

The opaque transparency: Depthless governance

Carlo Cappa* ■

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to an analysis of the equivocal role played by transparency in the current scenario of European education and, particularly, higher education. This concept is often presented by the governance at different levels – international, national, and local – as a tool for managing public administration in a more efficient way. But, if we look more thoroughly, transparency turned out a strong paradigm for shaping instruction, teaching and research, showing a strong impact on the very idea of our idea of education. In this framework, by referring to a plurality of different sources – institutional documents and academic literature rooted in different fields of study –, the article develops a conversation with relevant authors, such as Lyotard, Han and Paul Valéry, and it proposes an image of comparative education as a refined key for understanding – and living in a world marked by plurality, where differences and details are the most important elements.

1. Introduction

The considerations in the following pages were first presented in an important international conference held by the Greek Comparative and International Education Society, the Department of Social Policy of the Panteion University of Athens and the University of Athens, in which the Executive Committee of the Comparative Education Society in Eu-

* Carlo Cappa is full professor of History of Education in the Department of Storia, Patrimonio Culturale, Formazione e Società, University of Rome “Tor Vergata” – Italy and directeur de programme at the Collège International de Philosophie, Paris – France. Email: carlo.cappa@uniroma2.it

rope was involved. This conference was focused on comparative and international perspectives of education governance, a much-discussed theme in our field of study and in the European Higher Education Area. The topic of education governance is often in a situation of lively tension with our educational traditions, especially with the heritage of liberal education. The strong pressures for a continuous transformation of higher education in the framework of a market-driven management call into question the very idea of university developed and refined over the centuries. Accountability, relevance, assessment, efficiency, quality, excellence (and ranking): they are all pillars sustaining a new paradigm, where elements previously taken for granted are modified. In this shaping process, different tendencies converge, from the Americanisation of European universities outlined one century ago by Max Weber in his famous conference *Wissenschaft als Beruf* (1917) to the emergence of the performance as the criterion for evaluating culture and education, an approach detected by Lyotard in *La Condition Postmoderne* (1979). During the last century, this background and the new Western economies have created the conditions for the New Public Management and for a discourse rooted in the ambiguous concept of merit (Sandel, 2020).

In our democratic societies with a large access to universities enforced by a new economy based on “knowledge competition”, this complex process is often analysed and criticised from perspectives driven by the “North”, because of the prominence of some countries in the international discourse about higher education and for the importance of English as the main language for scholarly works. For example, a good book by Stefan Collini, *Speaking of Universities* (Collini, 2017), that engages strongly with the humanities and has a first chapter opened by a comparative nuance, is nevertheless focused on the universities of England and Scotland. For these reasons, in order to question the multifaceted context mentioned above, and always in conversation with other approaches, it is important to take into account a vision from one of the cradles of European culture, Greece, which has always had a special role in our tradition; nowadays, its voice must be heard to envision the future of our plural Continent (Prokou, 2018), as well as to build the next steps of a different Europe with a new balance including our Mediterranean area: a true crossroad of cultures and human beings, traditions and transformations, a beating heart of many educational ideals. Today (and tomorrow), these vibrant ideals shall endure in thinking about our common future.

Among the most relevant elements of the new scenario of higher education, transparency plays an equivocal role: it is required by the public administration for adequate management, but it is also a pattern for structuring every aspect of university, from teaching to research. In some ways, we can easily see a shift of this concept from a managerial recommendation to an ethical obligation; the enlargement of the semantic field of this term has many consequences, especially when transparency deploys its functions *inside* and *for* the governance of higher education, assuming a pivot role for shaping a certain profile of education inside a global context. My purpose is to sketch some critical remarks to undertake a joint reflection on *how* we think of university, research and our academic community. This approach implies referring to a plurality of different sources: institutional documents and academic literature rooted in three fields of study: education, comparative education, and philosophy. I would also like to sound a note of caution and to stress that in using the phrase “field of study”, I will not address the debate on the identity of Comparative Education – as a field of study, or not, and so on (Manzon, 2018). My approach, in continuity with the Italian tradition (Cappa, 2018; Palomba, 2018), envisages comparative education as a critical analysis of the international dynamics of education (Cowen, 2014; Rapple, 2020).

2. Transparency – looking through or looking like?

Transparency is not a usual theme in comparative education – for example, the term is not present in any title of the *Comparative Education* journal or the *Comparative Education Review*; of course, many articles mention this argument but only in a brief reference, which is often linked to knowledge society (Nelson, 2010) or to some problems about corruption (Heyneman, Anderson, Nuraliyeva, 2007). The occurrences of transparency testify to the conceptual diversity of this theme, but this diversity is often absorbed by intrusiveness of the market-oriented framework: the so-called neoliberalist approach for transforming public institutions and higher education implies new ways of control (Olsen, Peters, 2007), among which transparency is a key element for facing the possible irregularities; this is the main aim of Transparency International (<https://www.transparency.org/>), an international movement against corruption which involves more than a hundred countries.

To better understand the pervasiveness of the idea of transparency in different areas of the public discourse, this article is divided into three parts: the first one is about the institutional discourse focused on higher education and linked to governance and to the general framework of the Bologna Process. The second one indicates two movements: outside university, towards a so-called “transparent society”, and inside university, towards the implications on research of this governance framework; the third part is a note which concerns the repercussions of transparency on the very idea of university as a community at national and international level.

In the recent scenario of higher education, especially in the European Higher Education Area structured by the Bologna Process, we can easily see the insistence on a discourse focused on benchmarks as a tool to harmonise different national traditions. International assessment and evaluation of research are the pillars of a binding framework, where only slight variations are allowed, regardless of the field of studies and of the cultural history characteristic of each country (Corsini, 2020). Among other relevant aspects of this approach, the model of higher education that arises is embedded in an ideal of perfect transparency: process, methods, transformations, as well as communication and dissemination of results must be clearly exhibited as the components of a bigger mechanism. Slight concessions to diversity are sometimes proposed in the frame of a strong convergence process. Transparency is one of the key elements of the European Higher Education Area envisaged at the time of the Bologna Declaration in 1999: «European Higher Education Institutions would be able to cooperate and exchange students/staff on bases of trust and confidence and also of transparency and quality» (Bologna Declaration, 1999). It is important to stress the position that the term “transparency” has in this context: its closeness to *trust*, *confidence* and *quality* is not only a communicational choice; this closeness is a conceptual option widely found in a market-oriented framework. Trust is linked to clear information, confidence is interwoven with control, and quality is assigned to a protocol composed of precise procedures. In this respect, there is no difference between the market-oriented university and the market *tout court*.

From the Bologna Declaration to the Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve Declaration, we have had ten years during which transparency has increased in importance. In the Treaty of Lisbon of 2000, transparency

is a crucial link in shaping the new social contract between the citizen and the European Union, developing some points of the 1992 Treaty of Maastricht and of the 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam, while in 2000 the new aim is to change «the way the Union exercises its existing powers and some new (shared) powers, by enhancing citizens' participation and protection, creating a new institutional set-up and modifying the decision-making processes for increased efficiency and transparency», as explained by a recent factsheet of European Parliament (Pavy, 2020). An important new element has now appeared: efficiency. As a device, transparency comes into play with different concepts for increasing the functioning of our institutions. In 2009, the Ministers noted that the Bologna Process has always been concerned with making the diversity of the EHEA more transparent, and that purpose is rooted in a powerful creation of new institutional tools such as quality assurance, the qualifications framework, recognition, European Credit Transfer System, and the Diploma Supplement. In the Ministerial Declaration of Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve in 2009, we find several occurrences of transparency and a specific paragraph devoted to it (22. "Multidimensional transparency tools") where some important assumptions are elucidated: «there are several initiatives designed to develop mechanisms for providing more detailed information about higher education institutions across the EHEA to make their diversity more transparent» and «Such mechanisms, including those helping higher education systems and institutions to identify and compare their respective strengths, should be developed in close consultation with the key stakeholders. These transparency tools need to relate closely to the principles of the Bologna Process, in particular quality assurance and recognition, which will remain our priority, and should be based on comparable data and adequate indicators to describe the diverse profiles of higher education institutions and their programmes» (Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve, 2009: 5).

In 2012, during the Bucharest Ministerial Conference, where transparency is considered a key element for all the cycles of higher education, a paragraph was addressed to outline the following strategies "Improvement of data collection and transparency to underpin political goals" (Bucharest, 2012: 4) and an important new document was presented: *Transparency Tools across the European Higher Education Area*. In this report, the framework is clearly detailed in three areas of interest: «the transparency function of Bologna tools, structures and processes;

national classifications, national rankings, national databases; international rankings and classifications» (Vercruysse, Proteasa, 2012: 5). The link between transparency, data and rankings brings the document to its last chapter “Novelties that promise to improve transparency”, where the development of this tool embraces all aspects of higher education, from learning outcomes and the Third Mission to accountability and rankings (Vercruysse, Proteasa, 2012: 27-29).

We can see how a precise semantic constellation is built around transparency: quality assurance, recognition, indicators, stakeholders, and... comparison. Yes, because in this approach, the idea of comparison –evoked, actually, since the Bologna Declaration in 1999– is a restricted one: with no historical dimension, the diversities of educational systems are only benchmarks which work as evidence in a glasshouse, where every deeper question is erased. This is the lesson present in the Paris Communiqué (2018: 1): «Through the European Higher Education Area, we have paved the way for large-scale student mobility and improved not only the comparability and transparency of our higher education systems, but also increased their quality and attractiveness». The same approach is present also in the most recent Rome Ministerial Communiqué, 19 November 2020, but with an important shift: transparency is now included among the fundamental values of higher education realised by the Bologna Process (Rome, 2020: 5). This result is obtained with a precise reference to a project started in 2015: ETINED – Council of Europe Platform on Ethics, Transparency and Integrity in Education, where the fight against corruption envisages also a new form of democracy «based on the principles of ethics, transparency and integrity» (<https://www.coe.int/en/web/ethics-transparency-integrity-in-education/mission>). In this process, the transformation of transparency from a characteristic required for the public administration to a value for thinking and shaping higher education is accomplished, but it opens many questions for the future of universities and for our societies. In the framework of higher education, if the first suggestion of transparency is about clarity in data, procedures and rankings, in the international discourse its changing profile sets out a powerful and ambiguous tool for filtering out only selected elements, reducing university complexity.

3. A brave new world without mediation

This uncomfortable journey among the publications of the European Higher Education Area and Bologna Process allows us to focus on two important points. The first one: while the desire/project of transparency has a relevant role in the governance of higher education, yet this aspect is also broadly disseminated through every element of our social life; the second one: the pervasive governance of higher education is aligned with other elements of our society, thus its patterns and strategies also have an impact on some elements of university which are outside the administrative dimension and, in particular, they transform research and learning. Of course, the readiness to invade areas different from those where they originate is a common tendency of some concepts today extensively used for thinking and shaping our culture and policies. In 2014, Barbara Cassin edited a book about an ever-present notion which is strictly linked to transparency: *grid*. In this book titled *Derrière les Grilles. Sortons du Tout-évaluation*, grids refer particularly to the evaluation used for governing education and university; at the same time, the different chapters address other dimensions of life today. An evaluation based on grids is the tool – a tool under the pretext of transparency – applied by government for shaping its policies, forcing reality into a violent and contrived framework. Grids are: «Suicides, au propre comme au figuré. Car nous ne reconnaissons plus le monde, nous ne nous reconnaissons plus dans la représentation du monde que vous nous contraignez à instruire, bribe après bribe, dans un dépeçage généralisé qui prétend détenir le sens en cumulant des items parcellaires insignifiants» (Cassin, 2014: 67-74). A relevant aspect of grids is their self-reference: each grid is justified by another grid, in a net system in which reality is organised and transfigured. The alluring promise of transparency is fulfilled, but the price of this clarity implies an action on the “objects” observed, which are altered because of the grid: «Elle fonctionnerait en toute transparence, elle constituerait une garantie d’objectivité et d’égalité démocratique? Mais, et cela commence à se savoir, c’est une apparence de transparence, d’objectivité et de démocratie» (Cassin, 2014: 99-107). This book openly addresses the political class requesting a different approach to education and public policy: this appeal has not been heard and the theme of transparency has not found serious critical developments.

In this scenario, where transparency is often accepted as a legitimate fact, another voice outside the box is that of Byung-Chul Han. The South Korean philosopher who lives in Germany is the author of *Transparenzgesellschaft*, appeared firstly in German in 2012 and, in 2015, translated into English with the title *The Transparency Society*, to be published by Stanford University Press (Han, 2015). The analysis developed by Han focuses on some specific themes detailed in the chapter titles and placed in a Foucauldian framework with ample use of the philosophical French context and of the Frankfurt School; among Han's references, Baudrillard is particularly important. In Han's pages, we can easily track down the keywords scattered throughout the institutional documents of the Bologna Process. Han's proposal for interpreting our time is already expressed in the preface: «The society of transparency is not a society of trust, but a society of control» (Han, 2015: 36); the shift from clarity to control is facilitated by the emphasis placed on communication, a prominent feature of our society. Of course, this is a certain type of communication, a strategy to foster homogenization: «Transparent communication is communication that has a smoothing and levelling effect. It leads to synchronization and uniformity» (Han, 2015: 41). Then, for Han, «Transparency is an ideology». Around these assumptions, the philosopher structures an image of our society, where some categories are exiled because of their resistance to transparency: otherness, negativity, and knowledge.

As stressed in the first chapter, transparency society is a society of *positivity* – in the sense of a lack of problematisation – of hyperinformation and hypercommunication, but the uninterrupted flow of information produces no truth and no plurality. Another important consequence, in fact, is the impoverishment of language: the obsession with transparency necessarily entails the refusal of metaphors. All must be exhibited without mediation, but not in a theatrical way: this society requires immediacy and realises a new type of intimacy, without any difference between the subjects involved. The ideologization of transparency could bring us to a regime of terror, where even intimacy is exposed and simplified. A bitter note runs through the whole book, but I would like to stress the communicational issue: the refusal of metaphors, of poetry and of any elegance involved in a wise use of language, all these elements outline a world with no room for rhetoric. The prudent exercise of rhetoric has been a pillar of our culture, a human strategy for facing a

plurality which is not solvable in a direct way, because every time it requires negotiation and compromise. The intrusiveness of transparency erodes the delicate balance between different points of view, favouring a crude reduction towards an illusion of absence of alternatives. This is a concern widely present also in other works of the editor of the previously mentioned book about grids: Barbara Cassin, in fact, studying the heritage of Sophists and the plurality of our philosophical traditions, has stressed the importance of a language without reductions, because it expresses a complexity far from the fake directness of transparency (Cassin, 2016).

As stated, Han's approach is based on a specific cultural framework, but this choice entails a blameworthy absence: Jean-François Lyotard and, particularly, his most famous –not his most important– work: *The Postmodern Condition: A Report of Knowledge*, published in 1979 (Lyotard, 1984). As of the introduction and thanks to arguments shared with Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend, Lyotard stresses the *nature* of transparency in criticizing Jürgen Habermas' vision of a «“noisefree”, transparent, fully communicational society», as mentioned by Fredric Jameson, author of the *Foreword* (Lyotard, 1984, VII). Considering Habermas' ideal a weak key for a reading of the development of Europe, Lyotard proposes an interpretation linked to the *Society of the Spectacle* imagined by Guy Debord and to the bureaucratic society of controlled consumption by Henri Lefebvre (Peters, 1994). For Lyotard, in the postmodern society, transparency is an ideology for seeing communication as something «which goes hand in hand with the commercialization of knowledge, [and which] will begin to perceive the State as a factor of opacity and “noise”» (Lyotard, 1984: 5). Already forty years ago, in this insightful report, the link between transparency, opacity –as a form of resistance– and liberalism was stressed in a perfect way: «communicational transparency would be similar to liberalism» (Lyotard, 1984: 7). There is no difference between the flows of money and the flow of information, because they travel along identical channels of identical nature, some of which would seem to be reserved for the “decision makers” – or the stakeholders. The impact on knowledge is very strong and Lyotard illustrates this in the chapter *Education and Its Legitimation through Performativity*, as a warning against the creation of the «prospect for a vast market for competence in operational skills» (Lyotard, 1984: 51). If we think of the vocabulary widely used by the Bologna Process, the premonitory

power of the vision elaborated by Lyotard is impressive. Surprisingly, it is about this theme that we can find greater proximity between Han and Lyotard: the main aspect, in fact, is the relation which bonds knowledge, transparency and liberalism or neoliberalism: the time element. Lyotard stresses the erratic character of a true performance: «Applied to scientific discussion and placed in a temporal framework, this property implies that “discoveries” are unpredictable. In terms of the idea of transparency, it is a factor that generates blind spots and defers consensus» (Lyotard, 1984: 61). In the transparency society, Han similarly reports the contraction of all original projects, because «a vision directed towards the future proves more and more difficult to obtain. And things that take time to mature receive less and less attention» (Han, 2015: pos. 41).

We can say that performativity obliged our studies to be quickly readable, strictly impersonal and totally transparent, in a spectacle where we show ourselves in two different ways: we show ourselves using our publications and we show ourselves using our academic activities (teaching, Conferences, International Seminars and similar events). Things like the impact factor and the predominance of English are only the most evident clues of this situation. In all cases, we are dispossessed and governed by forces not under our control. They control us and impose on us their time, especially refusing the political (and civil) space for questioning each choice, which is always presented as the logical, necessary and transparent consequence of illogical, useless and opaque premises. This is a problematic break, a rift in our cultural tradition: at the heart of European cultural history, we find the concept of *study* (in Italian *studio*, from Latin *studium*, der. from *studēre*) deep-rooted in a generative function of doubt and individual engagement on the uncertain path of knowledge. The time of this activity is represented by the notion of *otium studiorum* or with an Aristotelian term *scholé*: it was always an individual time and a moment freed from any external obligation. The framework depicted by performativity which uses transparency as a tool for controlling and reducing diversity is completely different from Aristotle's ideal of education well explained in Book VIII of *Politics*, where the tension between work and leisure, *negotium* et *otium*, is solved questioning the noble use of time during the latter: «It is true that work and leisure are both necessary; but it is also true that leisure is preferable, and is more of an end» (Aristotle 1995: 1377b). Of course, this radical transformation is not only a usual change over the centuries, but it becomes a true threat for imag-

ining any continuity with our traditions, highlighting important consequences on the very idea of the university as a community.

4. Living the differences

In fact, with its pressure for transparency and for immediacy this framework also changes the nature of higher education and the relations inside university. It is easy to see how this use of transparency transforms the criticism of *Homo Academicus* by Pierre Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1984) and destroys the idea of *parresia* elaborated by Foucault (Foucault, 2016). The impact on the university community is more subtle; to interpret it, I would like to suggest an approach which, once again, is linked to the concept of time, referring to Roland Barthes and his seminar at the Collège de France in 1976-1977 devoted to *Comment vivre ensemble – How to live together* (Barthes, 2002: 33-186). In this seminar, with an elegant balance of philosophy, literature and semiotics and using a rich vocabulary of Greek terms, Barthes explores different types of text to question three major ways of life around the concept of idiorhythmic (Barthes, 2002: 39). He refuses two ways of life: the first for its *negative* excess: the hermitage, the loneliness. The second for its *integrative* excess: the *coenobium* where everything is in common, especially time, the same rhythm of life for everyone. His preference is for a fragile balance, «the aporia of sharing the distances». This is a way of life together, in a small community, where everyone can keep his personal – *idios* – rhythm – *rhuthmos*: it is not a compromise, it is a form of freedom. *Idiorhythmic*. To safeguard our communities with its differences, particularly the academic community, we must find a balance in order to live in our society – no refusal will serve – without sacrificing our own individual rhythm – no passive adoption of external rules is acceptable, or convenient. In such a balance, we can find a political strategy for living together as scholars, in our current university.

With a different approach, the unsophisticated solutions proposed by transparency are also refused by Paolo Rossi in his book *Speranze* (Hopes). Facing the trap of having to decide between the discourse *with no expectations* (Rossi, 2008: 21-52) and the discourse with *boundless expectations* (Rossi, 2008: 53-90), the Italian philosopher proposed a wiser road for sustaining *reasonable expectations, or hopes* (Rossi, 2008: 91-

138). If the immediacy of transparency discombobulates prudent decisions, this compression of time could compromise comparison itself. At the end of the nineteenth century, Nietzsche, a philosopher among the most scrupulous in criticising the spirit of his time, stressed the complexity of an epoch marked by plurality, evoking the role of comparison. In *Human, All Too Human*, published in 1878, the XXII chapter is devoted to a brief sketch of the *Age of Comparison* (Nietzsche, 2005: 24). Nietzsche brings together the weakening of the role of previous traditions and the attachment to a particular place with the new possibilities of choice for each person. Nevertheless, this possibility is founded on a critical analysis of reality, an exercise in liberty and responsibility, which has a tragic dimension, because it is interlaced with the lack of roots and the shadow of error: «This is the age of comparison! It is the source of its pride – but, as is only reasonable, also of its suffering». Nothing could be farther from the restful linearity of transparency: the growing complexity of reality discloses the potentialities of comparison, but this potential might be useful only if we are willing to admit the ambiguity of many dimensions of the human being and, in this tragic framework, applying judgment and prudence (Bodei, 2017).

With a different approach, this understanding of the comparison dimension as a fundamental key for considering the new landscape of a highly connected world is present in the speech given by Paul Valéry in 1935, *Le bilan de l'intelligence* (Valéry, 2018). When he starts the part dedicated to education, his entry point is: «Toute connaissance est, aujourd'hui, nécessairement une connaissance comparée (...) Il faut donc bien observer comparativement ce que nous faisons de nos enfants, et ce qu'en font les autres nations, et songer aux conséquences possibles de ces éducations dissemblables» (Valéry, 2018: 1208). This importance given to comparison is not the only relevant remark proposed by Valéry in this discourse: his main theme, in fact, is the transformation of the work of the spirit, the *esprit*, which is often considered equivalent to intelligence, under the pressure of the new challenges of a society marked by the increasing speed. We can easily find an analogy with the issue of transparency: as seen in the elaborate framework created to support transparency, the so-called soft power of international discourse is a powerful tool and the refined result of a specific political and cultural vision of knowledge; similarly, the irruption of technique, a main theme during the first part of twentieth century, was a product of a certain form

of intelligence. Now as then, the challenge is to understand if intellectual work can be an antidote to its own driftages: «toute la question que je posais revient à celle-ci: si l'esprit humain pourra surmonter ce que l'esprit humain a fait? Si l'intellect humain peut sauver d'abord le monde, et ensuite soi-même? C'est donc une sorte d'examen de la valeur actuelle de l'esprit et de sa prochaine valeur, ou de sa valeur probable, qui fait l'objet du problème que je me pose, – et que je ne résoudrai pas» (Valéry, 1957: 1063). This struggle is at the core of our culture, where different powers are juxtaposed and, once again, where no simple solution is a true solution, but only an impoverishment of complexity and a form of violence towards the wealth of possibilities. In this respect, the task of finding a balance between opposite forces is an unending exercise, involving dedication and alertness, particularly because the menace of the inhuman is always the shadow of the human (Revelli, 2020).

5. Coda

Today, global education is a powerful mantra and a multifaceted concept: like all keywords, it has many positive aspects and many negative ones. You must be careful what you wish for. If we use “global” for erasing differences or details, as is often the case in the “transparency framework”, we run the risk of mystifying cosmopolitan aspiration and of making the “global” absolute, but “global” cannot be an end in itself. We should refuse the seduction of the siren song of transparency, of a peaceful landscape without tensions and conflicts. Comparison – and, of course, comparative education – could be an antidote against any simplification. Comparison is in contradiction with transparency, it is something entirely different: it is rooted where there is no perfect transparency, where differences and details are the most important elements. For these aspects, comparative education is a typical gesture of the European culture: our tradition has its cornerstone in difference and in the critical analysis of plurality. The ethos of Europe, a Greek word that embraces a conceptual and spatial scenario as its etymology reveals, is interwoven with doubt and refuses a transparency which erases the slow work on details of differences: the scene of comparative education is richer than any shortened script realised for governing the possible.

References

- Aristotle (1995). *Politics*, translated by E. Barker, Revised with and Introduction and Notes by R.F. Stanley, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barthes, R. (2002). *Comment Vivre Ensemble. Simulations Romanesques de Quelques Espaces Quotidiens. Notes de Cours et de Séminaires au Collège de France, 1976-1977*, texte établi, annoté et présenté par C. Coste, Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Bodei, R. (2017). "Prudenza", in Bodei, R., Giorello, G., Marzano, M. & Veca, S., *Le Virtù Cardinali*, Roma-Bari: Laterza, pp. 3-24.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Homo Academicus*, Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Cappa, C. (2018). "Comparative Studies in Education in Italy. Heritage and Transformation", *Comparative Education*, 54, No. 4, pp. 509-529.
- Cassin, B. (2016). *Éloge de la Traduction. Compliquer l'Universel*, Paris: Fayard.
- Cassin, B. & Roland, G. (2014). "«Tous Grillés !» Deux Lettres Ouvertes à Ceux Qui Nous Gouvernent", in Cassin, B. (ed.), *Derrière les Grilles. Sortons du Tout-évaluation*, Paris, Mille et une nuits (digital edition).
- Collini, S. (2017). *Speaking of University*, London – Brooklyn: Verso.
- Corsini, C. (2020). "Valutazione: Controllo o Sviluppo?", *Lend – Lingua e Nuova Didattica*, Vol. 49, No. 1, pp. 20-26.
- Cowen, R. (2014). "Comparative Education: Stones, Silences, and Siren Songs", *Comparative Education*, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 3-14.
- Foucault, M. (2016). *Discours et Vérité. Précédé de La Parrèsia*, Paris: Vrin.
- Han, B.-H. (2015). *The Transparency Society*, Stanford – California: Stanford University Press (digital ed.).
- Heyneman, S.P., Anderson, K.H. & Nuraliyeva, N. (2008). "The Cost of Corruption in Higher Education", *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 1-25.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1979). *La Condition Postmoderne. Rapport sur le Savoir*, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Manzon, M. (2018). "Origins and Traditions in Comparative Education: Challenging Some Assumptions", *Comparative Education*, 54, No. 1, pp. 1-9.
- Nelson, M. (2010). "The Adjustment of National Education Systems to a Knowledge Based Economy: A New Approach", *Comparative Education*, Vol. 46, No. 4, pp. 463-486.
- Nietzsche, F. (2005). *Human, All Too Human. A Book for Free Spirits*, Translated by R. J. Hollingdale, Introduction by R. Schacht.
- Olsen, M. & Peters, M.A. (2007). "Neoliberalism, Higher education and the Knowledge Economy: From the Free Market to Knowledge Capitalism", *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 313-345.

- Palomba, D. (2018). "Themes and Theorisations: Rebalancing Comparative Education?", *Comparative Education*, Vol. 54, No. 4, pp. 440-458.
- Peters, M. (1994). "Habermas, Post-Structuralism and The Question of Postmodernity: The Defiant Periphery", *Social Analysis. The International Journal of Anthropology*, No. 23, October, pp. 3-20.
- Prokou, E. (2018). "Comparative Education in Greece, as a European 'Semi-periphery'", *Comparative Education*, Vol. 54, No. 4, pp. 530-547.
- Rapplee, J. (2020). "Comparative Education as Cultural Critique", *Comparative Education*, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 39-56.
- Revelli, M. (2020). *Umano Inumano Postumano. Le Sfide del Presente*, Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore.
- Rossi, P. (2008). *Speranze*, Bologna: il Mulino.
- Sandel, M.J. (2020). *The Tyranny of Merit. What's Become of the Common Good?*, London: Allen Lane – Penguin Books.
- Valéry, P. (2018). *La Crise de l'Esprit. La Politique de l'Esprit. Le Bilan de l'Intelligence*, Paris: Éditions AOJB (digital ed.).

Bologna Process

- Bologna Declaration (1999). Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education, 09/02/2021. https://www.ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/Ministerial_conferences/02/8/1999_Bologna_Declaration_English_553028.pdf
- Bucharest (2012). Making the Most of Our Potential: Consolidating the European Higher Education Area Bucharest Communiqué, 09/02/2021. http://www.ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/2012_Bucharest/67/3/Bucharest_Communique_2012_610673.pdf
- Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve (2009). The Bologna Process 2020 - The European Higher Education Area in the New Decade Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve, 28-29 April 2009, 09/02/2021. http://www.ehea.info/Upload/document/ministerial_declarations/Leuven_Louvain_la_Neuve_Communique_April_2009_595061.pdf
- Paris (2018). Paris Communiqué, May 25th, 2018, 09/02/2021. http://ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/2018_Paris/77/1/EHEAParis2018_Communique_final_952771.pdf
- Pavy, E. (2020). The Treaty of Lisbon, 09/02/2021. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/5/the-treaty-of-lisbon>
- Rome (2020). Rome Ministerial Communiqué, 19 November 2020, 09/02/2021. https://ehea.info/Upload/Rome_Ministerial_Communique.pdf
- Vercruyse, N. & Proteasa, V. (2012). Transparency Tools Across the European Higher Education Area, 09/02/2021. http://ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/2012_Bucharest/28/7/brosura_v1_v12_vp_120419_text_607287.pdf

Η αδιαφανής διαφάνεια: Διακυβέρνηση χωρίς βάθος

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Το άρθρο αφιερώνεται στην ανάλυση του διαφορούμενου ρόλου που διαδραματίζει η διαφάνεια στο τρέχον σενάριο της ευρωπαϊκής εκπαίδευσης και, ιδιαίτερα, της τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης. Αυτή η έννοια παρουσιάζεται συχνά από τη διακυβέρνηση σε διαφορετικά επίπεδα – διεθνές, εθνικό και τοπικό – ως εργαλείο για τη διαχείριση της δημόσιας διοίκησης με πιο αποτελεσματικό τρόπο. Αλλά, αν κοιτάξουμε πιο διεξοδικά, η διαφάνεια αποδείχθηκε ένα ισχυρό παράδειγμα για τη διαμόρφωση των παραδόσεων των μαθημάτων, της διδασκαλίας και της έρευνας, δείχνοντας ισχυρό αντίκτυπο στην ίδια την ιδέα της ιδέας μας για την εκπαίδευση. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο, με αναφορά σε μια πληθώρα διαφορετικών πηγών – θεσμικά έγγραφα και ακαδημαϊκή βιβλιογραφία που βασίζεται σε διαφορετικά πεδία μελέτης –, το άρθρο αναπτύσσει μια συζήτηση με σχετικούς συγγραφείς, όπως οι Lyotard, Han και Paul Valéry, και προτείνει μια εικόνα της συγκριτικής εκπαίδευσης ως ένα εκλεπτυσμένο κλειδί για την κατανόηση – και τη ζωή σε έναν κόσμο που χαρακτηρίζεται από πολυφωνία, όπου οι διαφορές και οι λεπτομέρειες είναι τα πιο σημαντικά στοιχεία.
