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HIGHER EDUCATION IN UKRAINE: EUROPEAN COOPERATION AT WHAT POLITICAL AND LINGUISTIC COST?

In 2005, Ukraine became a member country in the Bologna Process, a series of multinational educational reforms. The goal of the Bologna Process is to create a barrier-free European Higher Education Area (EHEA) characterized by “compatibility and comparability” between the higher education systems and increased mobility of students and educators among member countries (Papatsiba, 2006). An additional major goal is to “make European higher education more competitive and more attractive for Europeans and for citizens and scholars from other continents” (European Union, 2007).

On the one hand, membership in this organization—along with the funding and technical support provided to numerous higher education institutions throughout Ukraine by European Commission (EC) programs—may strengthen Ukraine’s standing in Europe and facilitate goals of European integration. As the report from the Ukrainian Ministry of Education to the Bologna Process clearly states about educational development, “Ukraine views its development within the context of integration into Europe” (Stepko, 2004). On the other hand, this agreement raises serious questions about the future of Ukrainian sovereignty. From the perspective of political theory, transnational activities like the Bologna Process may eventually drive a need for greater supranational (i.e. EC) control (Beerkens, 2005).

Additionally, there is a fear that the Bologna Process is pushing higher education institutions Europe-wide to use English as a lingua franca in order to allow for student mobility. Phillipson (2006) observes that “what emerges unambiguously is that in the Bologna Process, ‘internationalisation’ means ‘English medium higher education’” (p. 16). Tosi (2006) adds, “The unofficial but increasingly hegemonic role of English as a lingua franca is, despite the EU [European Union] official policy of multilingualism, a serious threat to national languages and
multilingualism in Europe” (p. 9). These fears should be particularly acute with regard to Ukraine (and other post-communist countries) because the government and higher educational leaders have only had 18 years since independence to encourage the use of the state language in domains where Russian was historically the language of power (including universities).

The objective of this paper is to further examine the degree to which the Bologna Process in Ukraine reflects a case of hegemony. Fairclough (2003), drawing on the work of Butler et. al. (2000), describes hegemony in politics as “partly a contention over the claims of their particular visions and representations of the world to having a universal status” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 45). Brand (2005), drawing on the work of Antonio Gramsci, says discourses are hegemonic when they become “the ‘historical-organic ideology’ of ruling actors, who in this way gain consent in society for their particular interests.” Both definitions of hegemony focus on one person or group laying claim to a singular conception of the world and of knowledge—a conception that must become the sole basis of social and political action.

**Methods and Data Analysis**

Multiple documents produced by the EC, Ukraine-based educational and policy organizations, the Verkhovna Rada (Ukrainian parliament), Ukrainian universities, and academics from relevant disciplines were analyzed for discourses of power differentials, Europeanization, English as global language, and English as a medium of instruction of higher education. Discourses in these documents are interpreted through the lens of critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 2003, 2006), an approach which aims to describe how oral and written discourse challenges or reproduces patterns of social dominance.
The paper will first describe general trends in political and structural discourse around higher education and the Bologna Process in the EU and Ukraine. It will then progress to questions of language in higher education. Finally, recommendations for further research will be made.

WHAT IS THE BOLOGNA PROCESS?

As indicated in the introduction, the Bologna Process is a series of structural reforms designed to align the higher education systems of member countries, thereby making it easier for students from one EU country to study in another country. It is also designed to make Bologna-member universities a more attractive option for students from countries outside the Bologna system. On a larger scale, the Bologna Process is linked with the Lisbon Declaration of 2000, which aims to create a “knowledge-based economy” in Europe in part through education (Fairclough, 2006). The Bologna Process is situated along with other sectors of society in Western European neo-liberalism, a set of principles characterized by liberalization of policies and ownership, open markets, and free trade (Fairclough, 2006; Toliou, 2007).

It can be said that the devil of the Bologna Process is in the details. As Nikitin (2008) observes, Bologna Process reforms are “bureaucratic, not substantive”. They are concerned less with the content of courses than the format of degree programs, syllabi, grades, and diplomas. Member countries are expected to implement a 3-2-3-cycle of education: a three-year Bachelor’s, a 2-year Master’s, and a 3-year Doctorate (Stepko, 2004). Syllabi are to be designed to conform to Bologna guidelines (TM, personal communication, December 2, 2009). Diplomas or diploma supplements should be available in a “widely used European language” (Stepko, 2004). A European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) establishes a common grading
scale, 60 credits for degree completion, and learning outcome guidelines for all member universities who use the system. Finally, there should be quality assurance measures in place characterized primarily by self-reviews but also external reviews of programs and staff. These quality assurance measures are designed to ensure transparency of program structures, and the use of “mutually shared criteria” in teaching (Fairclough, 2006). As Fairclough (2006) found in Romania, these “small” changes in educational structures can entail extensive discursive and material changes in conceptualizing and providing education.

**Power Differentials in the Bologna Process**

Being a member country of the Bologna Process has been described as a voluntary action (Beerkens, 2005; Papatsiba, 2006). However, rhetoric about joining the Bologna Process points more towards urging countries to join rather than merely inviting them. For post-communist societies in particular, the push for Bologna Process membership is likely linked to Western efforts to transition countries from a Communist system into a Western capitalist neo-liberal democracy (Fairclough, 2006). For example, the Council of Europe (CoE)—a nongovernmental agency that “seeks to develop throughout Europe common and democratic principles” (www.coe.int) made a recommendation in 2002 that “calls on [EU] member states from South-east Europe to take practical steps to join the Bologna Process” (Council of Europe, 2002). While the words “call on” and “recommendation” are by no means legally binding or even politically coercive, the rationale for this recommendation is that higher education in the region is “crucial for social, economic, and cultural development, especially in the current circumstances of the need to consolidate peace and stability”. The terms “common”, “crucial”, and “consolidate” indicate a stronger need to unify South-eastern Europe under the Bologna umbrella. In the
Ukrainian context, the main conclusion of a joint report from the Embassy of the Netherlands in Ukraine and the International Centre for Policy Studies in Kyiv is, “analysis of Ukraine’s educational policy shows that European integration must become the basis of reforming Ukrainian education” (Royal Netherlands Embassy in Ukraine & International Centre for Policy Studies, n.d., p. 3). Although the term “European integration” is used rather than the Bologna Process or Bologna Declaration, the word “must” indicates that the center believes Ukraine has to conform to the prevailing standards of European educational policy. Both these documents show that Ukraine is not likely gravitating towards the Bologna Process of its own volition; it is being led to the agreement by central or EU-nation political entities which exert a stronger force than mere “international peer pressure” as suggested by the CoE.

Another power differential in the Bologna Process is evidenced by who is entitled to mobility. Structural reforms and mobility programs in EU countries and Ukraine do not apply to vocational schools. There is a separate credits system, the European Credit System for Vocational Education and Training (ECVET), but no additional regulations apply. In Ukraine, these schools fall under education rating levels I and II and are not subject to the Bologna Process reforms. This bifurcation suggests that mobility and cross-country labor market participation is only intended to be open to academics—a major form of social class separation or limitation that no one seems to be railing against.

There is a similar bifurcation between European and non-European countries, and the dividing line is EU membership. In grants programs, the term “third country” refers to non-European countries who partner with at least two EU countries. While this term is allegedly not marked with the notion of “third world”, it is one that demarcates EU membership and non-
membership. Likewise, a recent article in a European Commission newspaper describes science awards for “15 European and non European promising young scientists” (“Young star scientists”, 2009).

Evidence of goals of continued European hegemony over Ukraine and other “third countries” comes from instructions about Lifelong Learning grants for EU-institution applicants. The instructions state that “applicants may request involvement of partners from third countries, as an additional option in an otherwise normal application” (emphasis mine). The instructions further require applicants to explain the “added value” of third country partners’ involvement. The instructions reiterate, “the involvement of one or more partners from third countries should be seen as an added optional element in the project, though one which contributes clearly to the added value of the project as a whole.” Finally, the evaluation process separates the “normal, European” part of the application from the optional “third country” portion of the application: “the main (“European”) part of the application will be assessed as normal with the assistance of external experts…the optional (“third country”) part will be assessed separately.” These lexical choices all index that support for “third countries” is incidental and should only be engaged in when it benefits European interests. Such disdain for “third countries” is not limited to bureaucratic paperwork. Getmanchuk (2009) reports that EU representatives were reluctant to refer to Ukraine as “European”. On the other hand, the financial value of grants to 3rd country participants may inspire Ukrainian participants to overlook such a negative positionality (Getmanchuk, 2009).
Educational Reforms in the Bologna Process: Convergence versus Diversity

The structural reforms of the Bologna Process are geared towards education system convergence (Papatsiba, 2006), harmonization (c.f. ec.europa.edu) or cooperation (Prague Communique, 2001) but are also, in principle, balanced with maintenance of diverse educational practices at national and local levels. The report from the European Ministers of Higher Education in 2001 (known as the “Prague Communique”) states that higher education stakeholders (students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff) must continue to be able “to benefit from the richness of the European Higher Education Area including its democratic values, diversity of cultures and languages and the diversity of the higher education systems.”

This same document calls for an awareness of the “diversity of qualifications” at universities and a “diversity of individual, academic, and labour market needs”. These notions are echoed in the CoE Web site “Bologna Process for Pedestrians”:

It is not foreseen that by 2010 all European countries should have the same higher education system. On the contrary, one of the very valued features of Europe is its balance between diversity and unity. Rather, the Bologna Process tries to establish bridges that make it easier for individuals to move from one education system or country to another. Therefore, even if degree systems may become more similar, the specific nature of every higher education system should be preserved. If not, what would be the point to go somewhere else to study if what one studies is going to be the same as back home?

The Prague Communique and CoE statements belie the fact that sometimes unity and diversity collide. In Germany, for example, students are protesting the new cycles because they reduce students’ time in school and makes studies a more intense experience (“German students protest university reforms”, 2009). Other documents further suggest that convergence is the primary goal and diversity is a problem to be solved in the Bologna Process. Papatsiba (2006)
argues that Bologna reforms are uneven and depend on national objectives in member countries. In saying “national systems have a longer or shorter way to go to meet the ‘Bologna’ model” (p. 93), Papatsiba implies that there is a single model that universities should be conforming to, not a pluralistic model espoused by the CoE.

Convergence and Diversity in Education in Ukraine

At the level of official national discourse, transformation of the Ukrainian educational system into the Bologna model is often described in categorical terms, suggesting strong uptake of convergence discourses. Stepko (2004) reports that modernization of higher education in Ukraine is realized “in full accordance” with the provisions of the Lisbon Recognition convention, the Berlin Communique of 2003, and the Bologna Process. Concretely, Stepko writes that “according to the Bologna Declaration the preparation of educated professionals at the level of specialists is abolished, and higher schools of learning have only bachelor's and master's courses” (emphasis original). Both Nikolayenko (2007) and Babyn (2008) report that 100 percent of universities in Ukraine have implemented the two-cycle Bachelor’s-Master’s system, and that all universities are using the ECTS system. The Ukrainian government also extended the elementary and secondary school system from 11 years to 12 years starting with the 2000-2001 school year to conform to the European or Bologna educational timeline (Janmaat, 2008). Since those students will not graduate until 2012 and the 1999-2000 class will graduate in 2010, Ukrainian universities will have no freshman class with Ukrainian students in the 2011-2012 school year. It will have to scramble to fill the pedagogical and economic gap (Alexander Malygin, personal communication, February 9, 2010). Whether these decisions are a case of full consent or mere acquiescence is not clear here. What is clear in these documents is the
perception on the part of Ukrainian officials that full compliance with the Bologna Process is necessary—most likely because there is a presumption of negative consequences (e.g. no European integration) if Ukraine does not comply.

One notable exception to this pattern is the diploma supplement. Fairclough (2006) reports that the mutual recognition of qualifications is “a central issue” in the Bologna reforms because it is linked to not only educational harmonization but also world trade agreements and labor market mobility. In Ukraine, Stepko (2004) writes that in 2005 Ukraine will use a new diploma supplement “adjusted for the specifics of Ukraine’s national system of higher education.” These specifics are never elaborated. Nikolayenko (2007) writes that the supplement will be available to all students graduating in 2009 “in the format of the EU/CoE/UNESCO Diploma Supplement”, without any caveats about national processes. This could mean the categorical transition to the new cycles eliminates the need for adjustment, but Babyn’s (2008) report reverts to Stepko’s stance and says that the format of the diploma supplement is a national one which is different from the EU/CoE/UNESCO format. The reasons for the formatting are not made clear in any of these documents, but the corrupt methods Ukrainian university students often end up using to obtain their diplomas makes this discrepancy especially suspect. On the other hand, this may simply be another example of the uneven pace of reforms among different aspects of the Bologna Process in different countries.

At the university level, actions seem to be geared towards a convergence defined in Ukrainian terms. Andrushchenko (2010), the president of a Ukrainian pedagogical university, writes, “Universities possess a unique role in the consolidation of European nations.” Unlike the CoE, which wants processes of peace and stability to converge, Andrushchenko’s goal is to
consolidate nations through education, both as common members of a political area or union and as a matter of identity. Andrushchenko (2010) adds that his peers are willing to make the necessary changes for this type of consolidation—“I was amazed at the response I got from other university presidents and their representatives. Concerned with the future of Europe, each of them demonstrated support and, even more importantly, showed readiness to launch the changes.”

Perhaps it is this ability to adapt macro-regional concepts to national goals that makes both convergence and diversity in discourse and in practice feasible in Ukraine. Andrushchenko (2010) describes concerns reported by others about the threat convergence poses to national identities, but he dismisses the threat as “theoretical”, adding, “As we know, our common European home is composed of a variety of cultures, nations, and traditions.” In this sentence, Andrushchenko manages to simultaneously evoke a converged European identity (“our common European home”) and the obvious (“as we know”), intrinsic (“is composed of”) characteristic of diversity. He goes on to say that promoting tolerance for this diversity is the key to preparing students for a “European” future.

**Mobility Goals and Reality**

The notion of mobility for students, teachers and administrators in education is central both to the Bologna Process and to the vision of being European in the European Union. Researchers have described how the roots of educational mobility in Europe can be traced back to the Middle Ages when scholars roamed from university to university (Beerkens, 2005; Musselin, 2004). In Ukraine, the prospect of mobility may be a strong motivator for buying into Bologna reforms at any price, as one music educator explained to me:
It’s good and bad. On the one hand, we lose our serious professional basis in teaching classical music. On the other hand, we have the possibility to choose where our children will continue their education. Our students can go to Europe and feed their education with people not only from their country but also other sources (KM, personal communication, October 20, 2009).

For EU member students, this mobility is financially and structurally supported by the ERASMUS [European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students] program, which provides grants for students from ERASMUS registered schools to study abroad—that is, outside of their home country at a university in another country which is also registered with ERASMUS. It also fosters cooperation among ERASMUS-registered universities (ec.europa.edu, n.d.; Papatsiba, 2006). Papatsiba (2006) says ERASMUS has a two-fold goal: to promote mobility associated with a common European labor market, and to cultivate a “European consciousness”.

As members of the Bologna Process, citizens of countries outside the European Union are not entirely excluded from mobility programs, but they participate in a more limited and compartmentalized fashion. Generally, it is prohibitively expensive for Ukrainians to study in European universities (Babyn, 2008; Getmanchuk, 2009; Stepko, 2004). Mobility for Ukrainians to Europe is therefore facilitated in two main ways. One is a series of “bilateral agreements on student exchange” (Babyn, 2008) likely financed through the TEMPUS program, a grants program which seeks to “support the modernization of systems of higher education in partner-countries in the western Balkans, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, North Africa and the Middle East” (European Commission, 2008). The second is the Erasmus Mundus program, a grants program with the purpose of “contributing to the socio-economic development of non-EU countries targeted by EU external cooperation policy” (eacea.europa.eu). While over 150
cooperative agreements have been reached in Ukraine under the TEMPUS program according to grants records on the EC Web site, only 28 students from Ukraine are studying in Europe this academic year under the Erasmus Mundus exchange program (Getmanchuk, 2009). Thus, the scope of these programs in Ukraine is extremely limited.

Additional evidence shows that mobility is not likely being realized by the Bologna Process. Nikolayenko (2007) reports that in 2005/2006, 35,000 students came to Ukraine for studies, and 20,000 students from Ukraine studied abroad. A figure published in Nikolayenko’s (2007) report shows the number of exchanges increasing over time from the year 2000. These data indicate that increased student mobility has been happening and could continue happening without the Bologna Process. Moreover, education researchers argue that the Bologna Process may decrease mobility where students will have fewer years of study and more course requirements (Schriewer, 2009; Valentyna Kushnarenko, personal communication, January 22, 2010). Given these facts, a complete dismantling of the Ukrainian education structure appears to be based more on the hope that Bologna reforms mean a level of mobility than was impossible in Soviet times as well as the hope of becoming more “European”.

THE LANGUAGE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Phillipson (2006) and Tosi (2006), referenced in the introduction of this paper, are not alone in decrying the hegemonic role of English in Europe and its impact on higher education. Tollefson & Tsui (2004) cite the Council of Europe as one of the international agents involved in the “gap between the rhetoric of linguistic diversity and the reality of its implementation” (p.5). Pérez de Pablos (2009, September 12) writes in El País, (author’s translation from Spanish), “The variety of languages in the EU is competing against the development of a common European
higher education area that seeks, as one of its most important objectives, to foment student mobility”. Coleman (2006) expresses concern that graduates of universities where classes are conducted in English may end up using English for social purposes and child-rearing, leading to a shift from their mother tongue to English.

Other documents suggest that Europeans accept this hegemonic role of English in education. In Sweden, Hult (2007) found through ethnographic research that the necessity of English was taken by Swedish teachers to be axiomatic. In Portugal, Kerlkaan, Moreira, & Boersma (2008) say the Bologna Process goals of attracting students inside and outside Europe “oblige European university policymakers to confront the language question and think about changing their curricula from local languages to the international standard: the English language” (p. 241). Phillipson (2006) quotes the president of Universities UK: “The concept of the bilingual university is already being widely discussed in eastern Europe; you can now do a medical degree in English in Hungary, for example. And that’s a trend that is going to continue” (p. 16, emphasis mine). All of these statements point to a resigned inevitability of the future role of English in European education.

The rise of English as a lingua franca could have positive effects on language diversity in Europe, but that effect varies by country. A Canadian representative of the Deutsche Akademischer Austausch Dienst (DAAD), a German academic exchange service, reports that students who don’t know German but know English now have the possibility to study in Germany through English. While in Germany, they become immersed in German culture and often become motivated to learn German (Jessica Denenberg, personal communication, January 22, 2010). Kalocsai (2009) conducted interviews and observations of Erasmus exchange students
in Hungary and found that students were interested in learning and using Hungarian as well as English. However, the students found that Hungarians outside of the university preferred to speak English with them, and it was difficult to be integrated into the social circles of native English and native Hungarian speakers at the university.

In Ukraine, discourse around the language of higher education is more nuanced for now. Article 28 of the Law of Languages of 1989 specified that the language of higher education should be in Ukrainian (Verkhovna Rada of the Ukrainian SSR, 1989). In the Ukrainian constitution ratified in 1996, the possibilities of language use are more open as indicated in Article 10:

Стаття 10. Державною мовою в Україні є українська мова.
Держава забезпечує всебічний розвиток і функціонування української мови в усіх сферах суспільного життя на всій території України.
В Україні гарантується вільний розвиток, використання і захист російської, інших мов національних меншин України.
Держава сприяє вивченню мов міжнародного спілкування.
Застосування мов в Україні гарантується Конституцією України та визначається законом. (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2008b)

**Article 10.** The state language of Ukraine is the Ukrainian language. The State ensures the comprehensive development and functioning of the Ukrainian language in all spheres of social life throughout the entire territory of Ukraine. In Ukraine, the free development, use and protection of Russian, and other languages of national minorities of Ukraine, is guaranteed. The State promotes the learning of languages of international communication. The use of languages in Ukraine is guaranteed by the Constitution of Ukraine and is determined by law. (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2008a)

This section of the Ukrainian constitution promulgates the use of Ukrainian in all spheres of life, but also allows for the use of Russian among ethnic minorities and the use of languages of

---

1 At the end of the English language translation it is written, “Official English translation. The only authentic text is the text in the state language of Ukraine.”
“international communication”. The Ukrainian law “On Higher Education” (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine 2984-III, 2002)--cited by Babyn (2008), Nikolayenko (2007), and Stepko (2004) as a basis for Bologna reforms--primarily refers readers to these earlier pieces of legislation. However, the use of the word “languages” in the “On Higher Education” law indicates the possibility of using more than one language in a Ukrainian university, an approach which appears to be constitutionally valid.

Стаття 5. Мова (мови) навчання у вищих навчальних закладах
Мова (мови) навчання у вищих навчальних закладах визначається відповідно до Конституції України (254к/96-ВР) та закону України про мови.

Article 5. The language(s) of teaching in higher education programs
The language(s) of teaching in higher education programs are defined according to the Constitution of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Law of Languages.

English in Higher Education in Ukraine

None of the laws on education or languages in Ukraine addresses English directly, but additional documents from Ukraine indicate the increasing importance of English in Ukrainian higher education. Stepko (2004) writes, “new methods of English language learning are applied, to ensure the appropriate level of language competence, sufficient for professional activity and continuation of studying outside of Ukraine.” This statement suggests that English is necessary to realize the “promises” of mobility offered by the Bologna Process.

Perhaps more surprising is that the Bologna Process is leading one university in Ukraine to begin teaching subjects entirely in English. On the Web site of the Dnipropetrovs’k University of Economics and Law (DUEL) (www.duep.edu), the section labeled “European integration in DUEL development” says, “at the moment we are ready to teach 12 economic, law and philological [language as a specialty] courses in English. Therefore, we can admit
foreign students for studying some disciplines at DUEL within the framework of exchange with universities of Europe.” The word “therefore” in this text indexes a causal relationship between offering courses in English and competing globally for students. Sadly, the pool of students from which DUEL can recruit students is likely small. According to an Erasmus Mundus multi-university project fact sheet, “An approximate rate of more than 80% of total mobility will consist of third country to EU mobility and less than 20% will consist of students moving out into third countries. These rates were discussed and agreed by the entire consortium, based on their interests.” The differential in participation between EU and third country students is framed in the final sentence as consensual. Even if the mutual nature of the agreement is taken as a fact, the desire to study in an EU country versus a third country at an 80/20 ratio suggests that EU countries are the perceived countries of power and status.

What may ultimately distinguish DUEL from other universities offering courses in English and give it a competitive edge within and outside Ukraine is its principled approach to teaching in English. In a university-produced monograph on English immersion (anglojazychnoe pogruzhenye) (Tarnopolsky et. al. 2008), the authors declare that English-medium universities such as Central European University in Budapest assume that students already have a level of English necessary to attend university courses in a subject such as business. This second point matches anecdotal observations or rumors in Germany that students need at least a B grade on their final exam in English (abitur) in order to attend a business university (Peter Scheubel, personal communication, January 2, 2010). In contrast, the DUEL monograph suggests that in the Ukrainian or post-Soviet context, a full immersion program which has the goal of improving
students’ ability to learn in English as well as developing their knowledge of the subject through the use of English as a language of instruction:

В западних университетах считение курсов специальных дисциплин на английском языке, который для всех или большинства студентов является иностранным, редко называется погружением, а скорее, рассматривается как проведение обычных стандартных занятий. Совершенно другое положение в Украине и в других странах постсоветского пространства. Если и внедрять в вузах этих стран обучение специальным (профессионалам) дисциплинам через погружение, то делать это целесообразно в первую очередь для того, чтобы совершенствовать владение студентами иностранным языком для профессионального общения.

In Western universities the teaching of courses in specialized disciplines in English, which for everyone or the majority of students is foreign, rarely is called immersion, and soon becomes a part of typical or standard lessons. There is an absolutely different guideline in Ukraine and other post-Soviet countries. If one wants to introduce in HEIs (Higher Education Institutions) in these countries instruction for specialists (professionals) through immersion, then one has to make it goal-oriented in the first instance, in order to improve students’ acquisition of a foreign language for professional communication (Tarnopolsky et. al. 2008, p. 5).

CONCLUSION

The structure, rhetoric and practice of Bologna reforms as described here clearly indicate that hegemony and convergence outweigh efforts to promote diversity in the Western European sphere. Particularly troubling is the degree of marginalization by Western European actors of Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and Post-Soviet states such as Ukraine and the class marginalization associated with these reforms. Linguistically, there is evidence in both Western Europe and Ukraine that English is replacing other languages at the university level. There is limited evidence from Germany and Hungary that this does not pose a threat to the national languages. Given that fact, it is possible that English will not pose a threat to languages in Ukraine, but more research is needed at the university level to demonstrate this fact.
From the Ukrainian side, there appears to be a level wholehearted support for Bologna reforms and implementation of English as a medium of instruction not found in other countries so far, a likely result of hegemonic practices. At the middle management levels at least, this support appears to be balanced with a desire to both converge with Western neo-liberalism and maintain a Ukrainian identity. More research is needed at the university level to determine the true nature of Bologna Process reform implementations and the role of English at Ukrainian universities. This investigation should include questions about the degree to which Ukrainian actors understand the degree of hegemony and marginalization involved here, as well as the limitations of the Bologna Process as a means to European integration. If the decisions and actions of Ukrainian actors turn out to be fully informed ones and if the structural changes lead to an improved educational structure, then Ukraine may turn out to be a model of Bologna implementation.
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