



CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR POLICY STUDIES



OPEN SOCIETY INSTITUTE

MARIA GOLUBEVA

New Practices, Old Discourses?
Change and Continuity in Humanities
and Social Sciences in Latvia during the
Democratic Transition

2005 / 2006

CPS INTERNATIONAL POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM ▲

MARIA GOLUBEVA

New Practices, Old Discourses?
Change and Continuity in Humanities and Social
Sciences in Latvia during the Democratic Transition

Abstract

Higher education in the Social Sciences and Humanities has undergone many structural changes in Latvia following the country's independence from the Soviet Union. Despite extensive cooperation with international donors however, academic departments in Humanities and Social Sciences do not yet participate in the introduction of democratic discourses in society at the level aspired to. This article identifies why in some cases academic reform in Latvia has not lead to promotion of liberal discourses in the academic milieu, and assesses the impact of international donors on the Departments of Humanities and of Social Sciences. A lesser exposure of researchers in Humanities to international academic discourses and public policy discourses is seen as an underlying factor. A comparison between Latvian and Romanian higher education is presented, showing that although there are more alternative channels for funding in Romania, it lies behind Latvia in the progress of reform of public administration. Finally, policy recommendations are offered aimed at how to promote liberal discourse. These focus on how to increase interaction between the Humanities and Social Sciences, and how to provide greater incentives for Humanities scholars to get involved in projects concerning issues of public policy.

This policy paper was produced under the 2005-06 International Policy Fellowship program. Maria Golubeva was a member of the Developing Socially Responsible Elites and the Challenge of Higher Education Reform working group, which was directed by Vadim Volkov. More details of their policy research can be found at <http://www.policy.hu/themes05/elites/index.html>.

The views contained inside remain solely those of the author who may be contacted at golubeva@policy.hu. For a fuller account of this policy research project, please visit <http://www.policy.hu/golubeva/>

July 2006

Language Editing – Martin Baker
Formatting and Type-setting – Linda Szabo

International Policy Fellowship Program
Open Society Institute
Nador Utca 9
Budapest 1051
Hungary

www.policy.hu

This document is available under a Creative Commons distribution copyright

Contents

Introduction.....	4
1 Goals of the policy study.....	5
1.1 <i>Research Objectives and Methods</i>	6
1.2 <i>Departments and discourses</i>	7
2 International donors and the funding of academic activities: a cross-cutting analysis.....	10
2.1 <i>Attitudes towards changes in academic life since the early 1990s</i>	14
2.2 <i>Research funding infrastructure: University-based researchers in Humanities and the Social Sciences in Latvia vis-à-vis government and international donors</i>	17
2.3 <i>Involvement in policy debate</i>	20
3 Unique or comparable? Putting the Latvian case in perspective by comparison with Romania.....	22
3.1 <i>Research funding structures for Humanities and Social Sciences in Romania today</i>	24
3.2 <i>Transformed, but how influential?</i>	26
3.3 <i>Conclusions</i>	27
4 Recommendations.....	28
References.....	32
Appendix 1.....	33
Appendix 2.....	34

Introduction

Scholars of Humanities and Social Sciences produce the bulk of academic texts touching on issues of political importance. They are also the ones who react to various challenges in the public policy community globally and nationally, by transforming dominant discourses according to the logic or 'culture' of their disciplines or 'tribes' (Trowler, 2001). It is important, therefore, to see what kind of discourses these scholars produce and reproduce in society.

The Latvian higher education system had to face up to many of the challenges with which universities across the world were confronted due to major structural changes in many societies in the 1990s (World Bank, 1994). Reforms in Latvia's academic sector have been considerable and, to a large extent, successful. It is also a country that has achieved a remarkable record of democratization and economic growth for a post-Soviet transition society.

At the same time, the issue of the spreading of exclusionary, nationalist and statist discourses is not irrelevant to Latvian society. Often, politicians' statements in the media and journalists' observations concerning policy-making processes provoke questions about the depth of democratic orientations among opinion leaders. Part of the political elite still reproduces nationalist and exclusionary discourses that have an impact on the ethnic polarization of society (Zepa, 2005). The debate about the normative implications of the involvement of 'external' actors – such as the Soros Foundation Latvia – in political agenda-setting arose in the summer of 2004 – and is still ongoing, with members of Saeima (the Parliament) and the National Security Council sometimes labeling the work of networks such as OSI as a 'threat' to national security. This debate has shown that the concept of the open exchange of normative and intellectual influences across national borders in the area of public policy is by no means taken for granted by the public.

In a society with a certain amount of ethnic polarization, it is especially important that intellectual elites and the media provide an arena for political debate, where informed and responsible critique of political elites is possible.

After more than a decade of political, economic and academic reform, this may be the right time to focus on the discourses being produced and reproduced in the academic milieu of Humanities and Social Sciences. One of the questions arising from any mapping of academic discourses is: what role does

the record of university departments' involvement with external actors (EU-related, OSI-related) play in this process?

The policy-oriented output of this paper is an assessment of the effect of international actors – both EU-related and OSI-related (CEP, HESP, Robert Bosch Stiftung and others) – on academic departments of Humanities and Social Sciences in Latvia, and, through them, on discourses produced by scholars in this range of disciplines. For the sake of giving a broader context to this study, some examples from another CEE country, Romania, will be used for comparison.

1 Goals of the policy study

This policy paper is based on a longer research paper entitled *Departments and Discourses*, and pursues the following objectives:

- To identify factors due to which, in some cases, academic reform in Humanities and the Social Sciences in Latvia, in which a number of external actors were involved, did not lead to the promotion of liberal discourses in an academic milieu, the introduction of new academic practices and/or where exposure to international cooperation has not precluded the reproduction of exclusionary, statist and nationalist discourses.
- To assess the impact of international actors – from EU-related and UN-related to OSI-related institutions (Civic Education Project, HESP, Robert Bosch Stiftung and others) – on academic departments, to see to what extent this impact is visible in the introduction of liberal and pluralist discourses in academic and higher education milieu, and what structural factors (funding, organization) may have led to the reproduction of nationalist and statist discourses in some cases.
- In order to broaden the study's scope and implications, the study of the impact of international funding on Social Science and Humanities departments in Latvia will be compared with the case of another CEE country currently aspiring to EU membership, namely Romania.
- On the basis of achieved conclusions, to develop policy recommendations for organizations with a democratizing agenda and which are involved in academic reform in transition societies, and for other stakeholders interested in the promotion of liberal and pluralist discourse in an academic milieu in Latvia and other Central and Eastern European societies.

1.1 *Research Objectives and Methods*

The paper is based on the following research and analysis:

- Analysis of a body of texts produced by scholars from selected departments of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Latvia – including conference papers, newspaper publications by academics and policy documents produced by scholars of respective departments and by government institutions in cooperation with such scholars.
- Analysis of effect of international donor organizations on the activities of academic departments in Latvia and in Romania. For this purpose, the types of activities implemented by departments with the support of EU-related and OSI-related institutions (e.g. CEP, HESP, Robert Bosch Stiftung and others), as well as other international organizations, were analyzed. This was done via a series of interviews with representatives of university departments (in the case of Latvia, the same departments where texts analyzed in Part I were produced).
- Analysis of structural factors (such as reorganization of departments and programs and available research funding infrastructure) that may have influenced the spreading of discourses in given academic milieu.

The choice of the University of Latvia and its departments as objects of primary study to test these questions was more or less predetermined by the role this university plays in the Latvian academic community. While other universities, university colleges or institutes may be equally important in the higher education system, the University of Latvia is the single most influential body in most areas of academic research, especially in the Humanities and Social Sciences, and also when it comes to the structures regulating the development of higher education and research in Latvia. It is also the most 'complete' university from the point of view of the number of academic disciplines it accommodates in its departments and research institutes. The University of Latvia can thus be viewed as a 'microcosm' of Latvian higher education and academic life.

In Latvia, the study covers five departments in Social Sciences, and six departments in Humanities, four of which are grouped together for analysis because they implement joint study programs and their academic staff sometimes fluctuate between departments (the History of Latvia was analyzed together with the History of Western Europe and the USA, and Baltic Philology was joined with Latvian Literature).

1.2 *Departments and discourses*

At the beginning of this research project, it was assumed that when a university department in Latvia in the 1990s chose to engage teaching staff affiliated to organizations with an articulated democratizing mission, or participated in projects funded by organizations with a democratizing agenda, it could be expected that not only new practices but also new discourses would arise and be introduced. However, there are specific factors normally influencing educational transfer and the borrowing of discourse. Structural factors, including first of all the existing teaching and research infrastructure, policies and funding patterns, are important, and so are 'cultural' factors, such as the dominant discourses which exist in a given society (Emirbayer and Goodwin, 1994). It takes some effort to introduce new discourses, and even when structural reforms do point in the direction of democratization, the disappearance of exclusionary discourses cannot be taken for granted.

Cultural factors, such as the role of Humanities departments as a locus of nationally-oriented academic counter-culture in the last decades of Soviet rule, will not, for the most part, be discussed in this paper. They deserve a separate study – and it is to be hoped that such a study will be one day produced in Latvia. This paper limits itself to an analysis of structural factors.

In order to see to what extent academic departments in Humanities and the Social Sciences participate in the introduction of democratic discourses in society or, instead, reproduce exclusionary, nationalist or statist discourses, a small systematic study of texts produced by academic personnel working in departments of the University of Latvia was undertaken. Recognizing that it takes time for new discourses to be introduced and developed, publications from the early 2000s – following approximately ten years of political and academic reform – were selected. Methods developed by the school of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) were used to analyze these texts. (See Appendix 1 for the criteria of text selection for discourse analysis).

As criteria via which to analyze texts, the following principles were used:

The scale of nationalist/exclusionary discourse

The extent to which the author(s) of a text use access control (e.g. use constructions that imply that some groups or individuals in society can be excluded from debate in the defining of some issue) shows whether the text could

be described as producing/reproducing exclusionary and nationalist discourses (Van Dijk, 1993).

In texts where a high degree of access control was in evidence, strategies of *discursive construction of national identity* (as described, for example, by Ruth Wodak et al. - Wodak 1999), were identified. Elements of *racist discourse* as defined by T. Van Dijk were also looked at.

The scale of statist discourse

Instances of *statist discourse* – constructions creating hierarchies in which the state is the primary agent of politics and social/cultural change, while society is depicted as being the object of state interference – were recognized in analyzed texts. In conjunction with nationalist discourse, statist discourse creates and reinforces power relations between the state and society and between majority and minority groups in society in a hierarchical way, while it also stabilizes existing power relations and justifies them.

The scale of the commercialization/internationalization and professionalization/internationalization discourse

Texts were also grouped according to the presence of *commercialization / internationalization discourse* (seeing processes in society, research and education as being driven by the market and globalization, with both being depicted as threats, and thus 'deviating' from what is assumed to be the true values of education and culture) or to the *professionalization / internationalization discourse* (describing processes in society, research and education as moving in the direction of increasing professionalization, in adherence to European and international standards). Another type of professionalization discourse often present in the analyzed body of texts could be described as being a *professionalization / communication discourse*, i.e. when constructing public policy as a field of informed debate.

Summing up the conclusions of discourse analysis, some 'maps' of discourses produced by respective departments emerge.

Taking first the presence of nationalist discourse as a criterion (Table 1), one can see that while some individual texts reproducing nationalist discourses have been produced at Social Science departments, the absolute majority of such texts 'gravitate' towards the Humanities departments, with the important exception of the Department of Practical Philosophy (Hum I).

Table 1 Nationalist discourse

Department(s)	Text I	Text II	Text III
S Sc I			
S Sc II			
S Sc III			
S Sc IV			
S Sc V			
Hum I			
Hum II			
Hum III + IV			
Hum V + VI			

The 'map' of statist discourse more or less repeats the same pattern (Table 2).

Table 2 Statist discourse

Department(s)	Text I	Text II	Text III
S Sc I			
S Sc II			
S Sc III			
S Sc IV			
S Sc V			
Hum I			
Hum II			
Hum III + IV			
Hum V + VI			

A slightly different picture emerges if one attempts to map the spread of professionalization / internationalization and commercialization / internationalization discourses (Table 3).

Table 3 Professionalization / internationalization (marked in black) and commercialization/ internationalization discourses (marked in grey)

Department(s)	Text I	Text II	Text III
S Sc I			
S Sc II			
S Sc III			
S Sc IV			
S Sc V			
Hum I			
Hum II			
Hum III + IV			
Hum V + VI			

It can thus be concluded that:

- While the *professionalization / internationalization* discourse permeates most of the texts produced by Social Sciences departments, this is not so evident in the texts produced by Humanities departments (with the exception of the Department of Practical Philosophy).
- The presence of nationalist and statist discourses is much more visible in the texts produced by lecturers from Humanities departments.

This may have to do with two factors: 1) the lesser exposure of Humanities researchers to international academic discourses and public policy discourses (via externally funded activities) and 2) the ideological and discursive frameworks set for government-funded research in Humanities.

The influence of these factors can be seen from the following analysis of activities funded during the 1990s by international donors, and from the analysis of the infrastructure of available funding for research; and we should see to what extent the spread of nationalist and statist discourses coincides with a lesser degree of structural change influenced by external/ international donors – and to what extent the reproduction of *professionalization / internationalization* discourse coincides with more systematic exposure to structural change and the influence of international donors.

2 International donors and the funding of academic activities: a cross-cutting analysis

In order to make any conclusions concerning evidence of the effect of external donors on academic discourses, we first need to see which departments have made use of available external funding from international organizations that came into the country with a democratizing mission, and for what types of activities they used it.

Table 4 Involvement of external (international) donors in the activities of departments and individual lecturers/researchers at the departments. University of Latvia, 1990s

Department(s)	Department created anew in the 1990s	Types of activities sponsored by international donors (according to interviews)	OSI-related agencies, US and EU government agencies, UN agencies up to 2000
Political Science	Y	Curriculum and program development, library development, international conferences, international research projects, individual, departmental and interdepartmental research projects, visiting lecturers ('several every year'), exchanges, creating a German-Latvian center for social science literature (DELA), creating a Eurofaculty (with the assistance of several EU countries and the US), individual mobility	SFL, CEP, HESP, CEU (CRC) UNDP, TEMPUS, PHARE, Fulbright, Volkswagen Stiftung
Sociology	Y	Curriculum and program development, individual, departmental, interdepartmental and international research projects, conferences, visiting lecturers, individual mobility, participation in CEU summer schools/seminars	SFL, HESP, CEU, UNDP, PHARE, Fulbright, DAAD or Robert Bosch 'all donor organizations that there have been in Latvia'
Communication Studies	Y	Curriculum and program development, library development, individual, departmental, interdepartmental and international research projects, conferences, visiting lecturers, exchanges, individual mobility, participation in CEU summer schools/seminars	SFL, CEP?, HESP, CEU UNDP, Nordic Council, PHARE, Fulbright
Psychology	Y	Curriculum development, individual, departmental, interdepartmental and international research projects, visiting lecturers, individual mobility	SFL, CEP, UNDP, PHARE, Fulbright
Teacher Training		Curriculum development, book projects, development of state standards of education for schools, individual and international research projects, visiting lecturers, individual mobility	SFL, TEMPUS, World Bank, Robert Bosch, DAAD, British Council, Katolisches Akademisches Austauschdienst

Baltic philology/ Latvian literature		Book projects, one course development, visiting lecturers, international conferences individual research projects (also individual involvement in international research projects), individual mobility	SFL, Fulbright, UNDP, TEMPUS, DAAD, Nordic Council, NORFA
History of Latvia/ History of Western Europe and the USA		Book projects, individual research projects, German-Latvian information center – library, visiting lecturers, individual mobility, conferences	SFL, Robert Bosch, Humboldt Stiftung, Volkswagen Stiftung
Practical Philosophy		Curriculum development, book projects, individual research projects, visiting lecturers, international conferences, individual mobility	SFL, HESP, DAAD, Nordic Council
History of Philosophy		Book translation projects, individual research projects (also individual involvement in international research projects), visiting lecturers, individual mobility	SFL, Fulbright, DAAD, Volkswagen Stiftung

By 'visiting' lecturers here meant only lecturers (Fulbright, CEP, others) teaching for at least one semester. Abbreviations: SFL – Soros foundation Latvia, CEP – Civic Education Project, HESP – International Higher Education Support Program, CEU – Central European University, CRC – Curriculum Resource Center, UNDP – United Nations Development Program, DAAD – Deutsches Akademisches Austauschdienst

The nature of activities mentioned by representatives of departments and implemented with the help of external international donors can be roughly subdivided into two categories:

- Individual activities involving academic mobility, research, book translation
- Department-based activities involving the development of new curricula, programs, procedures and collective research projects (also involving several departments), as well as organization of inter-departmental and international conferences.

It can be seen from Table 2 that while representatives of both Humanities and Social Sciences departments have taken part in the first (individual) type of activities, the difference lies in persons' degrees of involvement in larger-scale curriculum development and collective research projects (going beyond the boundaries of one department), where the Social Sciences Departments have been more active. This especially concerns activities aimed at the (re)construction of curriculum and of entire study programs.

While curriculum changes and, to a lesser extent, of teaching methods have taken place in virtually all study programs of the departments included in this

study, the scale of change (including organizational aspects such as restructuring or the creation of new departments; numbers of international exchange lectureships, such as CEP or Fulbright Fellowships, per department; the creation of new departmental libraries) has been greater in the case of Social Science departments.

Four out of five analyzed Social Science departments have been subject to greater organizational transformations than have the Humanities departments analyzed here. They or the study programs they implemented were created anew, with a significant role in this process being played by funding and other support from external international donors. In 2000, the departments of Political Science, Sociology and Communication Studies became part of a newly created Faculty of Social Sciences. Thus, an administrative and symbolic separation from their earlier 'roots' in the organizational structures of disciplines such as History, Philosophy and Philology was made complete. The department of Psychology, likewise a product of transformations that came with democratization and independence, is part of the (also largely transformed) Faculty of Pedagogics and Psychology, as is the Department of Teacher Training. The Faculties of History and Philosophy and of Philology, on the other hand, have kept their administrative structure from Soviet times largely unaltered (not counting some restructuring and the disappearance of 'ideological' departments). This leads us to the conclusion that the effect of external donors on Social Sciences departments has combined itself with the effects of structural innovation and change.

The following conclusions are relevant for the present study:

- The types of activities implemented with the support of international donor organizations at Social Science departments differed from the types of activities implemented in Humanities departments, and more often concerned major structural changes in the organization of teaching (such as development of new programs) along with collective research projects.
- Social Science departments have been created anew or underwent great structural changes, including in the development of study programs for new disciplines, in the 1990s – though this is, for the most part, not the case with Humanities departments.

2.1 Attitudes towards changes in academic life since the early 1990s

Interviews with departmental heads and lecturers have revealed a difference in evaluations of the main aspects of any organizational and academic changes that have taken place in Latvia since the late 1980s. While individual lecturers of the Social Sciences departments interviewed for this study differed as to the degree of impact external donors had on the transformation of teaching and research practices at their departments, almost all assessments coincided in describing the changes that occurred in their areas in the 1990s in terms of *internationalization* and *professionalization*, and a moving towards what many called ‘international’ or ‘western’ standards in teaching and research. Internationalization was mentioned also by the lecturers of Humanities departments, although, in their interviews processes connected with the opening up of their academic domain to the west are seen as being more ambiguous, often going together with negative connotations of *commercialization* and an erosion of what is viewed as the ‘true’ standards of scholarship. The effect of external donors was thus evaluated differently, with more emphasis being placed on the funding inequalities inherent in Humanities and the Social Sciences and sometimes with emphasis going on the internal inequalities of funding in international projects – e.g. ‘I know the rules set by the European Commission, and I know that a certain Heinrich from Denmark is getting several times as much for the same work that I am doing...’ (Lecturer, departments of Baltic Philology/Latvian Literature).

While a reconstruction of study programs has taken place everywhere, in the Humanities (via my interviews) one can see that this is first and foremost viewed as reconstruction/change in ideological approach. When asked about the main changes in academic life since 1991, ‘creative’ freedom, the demise of Marxist ideology’ and ‘the disappearance of ideological pressure’ were mentioned first of all, along with complaints about imperfect and scarce funding systems, a lack of interest/understanding from politicians and (at least in two cases) disorientation and moral problems arising either from ‘the lack of common state ideology’ or from ‘the new ideologies’ of the free market. While persons had deplored the presence of Soviet ideology, many lecturers in the Humanities expressed explicit or implicit desires to participate in the construction of a new state ideology, as both the interviews and the texts analyzed in the current study reveal:

Moral problems are left on the margins. At the moment we lack a common state ideology. I sometimes say, we have minister for this and minister for that, but there is no minister for ideology... Some new state ideology has to be created, and that needs a scientific basis... (Lecturer, Department of Baltic Philology).

A quotation from Robert Bosch Lecturer Anuschka Tischer, speaking of History Departments, illustrates a situation which is commonplace, with some exceptions, and which exists in some Humanities departments:

Historical research in Latvia is extremely nationally oriented. At the moment, there is a general consensus between society and historians that identity should be constructed from national categories. 'On the territory of today's Latvia' is a typical extension to the titles of research papers, even if the research is about burial culture in the 14th century – and as if the political transformation processes, ethnic migrations and everything that usually makes up history have left no trace, as if borders themselves are not first of all a product of historical development... This national self-limitation, however, is an obstacle to integration into the international academic community, which could improve academic levels (Tischer, 2005).

Putting this statement in context, it is important to add that while historians stressing their adherence to the 'international' or 'European' paradigm are also represented in History departments, their impact is less visible in areas of public debate, as they are compartmentalized within (ill-funded) areas of Medieval or Early Modern History, and not in the prioritized (in terms of policy debate and research funding) area of twentieth-century history.

Interviews with some lecturers and researchers confirm existence of the belief that the peculiarities of Latvian culture, language, literature and history cannot be easily 'translated' into the language of international scholarship:

We have to consider access to literature. I assume that for political scientists or economists there is no great difference – i.e. if you read a good book which is published in England or America – but in our faculty, where many things are connected with *Letonica* studies, there are no such textbooks, and we still have to practice the oral genre and to operate on the basis of the real situation... (Lecturer, Department of History of Philosophy)

The existence of a similar attitude to the uniqueness and 'untranslatability' of Latvian experience – something also existing among the younger generation of future researchers – was critically noted in an interview by a lecturer of a Social Science department:

In a seminar in Denmark, students from different countries were given a task: to solve an imaginary problem in an editorial office. Students from

other countries then came back, each group with their solution... The Latvian group came back *without* a solution, saying that the situation described in the task was untypical for Latvia and therefore not relevant to them! (Lecturer, Department of Communication)

The representatives of Humanities departments who view these developments more seriously and who analytically distance themselves from aspects of stagnation in their disciplines, tend to speak of 'insufficient openness' and 'a lack of interaction between Humanities and Social sciences', pointing out that 'each discipline lives in its own shell'.

A very different picture emerged from interviews held at the Social Sciences departments. There, the emphasis is on the internationalization of academic content, research and teaching processes, and on the growth of professional standards (viewed also, essentially, in connection with internationalization, e.g. 'now we are gradually able to attain western criteria'). The word 'internationalization' itself was mentioned by some interviewees. The creation of study programs and new curricula, at times from scratch, was described as a process that would require the influence of external donors and international academic associations, while also needing a participatory approach (e.g. consulting students for processes of curriculum development).

Two conclusions concerning the attitude of academic staff towards changes in academic life in the 1990s are particularly relevant to this study:

- There is a difference in attitude as regards the changes that took place in academic life during the 1990s between lecturers in Humanities and Social Sciences departments. While the lecturers of Social Sciences departments for the most part evaluate the impact of internationalization of academic life as being positive, Humanities lecturers have concerns about the commercialization of academic life – which, in their opinion, undermines academic standards.
- Lecturers in Humanities departments often viewed external forces, such as international influences and the free market, as being sources of threats for the social and cultural missions of their disciplines; and such persons occasionally expressed regrets that 'the state', or politicians, were not supporting them sufficiently in order to create a new ideological framework for the preservation of 'national identity' or 'traditional values' against such (perceived) threats.

2.2 Research funding infrastructure: University-based researchers in Humanities and the Social Sciences in Latvia vis-à-vis government and international donors

As a locus of academic teaching and research, the development of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University has to be viewed with this dual functional perspective. The lecturers interviewed in the course of this project were also active researchers – and it is important to see what kinds of policy and funding infrastructures serve to make up their priorities for their research activities.

As in most countries of the CEE, towards the end of the 1990s international donors that came to Latvia with funding specifically bearing a message of (re)constructing democracy – such as OSI-related agencies – have seen a reduction in their relative importance when it comes to available sources of funding.

Today, EU funding sources and, in some cases, government sources of funding are top of the priority list. These, however, are more readily available to researchers in Natural and sometimes Social Sciences, and only in specific areas are accessible to Humanities researchers. The Latvian Council of Science, the body responsible for distributing government research funding in Latvia, offers grants across a number of disciplines, however – including to Humanities and Social Sciences.

Research priorities in Latvia, according to policy documents, include the so-called *Letonica* – which could be described as ‘Latvian Studies’, covering areas of linguistics, literature, cultural anthropology, history, ethnography, and philosophy. As can be seen from the policy document for this program, the social, political and educational function of *Letonica* is at least partly ideological, and is viewed as such by the authors of the program. Funding made available to Humanities via the Latvian Council of Science is also selective and does not cover topics of research going beyond a Latvian subject-matter (e.g. European literature).¹

Modest, albeit symbolically significant Latvian government funds, are available to historians studying the events of the Second World War (including the Holocaust) and the ensuing Soviet repressions of the 1950s.

¹ Data about project topics and grants awarded by the Latvian Council of Science is available in Latvian, and partly in English, at <http://www.lzp.lv/latv/centr.htm>

Within the moderate limits of available government support, the creation of funding guidelines for research is partly in the hands of the administrative and academic elite of Humanities departments at the University of Latvia, which often coincides with the administrative elite of Humanities research institutes. The institutes (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Latvian Language Institute, Latvian History Institute and others) are separate administrative entities of the University, which formerly functioned under the auspices of the Latvian Academy of Sciences, and embodied the Soviet principle of administrative separation of research and teaching. After the recommendations developed by the Danish Research Council in 1992, the process of integration of research institutes into universities began. Reform of the administrative system dealing with research in Latvia was also influenced by the report of the National Science Foundation European bureau (1996), by a report prepared by Coopers and Lybrand in 1997 (commissioned by the EC) and by the European Commission 'Agenda 2000' conclusions.²

The degree of integration of humanities research institutes into the University of Latvia differs on individual bases. Some lecturers in University departments have spent most of their academic career at the institutes, and some are not connected with such institutes at all. For researchers in the Humanities employed both by University departments and the institutes, funding opportunities through government grant schemes, such as *Letonica*, are a significant source of support for their research. Their being included in these grants schemes, on the other hand, depends on the same administrative elite which heads Humanities departments and research institutes. Coordinators of departmental sections handling grant projects awarded by the Council of Science can often be heads of University departments or research institutes – while the same administrators sometimes act or have acted as Latvian coordinators for EU-funded projects under the 5th and 6th Frameworks. What is more, the chairperson and several members of the United Expert Commission on Humanities and Social Sciences, responsible for approval of project applications for Council of Science grants, are also heads of Humanities departments or institutes. The transparency of this system is thus limited, as one researcher can be involved in many projects funded via different channels, and even though the majority of the government funding will be coming from the same source. The concentration of

² National Concept on the Development of Research in Latvia, 1998, <http://www.lzp.lv/latv/centr.htm>

decision-making powers in the hands of a limited circle of leading researchers is, on the other hand, very high.

The infrastructure of government funding for research in the Social Sciences and Humanities inevitably limits the choice of legitimate research topics to areas that are viewed as being significant as regards Latvian state identity. It would be a mistake to say that government funding in the Humanities is available for research, equally, on all 'Latvian' topics – for the likelihood of a grant being awarded for a study of the political culture of aristocratic landowners in Courland during the Enlightenment is not high. A cursory look at topics of research chosen for funding in the 2004 project of the *Letonica* program and of grants given by the Latvian Council of Science confirms this conclusion.³ Some Humanities researchers at the University of Latvia research institutes (e.g. the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology) do take part in applied research projects – for example, those funded by the Society Integration Foundation (EC (PHARE)/Latvian government), although their participation in such projects is, in proportion, lower than is that of social scientists.

In the Social Sciences, on the other hand, priority is given to research on political, social and cultural phenomena in *today's* Latvia from a perspective of development, European integration or internationalization. The titles of research projects are influenced by EU institutional discourse and the discourses of other international organizations, such as the UNDP. Government funding may be limited but, owing to the international political context and membership in the EU and NATO, it is available for the study of topics such as European integration, cooperation for development, gender equality, or even for a study of the influence of elite discourses on inter-ethnic relations. It can come in different shapes: through government institutions commissioning policy research, or via the University itself.⁴ And it is still supplemented by the EU, UNDP and other international funding sources for applied research, things available through tenders and open competition. These sources are mutually independent and only seldom do the channels through which they are available coincide with the triadic hierarchy of Department – Research Institute – Council of Science. The ideological limitations effectively imposed via a configuration of available

³ See <http://www.lzp.lv/latv/centr.htm>

⁴ E.g. Larger-scale interdisciplinary research projects in Social Sciences at the University of Latvia in 2003 and 2004 included topics such as the Conceptual framework of Europeanisation, Innovation policies in the EU, Social processes in Latvia and the Influence of European Integration.

funding on researchers in the Humanities are, thus, virtually non-existent in the Social Sciences.

So the chances of a researcher in the Humanities getting funding for research on a topic not previously outlined for him/her by an ideological program or embodied in government funding guidelines, are much lower than the chances for a social scientist who chooses to adapt a more international – and possibly more critical – approach to Latvian social and political realities.

However, many of the funding opportunities for applied research that are on offer to scholars in the Social Sciences come from international organizations that seek to promote international policy discourses – e.g. human development discourse (UN, UNDP), European integration discourse (European Commission, other EU agencies), social and ethnic integration discourse (PHARE via Society Integration Foundation – co-funded by the Latvian government), human rights discourses (OSI, Council of Europe, UN, EU agencies, other organizations), gender equality discourses (EU, UN, OSI) and others.

2.3 Involvement in policy debate

It has been observed above that Social Sciences researchers are under greater pressure to engage themselves in applied research through their practical involvement in applied projects funded by PHARE, UNDP and other international funding sources, though there is no equivalent exposure in the Humanities. This implies that representatives of Social Sciences are pragmatically involved in policy debate involving diverse communities and social groups, and the debate has until now been stimulated by UNDP and other international agencies. The involvement of Humanities scholars in the Latvian policy debate has predominantly had a different character – via conferences and publications in the media, as well as through applied projects in more limited areas (compared to the case of, for example, public administration reform), such as for improving the methods of Latvian language teaching. The two types of involvement imply different models of interaction.

While the presenting of research results at conferences or publishing articles in the media is undoubtedly important, the effect of direct involvement in applied research, such as the preparation of UNDP Human Development Reports, on the transformation of academic discourse be greater because it implies a direct engagement and dialogue with diverse groups within the policy

community, as well as a more direct engagement with discourses as represented by international agencies.

The exposure of researchers from selected Social Science departments, for example, to human development discourse, can be seen in a brief analysis of their involvement in the preparation of Human Development Reports for Latvia. The Report for 2000/2001 was undertaken by a team headed by the head of Sociology Department, with representatives of the Sociology Department and Political Science Department. Sociologists and political scientists from other universities in Latvia also took part in the project. The Human Development Report 2002/2003 was made by a team including the head and several representatives of the Psychology Department, as well as two lecturers from the Political Science department. Interviews with participants of these research teams in the press support the conclusion that they were aware of the critical role of their research for the public sphere: thus, the head of the Sociology Department called the Report he edited 'a weapon for the defense of the public interest'.

Whether the discourses promoted by OSI were as effectively absorbed by departments is a more complicated issue, since this support, as a rule, came via individual channels, such as the CEP and Robert Bosch lecturers, trips to CEU events, or via book and conference projects supported by the Soros Foundation Latvia. Interviewed representatives of departments had difficulties in identifying the impact specifically of OSI-supported activities, even though at all selected departments some activities were mentioned. Some of the texts included in the analysis sample and demonstrating the unequivocal presence of statist and nationalist discourses in fact come from former grantees of OSI-funded education development projects, whose political or institutional embeddedness (at the center of the government funding system for the Humanities) makes them unlikely promoters of open society ideas.

We can thus conclude here that:

- The configuration of the research funding infrastructure available to Latvian scholars in the Humanities and Social Sciences differs significantly, with funding for the Humanities coming mostly through the Council of Science, with distinct ideological guidelines being attached to it; while the sources of available research funding for the Social Sciences are more diversified.
- The exposure of Social Sciences researchers to international policy discourses (such as human development discourse, human rights discourse, gender equality discourse) was and is much greater, owing to their involvement in applied research projects funded by UNDP and other UN agencies, EU agencies and programs, and other international

organizations promoting such discourses. No equivalent exposure is evident for the Humanities, however.

3 Unique or comparable? Putting the Latvian case in perspective by comparison with Romania

The conditions under which academic and political change happened in Romania in the early 1990s can be compared to those in Latvia, though the aspect of ethnic mobilization was not so prominent. Interviews with department representatives from the University of Bucharest show, for the most part, that the same importance has been attached to the removal of ideological barriers after 1989, while the same (or even greater) importance was accorded to the processes of transformation of academic life – thus establishing a link between teaching and research, the introduction or ‘restoration’ of Social Science disciplines with the effect of openness and internationalization. References to government funding shortages in the 1990s (and even today) were also common in interviews with lecturers, especially in Humanities, both in the Latvian and in the Romanian case.

The establishment of Social Science departments in the early 1990s in Romania can be compared to the establishment of similar departments in Latvia, and it can be seen from the table below that, at least in the cases analyzed here (all from the University of Bucharest), the degree of structural transformation and the involvement of external donors in the development of Social Science departments has been at least as significant (and perhaps more so) than in the case of Latvia. Of the two Humanities faculties analyzed here, the Faculty of Philosophy at a minimum shows a much higher degree of involvement of international donors in the funding of ‘transforming’ activities, such as program development, than is the case with the two Philosophy departments analyzed in Latvia.

Table 5 Involvement of external (international) donors in the activities of departments and individual lecturers/researchers in departments. University of Bucharest, 1990s

Department(s)	Department created anew in the 1990s	Types of activities sponsored by international donors (according to interviews)	OSI-related agencies, US, Canada and EU government agencies, UN agencies up to 2000
Political Science	Y	Creation of French, English and Romanian modules of study, establishment of Master-level study programs, curriculum development, visiting lecturers, summer schools, research projects involving several lecturers from the department, individual mobility, journal publishing	OSI-Romania, HESP, CEP TEMPUS, Socrates, Fulbright, Agence Universitaire (French government), World Bank
Communication	Y	Establishment of Master-level study programs, curriculum development, establishment of a Research Center for Canadian Studies, visiting lecturers, library development, individual mobility	OSI-Romania, HESP, CEP TEMPUS, Socrates Fulbright, USAID, French government, Canadian government funding, Nordic Council of Ministers
History (several departments)		Establishment of research centers at the Faculty of History, development of a research base, visiting lecturers, applied projects (textbooks, seminars for teachers), individual mobility	OSI-Romania, HESP, CEP PHARE, TEMPUS, Socrates, EuroClio, Körber Stiftung (Germany) Fulbright World Bank
Philosophy (several of them)	Some departments	Establishment of a Department of Moral political Philosophy, establishment of Master-level study programs, curriculum development, individual research grants to professors, individual mobility 'In 1997, all projects funded by international donors at the Faculty of Philosophy amounted to approximately 1 million USD' (from an interview with the former Dean)	OSI-Romania, HESP, PHARE, TEMPUS, Fulbright, Dutch government, British Council World Bank

The establishment of a large number of research centers or seminars at the History Department (working independently of Romanian Academy institutes) and the establishment of new departments and programs with the major involvement of international funding (including OSI funding) at the Faculty of Philosophy seem to indicate a greater impact of international donors on the transformation of research and teaching in Philosophy and History in Romania than has been the case in Latvia.

3.1 Research funding structures for Humanities and Social Sciences in Romania today

A major difference between the Romanian and the Latvian systems of funding for research in the Humanities and Social Sciences at the moment seems to be in the existence of several alternative channels of government funding in Romania; while, in Latvia, the government system of research funding is streamlined via the Latvian Council of Science. Romanian university-based researchers can apply for available funds through a council established by the National Ministry of Education, with the support of the World Bank and the PHARE program (CNCSU), who will distribute such research grants. However, the Romanian Academy still maintains a system of research institutes that are separate from universities, and this has its own funding system and open grant competition for all recognized researchers. From the point of view of priority-setting and accountability in research funding at a national level, the benefits of such a dual system are questionable, when, for individual researchers, it might signify more flexibility and less centralized control over favored topics and agenda for research.

The establishment of CNCSU and research funding channeled through it with the support of the World Bank and the PHARE program was a response to the failure to establish a close link between university-based research and society (and the market) within the process of higher education reforms and, in the 1990s, the search of universities for autonomy. As noted with regard to recommendations on which the PHARE project was based, in 1998,

The changes in our universities have focused on a (macro-systemic) framework, breeding an institutional autonomy that has severed the institutions of higher education from the world around them, the economy and the community... Once isolated, universities have come to be dominated by a category of professors, most of them accomplished

ones, who nevertheless share among themselves cognitive territories and privileges, thus forsaking the constant and responsible concern for new developments aimed towards research and economically accessible.⁵

This description to a large extent also fits the situation of many academic departments in Latvia in the 1990s, and even of some departments today. In Latvia, though, no major involvement of international donors (such as the World Bank) in the establishment of an alternative system for university research funding has happened. The only comparable program that existed in the 1990s was the funding program for basic research (not in the Humanities or Social Sciences) run by the Soros Foundation Latvia in cooperation with MOES (N.B. since 1995, with equivalent government funds).

Since the late 1990s, the reform of academic research and university teaching in Romania has been facilitated by two specially created departments at the National Ministry of Education: The World Bank Higher Education Reform Project Department and The PHARE Reforms Projects Department. As a result, channels for funding of research (grants to research teams and universities) were created with the direct involvement of major international donors, and the conditionality implied by the donors led to the creation of research funding guidelines that were output-oriented and universal for different branches of scholarship, while *not* creating enclaves of ideologically conditioned research funding for Humanities and Social Sciences. Based on the Project prepared within the framework of the PHARE Program for the Reform of Higher Education and with the assistance of CEPES/UNESCO (1998), complimentary funds earmarked for research were provided to selected teams of researchers, based on a set of criteria elaborated by the CNCSU.

The degree of cooperation between departments of Humanities and Social Sciences in Romania was difficult to establish from the interviews, since there were contradictory opinions on this issue. At the same time, though, it is important to note that at least one type of institutional framework for such cooperation exists with the body of the New Europe College – Romania, an independent Romanian institute for advanced study in the Humanities and Social Sciences that was founded in 1994 by Professor Andrei Plesu (philosopher, art historian, writer, 1990-1991 Romanian Minister of Culture; 1997-1999 Romanian Minister

5 'Higher Education in a Learning Society: Argument for a new national policy on the sustainable development of higher education'. See <http://www.edu.ro/highereducation.htm#G>

of Foreign Affairs) within the framework of the 1994-established *New Europe Foundation* (a private foundation subject to Romanian law).

In 1998, the *New Europe College* was awarded the prestigious *Hannah Arendt Prize* for its achievements in setting new standards in higher education and research. In 1999, the Romanian Ministry of Education officially recognized the *New Europe College* as an institutional structure of continuous education in the Humanities and Social Sciences at the level of advanced studies. It awards scholarships and grants to scholars both in the Social Sciences and Humanities – and 320 such grants were awarded between 1994 and 2004. The international conferences and seminars regularly organized by New Europe College gather together high-profile researchers from different countries and thus facilitate the involvement of Romanian scholars in the international academic milieu while keeping them focused on the social, political and economic challenges being faced by their country and by Europe overall. The independence of the New Europe College from direct government control and its international funding sources guarantee that such involvement and debate is not subject to priorities imposed by government policy makers but, rather, responds to the needs of society and the sensitivities of the academic community.

3.2 Transformed, but how influential?

As some of the interviews with former CEP lecturers and department heads demonstrate, the way in which academics influence policy processes in Romania differs from that of Latvia:

Policy-makers are willing to work with experts from the Social Sciences – for example, see the number of professors who worked as advisers to previous government. Our dean was adviser to the President in 1998-2000, and he now holds a government position again... There is a lot of 'co-opting' into government. Experts co-operate by being employed in government structures – so they are not invited to work on documents as members of civil society. (Lecturer in Political Science, former CEP Fellow)

While in Latvia, in the second half of the 1990s and early 2000s, such cases are increasingly rarer, it is the government embeddedness of prominent academics in Romania that pose question about the limits to their capacity to act as constructive critics/independent evaluators of government policy – or, indeed, as independent voices that could influence policy processes. One of the reasons why this may be so is the current stage of development of Romanian public administration, which is less open to consultations in policy-making pro-

cesses than Latvian public administration (N.B. the progress of reform for public administration was one of the criteria in which Romania lagged behind Latvia in European Commission country progress reports).

The following conclusions can be made from the above:

- The impact of international funding on the creation of Social Science departments and new study programs in the 1990s seems to have been more or less the same as in the case of Latvia (and was greater in for Humanities departments analyzed here).
- The range of opportunities to influence the policy process for academics outside the civil service and political parties seems, at the moment, to be more restricted in Romania. This could be connected with the extent to which respective public administration systems are ready to absorb recommendations coming from civil society or envisage the involvement of independent academic experts in creating public policy.

3.3 *Conclusions*

In the first part of this paper, it was argued that two factors, namely:

- the lower degree of exposure of researchers in Humanities to international academic discourses and public policy discourse (through externally funded activities) and
- the ideological and discursive frameworks set for government-funded research in Humanities
- were influencing the limited spreading of internationalization / professionalization discourses and relative proliferation of nationalist and statist discourses in the Humanities milieu.

A comparison with the case of departments in Romania shows that the degree of restructuring implemented with the direct impact of international funding at Humanities departments could be greater – this, however, has not yet happened in Latvia.

At this stage, it is not to be expected that a large amount of international funding will come to Humanities departments in Latvia with the aim of promoting liberal discourse. Nevertheless, there are several ways in which the discursive separation between Humanities and Social Sciences milieus could be overcome, via which a sense of the 'external threat' from free market forces and internationalization in the Humanities academic community could diminish.

One such way is greater interaction and cross-fertilization among Humanities and Social Sciences areas. Most lecturers and researchers in the Social Sciences interviewed for this study (those who began their career in Latvia before 1990) came from Humanities departments – though most of them had also 'cut the bonds' connecting them to such departments.

Another way forward here is via providing greater incentives for Humanities scholars to become involved in projects touching on issues of public policy in areas other than just those coming with funding for Humanities research and ethnic politics (the two areas where their involvement has been most in evidence so far); such projects would deal with topics pertaining to development and the knowledge-based society, from education policies to adjusting to the future challenges of the labor market, to Latvia's contribution to the EU policy debate. This is not to say that an immediate input from Humanities departments in such projects can be achieved. However, the same problem was faced when lecturers from fledgling Social Sciences departments were first involved in public policy projects in the mid-1990s. Many of them have *learned by doing* – hence their comparative advantage today.

4 Recommendations

Two ways of reducing the reproduction of exclusionary and statist discourses in the Humanities – and of overcoming the sense of isolation and the ‘external threat’ from the market and globalization – in Humanities departments were suggested in above conclusions:

- Greater interaction and cross-fertilization among Humanities and Social Sciences milieus, and
- Providing greater incentives for Humanities scholars to become involved in projects touching on public policy issues related to development and a knowledge-based society.

Both of these are objectives that can be achieved by various sets of measures, and the measures suggested here by no means exhaust the possible options.

Increasing the accessibility of courses taught by representatives of Social Science departments to students from Humanities departments.

Some interaction between Humanities and Social Sciences departments is happening already, though the provision of ‘general’ courses, such as an Introduction to Philosophy, to students of other disciplines is viewed as a lower priority by such departments. Social Science courses should be made more accessible to Humanities students, and vice versa. This need not undermine academic *specialization* but will instead impose a greater coherence of academic standards and cause a greater openness to ‘external’ ideas and normative in-

fluences. The implementation of such a recommendation will depend entirely on local stakeholders at a University. A survey might be conducted to find out how many Humanities and Social Sciences students so far are benefiting from 'B' (specialized) and 'C' (free choice) part-courses at other departments. If managed properly by the university (which should be feasible with the current credit point system), this policy option will have no major drawbacks.

Involving Humanities departments in interdisciplinary projects on issues related to development and a knowledge-based society, the future of education and the challenges of the labor market, the future of the EU, cooperation for development, and other issues with high exposure to international discourse.

This cannot happen without the involvement of organizations which fund such projects – from the UNDP (no longer active in Latvia as of 31 December 2005, but still active in the region), the World Bank and European Commission to OSI programs such as HESP (including AFP) and country representatives with OSI programs. Any organization funding research projects and seminars on these issues in the region will be able to contribute by involving Humanities scholars and departments in these activities in a more systematic way than has happened so far.

The main disadvantage of this option is that, most probably, in many cases the quality of input from Humanities departments and scholars in such projects may be uneven, as their involvement in such projects before may have been limited. Social Sciences have a comparative advantage here. Nevertheless, some examples show that such involvement *is* possible – thus, UNDP has chosen the Institute of Political Studies of the University of Latvia as the future base for Human Development Reports in the country, while some Humanities scholars have been involved in the production of reports.

Besides this, an opening up of the Humanities academic community, which would bring about improvements in academic standards and point to the international relevance of the work they produce, is a valid policy goal in itself. International organizations working for the promotion of such values as human development, an open society or even a competitive knowledge-based economy in the EU should be interested in getting the support of local academic communities having these values. Without providing a funding incentive to work on cross-disciplinary projects together with social scientists, however, such support might remain open to question.

This brings us to the third, wider policy option – which also presents the greatest challenge:

A diversification of research funding for the Humanities

It is difficult to hope that government-funded bodies, such as the Council of Science, in Latvia might be persuaded to support the creation of alternative channels of government funding that would undermine their own administrative and ideological monopolies. The target audience for this recommendation, therefore, is the same as for the previous group of recommendations, so it would consist of international donor organizations and major private donors.

Policy Option 1: the creation of an alternative source of funding for quality research in the Humanities and Social Sciences in Latvia.

Bodies like this have been created in a number of CEE countries, sometimes combining government and independent funding, sometimes relying on independent funding entirely. A good analysis of most examples is provided by Peter Darvas (Darvas, 2000).

A potentially promising form for the Latvian case could be that of the New Europe College in Romania – an independent research funding institution with strong executive and academic boards, which would award fellowships to a number of scholars in Humanities and Social Sciences on an annual basis.

The advantages of this option are possibilities to open new perspectives for the development of Humanities disciplines in the country, giving them greater openness to issues with which intellectual communities across Europe and the world are grappling at the moment (such as the future of Europe, global inequalities and poverty, international migration and others) – instead of reinforcing the focus on narrowly conceptualized threats to cultural identity (as is often the case with the Humanities in Latvia at the moment).

Disadvantages come from there being a lack of an easily identifiable source that could give the initial funding for such a project (though the challenge is not insurmountable) and, more importantly, the lack of an easily identifiable nucleus of scholars that have shown an interest in taking on leadership for such a project. As pointed out by Darvas, the issue of leadership is crucial, and not only at the initial stage (Darvas, 2000). This, however, does not go to say that the option is altogether not feasible.

Policy Option 2 would be to ‘resuscitate’ some of the earlier forms of academic programs coordinated by international donor organizations, which were active in Latvia in the 1990s but which have left (e.g. CEP); these could provide more focused support for younger scholars in the Humanities and involve such persons in international projects and outreach activities.

The advantage of this option is that virtually no new administrative structures would have to be created – and departments could benefit, for example, from AFP’s Department Development Program. This could supply new impetus for change and a greater openness, too. As can be seen from this study, however, few departments in the Humanities have had exposure to such programs in the 1990s.

The disadvantage, at least at a symbolic level, would be in putting Latvia back on the list of countries that have been less than successful in their transitions, and where it would probably still need resources for academic reform (more than the country does at present).

The policy options proposed here are not mutually exclusive. Keeping in mind the effect of other processes influencing academic communities in the CEE – such as the Bologna Process and the aspirations of national governments, including the Latvian one, to develop knowledge-based economies with an emphasis on research and development, the pressure on all academic disciplines to ‘open up’ to the needs of economic development and the ‘marketization’ of universities will grow. It is important, however, to recognize that Humanities disciplines should *not* become marginalized, self-isolated outsiders or the ‘victims’ of such pressures.

References

Darvas, P, (2000), 'Institutional Innovation in Central Europe'. *International Higher Education*, Winter.

Emirbayer, M and Goodwin, J, (1994), 'Network Analysis, Culture, and the Problem of Agency'. *American Journal of Sociology* 99(6).

McGuinness, A, (2001), 'Reforms in the Baltics'. *International Higher Education*, fall.

Tischer, A, (2006), 'Die akademische Geschichtswissenschaft in Lettland: Ein Erfahrungsbericht'. In: Umland, A, (ed.), *Hochschullehre in Osteuropa*, to be published.

Trowler, P, (ed.), (2001), *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Open University Press.

Van Dijk, T, (1993), 'Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis'. *Discourse and Society* 4(2).

Wodak, R, de Cilia, R, Reisigl, M and Liebhardt, K, (1999), *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. University of Edinburgh.

World Bank, (1994), *Lessons of Experience* (report).

Zepa, B, (2005), *Etnopolitiskā spriedze Latvijā: konflikta risinājuma meklējumi*. Baltic Institute of Social Sciences.

Appendix 1

The texts selected for analysis had to meet the following criteria:

- For each department, two academic and/or policy articles and one policy study or policy document text were selected. In one case, when no policy study or policy document produced with the visible participation of department lecturers between 2002 and 2005 could be identified, two conference papers dealing with policy issues were substituted for it.
- The articles had to be published between 2002 and 2005 in one of the academic journals for Humanities and the Social Sciences in Latvia – *Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmijas vēstnesis*, *Latvijas vēsture* or *Letonica* – and/or in a national newspaper or on the Latvian policy community website – *politika.lv*
- The policy texts could have a collective authorship, and in some cases the authors could come from more than one department. In such cases, the CDA results for this text were entered under each of the departments from which academic personnel had contributed to the policy document.

Since some of the lecturers published several texts within the context of eligible sources between 2002 and 2005, and others did not publish any, samples for some departments contain two texts by the same author. Texts that had as their topic issues of citizenship, nationalism or the nation-state were systematically excluded from the selection.

Appendix 2

List of Interviews

I. University of Latvia

- Dean, Social Sciences
- Department Head, Political Science
- Former Department Head, Political Science
- Department Head, Sociology
- Lecturer, Sociology
- Lecturer, Communication Studies
- Lecturer, Communication Studies
- Department Head, Teacher Training
- Lecturer, Teacher Training
- Department Head, Psychology
- Lecturer, Psychology
- Department Head, Baltic Philology
- Lecturer, Baltic Philology
- Dean, History
- Department Head, History
- Lecturer, History
- Department Head, Practical Philosophy
- Lecturer, Practical Philosophy
- Department Head, History of Philosophy
- Lecturer, History of Philosophy

II. University of Bucharest

- Lecturer, Political Science (former CEP fellow)
- Department Head, Political Science
- Former Dean, Philosophy
- Dean, History
- Lecturer, History (former CEP fellow)
- Department Head, Communication Studies
- Former CEP Country Director