egalitarian liberalism is questionable. Rawls only suggests equalising the chances of citizens to live the life they want, not to in any way reduce someone's abilities.

References

Fraser, Nancy. 2004. 'Sociální spravedlnost ve věku politiky identity: přerozdělování, uznání a participace.' (Social Justice in the Age of the Politics of Identity: Redistribution, Recognition and Participation) Pp. 21–141 in *Přerozdělování nebo uznání?*, edited by Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth. Prague: Filosofia.

Rothhaar, Markus. 2010. 'Human Dignity and Human Rights in Bioethics: The Kantian Approach.' *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy* 13 (3): 251–257.

Tugendhat, Ernst. 2004. *Přednášky o etice*. (Lectures on Ethics) Prague: Oikoymenh.

Michael Dobbins: *Higher Education Policies in Central and Eastern Europe. Convergence towards a Common Model?* Basingstoke 2011: Palgrave Macmillan, 249 pp.

Governance change in higher education is one of the key topics in today's higher education policy literature and increasingly an important area of research for social scientists. This book is timely as governance change in higher education, and especially the autonomy of universities, is increasingly on the policy agendas of governments and has fascinated researchers for decades. The author of this book successfully synthesises the findings of earlier studies and provides an insightful and timely comparative account of governance change in higher education in four Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries in the context of Europeanisation and other international influences.

Dobbins systematically describes, analyses, and compares pathways of development of higher education governance in Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, and the Czech Republic. He focuses on the influence of the Bologna Process, especially on the convergence towards the ideal model of higher education governance brought about by increased international communication and exchange platforms. Institutional isomorphism is also mentioned as part of the process in the post-Bologna stage, re-shaping university and state responsibilities and resources. At a more general level, Dobbins aims to identify whether Europeanisation is penetrating more deeply into national systems, reshaping long-standing patterns of governance and state involvement in higher education. The author questions the direction and intensity of change based in four time periods—pre-communist, communist, pre-Bologna post-1989, and post-Bologna.

The book is conceptually framed using transnational policy convergence and convergence-promoting mechanisms [Holzinger and Knill 2007]. Dobbins develops the analytical framework for assessing convergence in higher education governance by identifying the main state and non-state actors and developing ideal models of higher education governance. Clark's [1983] famous triangle of coordination is the basis for the models that Dobbins uses to assess the direction and extent of the governance change. Building extensively on higher education studies and the political science literature, he builds a typology consisting of three general higher education arrangements: the allocation of procedural autonomy; relations between the state and society; and controlling functions. In line with other, similar studies, the shifts in governance are studied by investigating state-university relations and internal governance patterns. Further, Dobbins draws on neo-institutional theory [DiMaggio and Powell 1991] and more specifically normative and mimetic isomorphism to understand higher education convergence, while employing historical institutionalism [Hall and Taylor 1996] to understand the historically embedded national opportunity structures.

The main argument of the book is built by assessing four expectations, which structure it quite well. The first expectation posits that, during the pre-Bologna phase, higher education policies in CEE countries will reflect different models of governance based on the nature of their transnational inter-linkages. This proposition was confirmed. Governance of higher education in the four countries diverged by the mid-1990s; however, the impact of transnational communication was weak. As Dobbins argues, the policy process was dominated by national exigencies. This finding is noteworthy since it has been argued that the roles of the World Bank, the OECD, and other international organisations had been highly influential in shaping higher education policies in the post-communist countries. The second expectation postulates the convergence of higher education policies in the CEE countries during the Bologna phase as a result of increasing homogeneity and the institutionalisation of inter-linkages (and the ensuing isomorphic processes). This expectation was generally fulfilled, although the policy change started at different times with different momentum and consequences. Romanian higher education governance was influenced by far the most, which resulted in a consistent shift towards market-oriented governance after 1997. The third expectation, rooted in historical institutionalism, states that the more similar the higher education policies of various countries during the pre-communist era, the more their higher education policies would develop towards a similar model in post-communism. The evidence shows that this expectation holds up, especially in higher education systems with strong ties to the Humboldtian past during the pre-communist era (e g. the Czech Republic and Poland). Finally, the fourth expectation put forward asserts that the more similar the higher education policies of various countries during the communist era, the more their higher education policies would develop towards a similar model in the post-communist period. The findings reveal that the communist past only partly shaped countries' higher education governance, even in such a tightly state-controlled system as in Romania. The finding stemming from this expectation is the most intriguing of the book, since other studies have observed the influence of communist legacies on current higher education structures and governance arrangements (e g. the creation of research institutes of the academy of sciences in these countries) [Leisyte 2002].

Dobbins rightly identifies the incrementally converging trend towards the market-type model of higher education governance. He reasons that path-dependencies (with strong academic guilds 'watering' down reform efforts) and isomorphism from the international exchange platforms during the post-Bologna period were indeed observed in all countries, although the extent to which this affected change within universities has varied. The main conclusions of the book point to the importance of pre-communist legacies, such as the Humboldtian model of university governance and the importance of uncertainty within the countries over whether they should adopt or rebuff foreign-inspired normative ideals and models. Here the role of academic self-regulation has been paramount because the ability of academic guilds to self-organise and their confidence and power have been key to resisting change initiated by the state officials.

This is a well-structured account of the changes to higher education governance in the four countries and a significant contribution to the Europeanisation of higher education literature. The book captures the reader with its dynamic yet detailed stories of the development pathways for higher education governance. This comparative and systematic study is very much needed and welcome both for the assessment of convergence and also for its choice of coun-

tries, which are under-represented in the higher education and political science literature. Given the complexity and diversity of their systems, the graphic representation of changes is particularly useful. I found the categorisation of higher education models and their operationalisation to be useful since it provides a more comprehensive view of the changes in higher education governance. At the same time, some points for improvement can be mentioned.

Although I found the story of convergence convincing, and the comparison of countries' higher education legacies and current developments useful, I would have liked the indicators regarding stakeholders and networks in the governance of higher education to have been more prominent. Dobbins' argument on the changing role of the state in higher education governance has been highlighted, but I am not sure that the different roles of the state have been given enough attention, such as state regulation versus state guidance. Finally, although managerial governance is noted in the operationalisation of the models—and attributed largely to the market-based ideal-type model—I wish it had been highlighted more, since institutional management can be important not only within institutions, but also at the policy level (e g. via the Rectors' Conference) and international networks. As observed in different countries, the Rectors' Conferences may have a significant influence on governance changes or stability, even though their managerial guidance in the institution may be constrained by their powerful Senates.

The comparative political science lenses selected in order to understand the directions of change in higher education governance and the reasons behind it, with a special focus on the Bologna Process, successfully invigorate the debate on the dynamics of change in higher education governance and the institutionalisation of Europeanisation processes across countries, and, most importantly, they shed light on these processes in the highly dynamic higher education systems of Central and Eastern Europe, which is seldom done.

Liudvika Leisyte
School of Government and Management, Twente University
l.leisyte@utwente.nl

References

Clark, B. 1983. *The Higher Education System*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

DiMaggio, P. and W. Powell. 1983. 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields.' *American Sociological Review* 48: 147–160.

Hall, P. and R. Taylor. 1996. 'Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms.' *Political Studies* 44 (1): 936–957.

Holzinger, K. and C. Knill. 2007. 'Ursachen und Bedingungen internationaler Politikkonvergenz.' Pp. 85–106 in *Transfer Diffusion und Konvergenz von Politiken*, edited by K. Holzinger, H. Jörgens and C. Knill. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Leisyte, L. 2002. *Higher Education Governance in Post-Soviet Lithuania*. Oslo: University of Oslo, Institute for Educational Research.

James Wilson: *Moravians in Prague. A Sociolinguistic Study of Dialect Contact in the Czech Republic*
Frankfurt am Main 2009: Peter Lang, 267 pp.

Variation sociolinguistics investigates correlations between linguistic elements and key social characteristics of a speaker, such as his or her age, sex, region of origin, socio-economic status, and education. It might sound somewhat paradoxical to state that Wilson's study is one of only a few works in variation sociolinguistics based on Czech and that it is actually the first study on such a comparatively large scale to investigate dialect contact between speakers of different varieties of Czech. The paradox follows from the fact that Czech linguists have been interested in the social