf](http://www.uad.ro/storage/Dataitems/metodol%20finantare%20tranzitoriu%202012(1).pdf), accessed on 23.09.2012
22. Metodologia de calcul a indicatorului de Calitate IC6. CNCS, <http://www.cncsis.ro/Public/cat/26/IC6-2011.html>, accessed on 27.08.2010
23. Metodologia de evaluare externă, standardele de referință și lista indicatorilor de performanță a Agenției Române de Asigurare a Calității în Învățământul Superior. (2006) RAQAHE, http://www.ARACIS.ro/uploads/164/Metodologia_de_evaluare_externa.pdf, accessed on 27.08.2010
24. Metodologia de evaluare externă, standardele, standardele de referință și lista indicatorilor de performanță a Agenției Române de Asigurare a Calității în Învățământul Superior. Proiect. (2011) RAQAHE, http://www.ARACIS.ro/uploads/media/Proiect_Metodologie.pdf, accessed on 23.09.2012
25. Metodologia de repartizare pe instituții de învățământ superior a alocațiilor bugetare pentru finanțarea de bază în anul 2010. (2009) CNFIS, http://www.cnfis.ro/index_f.html, accessed on 21.11.2010
26. Mobilizing the brainpower of Europe: enabling universities to make their full contribution to the Lisbon Strategy, April 2005. European Council, http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/comuniv2005_en.pdf, accessed on 04.05.2008
27. Ministerial Order no. 3928/2005. <http://www.old.edu.ro/download/omedc3928x.pdf>, accessed on 20.07.2010
28. Ministerial Order no. 4786/2011. <http://administrasite.edu.ro/index.php/articles/15893>, accessed on 23.09.2012
29. Ministerial Order no. 3794/2011. <http://www.cncs-nrc.ro/documente-de-infiintare/>, accessed on 23.09.2012

30. Ministerial Order no. 6422/2011. [http://www.ancs.ro/ro/articol/2752/despre-ancs-legisla-
ie-acte-normative-ordin-nr-6422-2011](http://www.ancs.ro/ro/articol/2752/despre-ancs-legisla-
ie-acte-normative-ordin-nr-6422-2011), accessed on 23.09.2012
31. Ministerial Order no. 5212/2011. <http://www.ucdc.ro/cc/5212.pdf>, accessed on 02.04.2012
32. Ordinance no. 75/ 2005. www.cnfis.ro/documente/pdf/OU75-2005.pdf, accessed on
18.09.2010
33. Ordinance no. 75/2011.
[http://www.dreptonline.ro/legislatie/oug_75_2011_modificare_oug_75_2005_asigurarea_
calitatii_educatiei.php](http://www.dreptonline.ro/legislatie/oug_75_2011_modificare_oug_75_2005_asigurarea_
calitatii_educatiei.php), accessed on 02.04.2012
34. Poziția ANOSR privind dezvoltarea *ranking*-urilor și clasamentelor în Instituțiile de
Învățământ Superior din Romania. (2009) ANOSR,
[http://www.anosr.ro/index.php/pdf/pozitia-anosr-privind-dezvoltarea-ranking-urilor-si-
clasamentelor-in-institutiile-de-invatamant-superior-din-romania.pdf](http://www.anosr.ro/index.php/pdf/pozitia-anosr-privind-dezvoltarea-ranking-urilor-si-
clasamentelor-in-institutiile-de-invatamant-superior-din-romania.pdf), accessat In
23.10.2010
35. Presidency Conclusions. Lisbon European Council, March 2003. European Council,
[http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/PRESIDENCY CONCLUSIONS_Lisbon.pdf](http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/PRESIDENCY_CONCLUSIONS_Lisbon.pdf),
accessed on 19.11.2009
36. Raport asupra stării sistemului național de învățământ. (2009) MECTS,
<http://www.edu.ro/index.php/articles/129261>, accessed on 14.02.2010
37. Rauhvargers, A., Deane C., Pauwels W. (2009) Bologna Process Stocktaking Report
2009. Report from working groups appointed by the Bologna Follow-up Group to the
Ministerial Conference in Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve, 28-29 April 2009. European
Commission,
[http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/conference/documents/Stocktaking_
g_report_2009_FINAL.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/conference/documents/Stocktaking_
g_report_2009_FINAL.pdf), accessed on 25.10.2009
38. Reichert, S., Tauch, Ch. (2005) Trends IV. European Universities implementing Bologna.
EUA, http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/TrendsIV_FINAL.1117012084971.pdf,
accessed on 25.10.2009
39. România educației, România cercetării. Raport al Comisiei Prezidențiale pentru analiza și
elaborarea politicilor din domeniile educației și cercetării. (2007) MECTS,
http://edu.presidency.ro/upload/raport_edu.pdf, accessed on 25.10.2009
40. Romania National Report. Bergen 2005. European Commission,
http://bologna.mgimo.ru/files/otcheti-2005/Reports-Romania_05.pdf, accessed on
25.10.2009
41. Romania National Report. London (2007). European Commission,
[http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/links/National-reports-
2007/National_Report_Romania2007.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/links/National-reports-
2007/National_Report_Romania2007.pdf), accessed on 25.10.2009

42. Standarde specifice de evaluare academică. Arte, Arhitectură, Urbanism, Educație Fizică și Sport. RAQAHE, http://pfe.ARACIS.ro/inscriere/registru/lista_comisii_permanente/, accessed on 05.07.2010
43. Standarde specifice de evaluare academică. Științe Administrative, ale Educației și Psihologie. RAQAHE, http://pfe.ARACIS.ro/inscriere/registru/lista_comisii_permanente/, accessed on 05.07.2010
44. Standarde specifice de evaluare academică. Științe Agricole, Silvice și Medicină Veterinară. RAQAHE, http://pfe.ARACIS.ro/inscriere/registru/lista_comisii_permanente/, accessed on 05.07.2010
45. Standarde specifice de evaluare academică. Științe Economice. RAQAHE, http://pfe.ARACIS.ro/inscriere/registru/lista_comisii_permanente/, accessed on 05.07.2010
46. Standarde specifice de evaluare academică. Științe Exacte și Științe ale Naturii. RAQAHE , http://pfe.ARACIS.ro/inscriere/registru/lista_comisii_permanente/, accessed on 05.07.2010
47. Standarde specifice de evaluare academică. Științe Inginerești I. RAQAHE , http://pfe.RAQAHE.ro/inscriere/registru/lista_comisii_permanente/, accessed on 05.07.2010
48. Standarde specifice de evaluare academică. Științe Juridice. RAQAHE , http://pfe.ARACIS.ro/inscriere/registru/lista_comisii_permanente/, accessed on 05.07.2010
49. Standarde specifice de evaluare academică. Științe Medicale. RAQAHE , http://pfe.ARACIS.ro/inscriere/registru/lista_comisii_permanente/, accessed on 05.07.2010
50. Standarde specifice de evaluare academică. Științe Sociale, Politice și Ale Comunicării. RAQAHE , http://pfe.ARACIS.ro/inscriere/registru/lista_comisii_permanente/, accessed on 05.07.2010
51. Standarde specifice de evaluare academică. Științe Umaniste și Teologie. RAQAHE, http://pfe.ARACIS.ro/inscriere/registru/lista_comisii_permanente/, accessed on 05.07.2010
52. Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area. (2005) EAQA, Helsinki, http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Mayn_doc/050221_ENQA_report.pdf, accessed on 24.11.2010
53. Statement on the development of rankings and classification in the EHEA. (2009) ESU, <http://www.esib.org/documents/statements/ESU%20rankings%20statement.pdf>, accessed on 23.10.2010

54. Sursock, A., Smidt, H. (2010) Trends 2010: A Decade of Change in European Higher Education. EUA ,
http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/2010_conference/documents/EUA_Trends_2010.pdf, accessed on 28.09.2011
55. The role of the universities in the Europe of knowledge. (2003) European Council
http://europa.eu/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2003/com2003_0058en01.pdf, accessed on 25.07.2007
56. Towards the European higher education area. Bologna process. Romania National Report. (2009) European Commission,
<http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/actionlines/stocktaking.htm>,
 accessed on 23.02.2010
57. Youth in Europe - a statistical portrait of the lifestyle of young people. (2009) EUROSTAT,
<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=STAT/09/177&format=HTML&>
 , accessed on 05.03.2010
58. Youth in Europe. A statistical portrait. (2009) EUROSTAT,
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-78-09-920/EN/KS-78-09-920-EN.PDF, accessed on 05.03.2010

D. Online references

1. Academic Ranking of World Universities, (ARWU), (Institute of Higher Education, Shanghai, Jiao Tong University), <http://www.arwu.org/>
2. AD ASTRA, www.ad-astra.ro
3. Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC), <http://www.eacinfo.org>
4. Centre for Higher Education Development, <http://www.che.de/cms/>
5. Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies, <http://www.utwente.nl/chpes/>
6. Classifying European Institutions for Higher Education (CEIHE),
<http://utwente.nl/cheps/research/projects/ceihe/>
7. European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), www.enqa.eu
8. European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP),
www.cedefop.europa.eu
9. European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA), <http://www.elia-artschools.org>
10. European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR), www.eqar.eu

11. European Students' Union, (ESU), www.esib.org
12. European University Association, (EUA), www.eua.be/
13. EUROSTAT, <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/eurostat/>
14. Evenimentul Zilei, www.evz.ro/index.html
15. „Gheorghe Dima” Music Academy Cluj-Napoca, (GDMA), <http://GDMA.ro/>
16. International Labour Organization (ILO), <http://www.ilo.org/>
17. National Centre for Recognition and Equivalence of Diplomas, <http://www.cnred.edu.ro/>
18. National Council of Higher Education Financing (CNFIS), <http://www.cnfis.ro/>
19. National Institute of Statistics (INS), www.insse.ro
20. National Research Council (CNCS), <http://www.cnctis.ro/>
21. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), <http://www.oecd.org>
22. Professional Ranking of World Universities (MINES – Paris),
<http://www.ensmp.fr/Actualites/PR/EMP-ranking.html>
23. Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (RAQAHE),
<http://www.RAQAHE.ro/>
24. The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/money>
25. The Telegraph, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/>
26. The Times Higher Education Supplement – QS World University Rankings,
<http://www.topuniversities.com/worlduniversityrankings/>
27. The Times Higher Education Supplement – QS World University Rankings (THES),
<http://www.topuniversities.com/worlduniversityrankings/>
28. Webometrics Ranking of World Universities, <http://www.webometrics.info/>
29. Ziarul Financiar <http://www.zf.ro/profesii/>
30. 2008 Performances Ranking of Scientific Papers for World Universities (HEEACT-Taiwan), <http://ranking.heeact.edu.tw/en-us/2008/page/methodology>