

Chapter 1

The Growing Complexity of the Academic Enterprise in Europe: A Panoramic View

Marek Kwiek

1. Introduction

The increasingly complicated picture of the academic enterprise in Europe is due to several general factors: globalization and Europeanization, educational expansion and the massification of higher education, the economic crisis and public sector reforms, and the knowledge-driven economic competitiveness of nations and regions. Some factors, like expansion and massification, have exerted their influence over a few decades; others, like the economic crisis, for a few years. They can be put under four more general categories of external pressure exerted on higher education: economic (financial), political (ideological), social, and demographic. The factors generating change in national higher education policies and in national higher education systems have been multilayered, interrelated and often common throughout the continent.

The growing complexity of the academic enterprise today is also due to the fact that higher education systems in Europe have been under powerful reform pressures.¹ Reforms increasingly today, and throughout the European continent, lead to further reforms rather than to reformed higher education systems, which supports the arguments put forward by Nils Brunsson about all organizations in modern society: “large contemporary organizations, whether public or private, seem to be under almost perpetual reform-attempts at changing organizational forms” (Brunsson 2009: 1).² Higher education has changed substantially in most European economies in the last two or three decades but it is still expected by national and European-level policymakers to change even more, as the recent European Commission’s modernization

1 As Maurice Kogan and Stephen Hanney emphasized a decade ago, “perhaps no area of public policy has been subjected to such radical changes over the last 20 years as higher education” (Kogan and Hanney 2000: 11); see also Ladislav Cerych and Paul A. Sabatier (in their 1986 study of the implementation of higher education reforms in Europe) who said the late 1970s and the early 1980s were “a most critical period” (Cerych and Sabatier 1986: 3).

2 Not surprisingly, as observed in organizational research by Johan P. Olsen fifteen years ago: “Decisions to change often do not lead to change, or they lead to further unanticipated or unintended change. Institutional reforms breed new demands for reforms rather than making reforms redundant” (Olsen 1998: 322; see also Brunsson and Olsen 1993).

agenda for “universities” and for “higher education systems” tend to show (see EC 2006, EC 2011a, EC 2011b and numerous related documents). Universities, throughout their history, have changed as their environments changed, and the early 21st century is no exception (see Rüegg 2011 for the post-war period; for theoretical perspectives in organizational theory, there are two streams: a population ecology perspective as in Hannan, Pólos and Carroll 2007, Hannan and Freeman 1989, Morgan 1986, and Aldrich 1979/2008; and a resource-dependence perspective, as in Pfeffer and Salancik 1978).³ Different directions regarding current and projected academic restructuring in different national systems add to the complexity of the picture at a European level.

There are a number of broad features that add to the complexity of the academic enterprise. In general, they include the acceleration of national, European and global discussions; permanent renegotiations of the state/university relationships; universities functioning under permanent conditions of adapting to changing environmental settings; renegotiations of the general social contract providing the basis for the post-war welfare state and its public services; the tremendous scale of operations of and funding for universities; the divergence between global, supranational, European and often national reform discourses and academic discourses about the future of the university; and the link between arguments about private goods/private benefits from higher education and arguments about public subsidization of higher education. In more detail, these broad features are as follows:

- *The acceleration of national, European and global discussions.* In the last one or two decades, discussions about the future of the institution of the university at national, supranational (e.g. European) and global (e.g. by the World Bank and the OECD) levels have accelerated to an unprecedented degree. The university is viewed as becoming one of the most important socioeconomic institutions in post-industrial societies in which social and economic well-being is increasingly based on the production, transmission, dissemination and application of knowledge (see Stehr

3 Various forms of the population ecology perspectives stress the critical role of environments in the transformations of organizations; while the resource-dependence perspective stresses the mutual interdependence of organizations and their environments (organizations being able to modify their environments). For a traditional powerful defense of higher education as a “unique institution”, see John D. Millett (1962), and recently Christine Musselin (2007a), on universities as “specific organizations”. See also Maassen and Olsen’s distinction between universities as “instruments for shifting national political agendas” and as “institutions” made throughout the book they edited (Maassen and Olsen 2007).

2002, Foray 2006, Kahin and Foray 2006, Bok 2003, Slaughter and Rhoades 2004, Shattock 2008). The rising importance of the institution is reflected, *inter alia*, in the breadth and scope of public, academic and political discussions about its future. Also, at the EU level, universities have been in the policy spotlight throughout the 2000s (a reform strategy is “necessary and urgent”, education and research being viewed as “growth-friendly areas”, EC 2011c, with the potential of European higher education institutions being viewed as “underexploited”, EC 2011a:2).

- *Permanent renegotiations of the state/university relationships.* In the last two or three decades in Western Europe, there have been permanent renegotiations of the relationship between the state and higher education institutions (see Amaral *et al.* 2009, Amaral *et al.* 2008, Paradeise *et al.* 2009, Enders and Fulton 2002, Neave and Van Vught 1994, Neave and Van Vught 1991). As developed economies are becoming ever more knowledge-intensive, the emphasis on university reforms may be stronger in the future than today. At the same time, knowledge, including academically-produced knowledge, is located in the very centre of the key economic challenges facing modern societies (Geiger 2004, Leydesdorff 2006, Bonaccorsi and Doraio 2007). In most European systems, the relationship between the state authorities and higher education institutions is far from being settled (as public institutions, universities can be viewed either as “subsystems of the state or as independent institutions that nevertheless are strongly affected by the nature of the state”, Kogan and Hanney 2000: 22). There are also fee-based private institutions (termed “independent private” by the OECD), especially in Central and Eastern Europe, and “foundation universities” (in Sweden or Germany) which are at the same time non-public and non-private, which further complicates the picture.
- *Universities functioning under permanent conditions of adapting to changing environmental settings.* The changing social, economic, cultural and legal settings of European higher education institutions increasingly compels them to function in a state of permanent adaptation; adaptations are required as responses to changes both in their financing and governance modes (see Clark 1998, Shattock 1998, Paradeise *et al.* 2009, Krücken *et al.* 2007). Reforming universities does not lead to reformed universities, as examples from major European higher education systems show. Policymakers tend to view universities, like other public institutions, as “incomplete”; reforms are intended to make them “complete” institutions

(Brunsson 2009). Reforms are thus leading to further waves of reforms (Maassen and Olsen 2007, Clancy and Dill 2009).⁴

- *Renegotiations of the general social contract providing the basis for the post-war welfare state and its public services.* Europe faces a double renegotiation of the post-war social contract related to the welfare state (which traditionally includes education, as in Stiglitz 2000, Barr 2004, Kwiek 2010b) and the renegotiation of the social contract links, over the last two hundred years, between public universities and European nation states (see Jakobi *et al.* 2010, Rothblatt and Wittrock 1993, Kwiek 2005, 2006). The future of the traditional idea of the university in new settings whereby public institutions and public services are increasingly based, or compelled to be based, on the economic logic and (quasi-)market formulas of functionality is still unclear (see Dill and Van Vught 2010, Geiger 2004, Bok 2003, Weber and Duderstadt 2004, Clancy and Dill 2009). Current pension reforms throughout Europe are a widely, publicly debated aspect of the same social contract.
- *The tremendous scale of operations and funding.* The scale of operations (and financing) of universities, both regarding university teaching and university-based research, in European economies remains historically unprecedented. Never before had the functioning of universities brought so many diverse benefits, both explicitly public and explicitly private. But also, never in post-war history had all aspects of their functioning been analysed in such a detailed manner from international comparative perspectives, and, indirectly, carefully assessed by international organizations (see Martens *et al.* 2010, Martens *et al.* 2007, OECD 2008, Dill and Van Vught 2010, Weber and Duderstadt 2004). Measuring the economic competitiveness of nations increasingly means, *inter alia*, measuring both the potential and the output of their higher education and research and development systems (as e.g. the annual Global Competitive Index shows; see Kwiek 2011b on knowledge production in Central Europe). Therefore, higher education can expect to be under ever more (both national and international) public scrutiny. The traditional post-Second World War rationale for resource allocations to universities has been shifting towards a “competitive approach” to university beha-

4 As organizational research shows, there is no surprise that reforms based on “simple prescriptive models” seldom succeed in achieving their aims: “such reforms often increase rather than decrease the felt need, and probability of, new reforms. ... it is often observed that organizations work well precisely because naïve reforms have *not* been implemented” (Brunsson and Olsen 1998: 30). Or, in other words, reformers’ “great expectations” often lead to what Cerych and Sabatier called “mixed performance” (Cerych and Sabatier 1986).

viour and funding (Geuna 1999), with possible unintended negative consequences (Geuna 2001).

- *The competing discourses about the future of the university and its missions.* There has been a growing divergence between two major sets of discourses about university missions in the last decade. The first is a set of global, supranational and EU discourses (reflected often in national public policy debates about systemic reforms to higher education, and reflected also in the 2011 Communication from the European Commission, referred to throughout the present volume). And the second is a set of nationally differentiated traditional discourses by the academic community, deeply rooted in traditional, both national and global, academic values, norms, and behaviours (see Novoa and Lawn 2002, Ramirez 2006). These two sets of discourses seem polarised today as never before. The struggles between them (the former set supported by the ascendancy of the changing modes regarding the redistribution of resources and the legal changes relevant to universities' operations; and the latter set supported by the strength of academic traditions, and, in general, of the academic community) lead in many systems to conflicts between alternative institutional rules (see March and Olsen 1989, and especially Maassen and Olsen 2007) and conflicts between policymakers and the academic community about the substance of higher education reforms. The political economy of reforms suggests, though, that no reforms can be successful without the support of at least some groups of academics.
- *Finally, the link between arguments about private goods/private benefits from higher education and arguments about its public subsidization.* Private goods (and private benefits) from higher education have been increasingly high on the reform agendas and in the public discussions that accompany them. Together with the increased emphasis in public policy on private goods (and private benefits), the threat to the public subsidization of traditional public institutions may be growing (Marginson 2011, 2007b, McMahon 2009). Viewing higher education more consistently from the perspective of private investment (and private returns) is more probable than it has ever been since the 1960s when the human capital approach was formed. This may have an impact on long-term public perceptions of the social roles of universities and their services, and on long-term views about the public funding of universities in the future.

The panoramic view presented here draws on both current research and policy debates to show possible directions of change for the academic enterprise in Europe. There are many options possible and forecasting in the arena of higher education does not have a good track record. There are many variables, and most

of them are explicitly related to the changing social and economic environments in which universities function.⁵

There are several contentious areas, and all of them contribute to the possible growing systemic complexity of the academic enterprise in the next decade. Six of them will be briefly discussed here. The contentious areas, and the questions related to them, have different priorities across different European systems; but in most of them, they are, or are at least expected to become, crucial. They include the following (descriptions of each area will be followed by related questions):

- *University funding in mass higher education systems and the role of cost-sharing.* Who pays and who benefits? Who should pay and who should benefit? What is the future of tax-based higher education systems in economies increasingly characterized by the growing competition for scarce public resources and financial austerity in all public services generally?
- *The role of third-stream funding.* What is the role in university budgets for non-core, non-state income, mostly research-related? What is the future of academic entrepreneurialism and differentiated third mission activities in ever-more competitive higher education systems?
- *Changing university governance modes.* What are the many faces of the new managerialism in universities, and what will its impact be on the norms, behaviours, and routines of the academic community?
- *The delinking of teaching/research activities.* How strong is the traditional teaching/research link in university and non-university sectors today? What is the long-term impact of national systems becoming internally differentiated by various levels of research intensity and competitive access to research funding? How does the research-intensity of institutions determine their funding levels and national prestige hierarchies?
- *The changing academic profession(s).* How far can the differentiation processes within the academic profession go in following the differentiation processes in higher education systems themselves? What are the many futures for differentiated academic profession(s) in national systems?
- *Further expansion of higher education systems.* What might universal higher education mean for millions of graduates, for their job prospects and future income differentials in today's post-industrial economies? Are middle-class lifestyles attainable for all, based on universal access to higher education?

5 Good examples of the low ability of higher education researchers to analyze the future of higher education come from the late 1980s: see, for instance, the role of demographics in shaping the future of higher education and the future roles of private higher education (see Levine *et al.* 1989, Breneman and Finn 1978, and the Carnegie Report 1977).

The present chapter will refer to the above contentious areas in higher educational research and policies and will discuss the three following major questions with reference to the coming decade:

- Should European higher education systems expect, in general, more (quasi-) market mechanisms and more new income-generating patterns?
- What is the role of the new university stakeholders and how might teaching/research missions evolve in European universities?
- To what extent is meeting the conflicting demands from different university stakeholders a major challenge to the European academic profession?

2. Marketization and the growing competition for public funding in European universities

The first question is whether European higher education systems should expect more market (and quasi-market) mechanisms and more new income-generating patterns? The answer is moderately positive, and the reasons are given below.

Firstly, there may be a growing relevance for a market perspective, as well as increasing financial austerity, in respect of all public services (accompanied by a growing competition for all public expenditures, both services and infrastructure, including both civil and public infrastructure, or related to such infrastructure as roads, airports, railroads or power, and schools, hospitals, civic buildings etc.⁶), strengthened by several factors. These factors include the globalization and internationalization processes, the financial crisis, as well as changing demographics and its implications for national social and public expenditures. European higher education institutions in the next decade may have to respond to increasingly unfriendly financial settings by either cost-side solutions or revenue-side solutions (see Johnstone 2006). A more probable institutional response to possibly worsening financial environments in which institutions operate is basically by revenue-side solutions: seeking new sources of income, largely non-state, non-core, and non-traditional to most European systems, already termed “external income generation” and “earned income” by Gareth Williams in *Changing Patterns of Finance in Higher Education* with reference to British universities two decades ago (see Williams 1992: 39-50; ex-

6 In developed countries, civil and social infrastructure built in the last century initially served those countries well, but today it has been systematically under-maintained and it needs “substantial expansion and refurbishment at a time when governments worldwide are severely fiscally strained” (Scott, Levitt and Orr 2011: xv). I have developed the theme of growing competition for public funding between different segments of the traditional welfare state in Europe in Kwiek 2006, Kwiek 2007a and Kwiek 2010.

amples of academic entrepreneurialism so understood can already be found in most European systems, to different degrees, as empirical research demonstrates, e.g. EUERЕК project, *European Universities for Entrepreneurship*; see Shattock 2008, Kwiek 2008b, 2008d).⁷

New sources of income may thus include various forms of academic entrepreneurialism in research (consultancies, contracts with industry, research-based short-term courses etc.) and various forms and levels of cost-sharing in teaching (tuition fees, at any or all study levels, from undergraduate to graduate to postgraduate studies), depending on the academic traditions in which the systems are embedded, as well as the incentives for institutions and for entrepreneurial-minded academics and their research groups within institutions. In general, the non-core income of academic institutions includes six items: gifts, investments, research grants, research contracts, consultancies and student fees (Williams 1992: 39). What also counts (and determines the level of cross-country variations in Europe) is the relative scale of current underfunding in higher education – most underfunded systems, such as, for instance, some systems in Central and Eastern Europe, may be more willing to accept new funding patterns than Western European (Continental) systems with traditionally more lavish state funding.⁸ “Academic entrepreneurialism” and various forms of “third mission activities” seem to have attracted ever more policy attention at both national and EU levels in the last few years (see, for instance, European University-Business Forums 2008-2011 and the stream of activities termed “university-business dialogue and cooperation” in the European Commission; as a recent communication stressed, the contribution of higher education to growth and jobs can be enhanced through “close, effective links between education, research and business – the three sides of the same ‘knowledge triangle’”, and, furthermore, partnership and coopera-

7 The EC communication explicitly mentions the need for both the diversification of funding sources in higher education and of access to “alternative sources of funding”, with a clear reservation, though: “public investment must remain the basis for sustainable higher education. But the scale of funding required to sustain and expand high-quality higher education systems is likely to necessitate additional sources of funding” (EC 2011a: 8, 7).

8 As Williams defined academic entrepreneurialism based on research performed in the EU FP6 EUERЕК project (in which the present author was a partner): “entrepreneurialism is fundamentally about innovation and risk taking in the anticipation of subsequent benefits. Neither the innovations and risks nor the expected benefits need necessarily be financial, but it is rare for them to have no economic dimension. Finance is a key indicator and an important driver of entrepreneurial activity... Financial stringency and financial opportunities have been the main drivers of entrepreneurial activity in the case study institutions” (Williams 2008: 9).

tion with business should be viewed as a “core activity” of higher education institutions, EC 2011a: 7,8; see the wide panorama in my recent monograph, Kwiek 2012c).

Secondly, in such times of possible reformulations to the most generous types of welfare state regimes in Europe (see Powell and Hendricks 2009, Pestieau 2006, Iversen 2005), higher education institutions and systems in the next decade should be able to balance the negative financial impact of the possible gradual restructuring of the public sector with the levels of public funding for higher education. And overall trends in welfare state restructuring seem to have been relatively similar worldwide (as Paul Pierson had already stressed a decade ago, long before the recent financial crisis arose, “while reform agendas vary quite substantially across regime types, all of them place a priority on cost containment. This shared emphasis reflects the onset of permanent austerity ... the control of public expenditure is a central, if not dominant consideration”, Pierson 2001: 456). In the case of higher education, the economic outlook of the sector, “vis-à-vis the intensification of competing social needs, is ever more problematic” (Schuster 2011: 3).⁹ The competition for tax funding between various social needs and different public services is bound to grow, regardless of the time when the current financial crisis will be overcome. The reason is simple, as both students of welfare and students of demography have shown: European welfare state regimes were created mostly for the “Golden age” period of the European welfare state model, or a quarter of a century between the 1950s and the oil shock of the early 1970s: “taking a long-term view, we can say that this was a most unusual period” (Lutz and Wilson 2006: 13).

While the cost containment may be the general state response to financial austerity across European countries, seeking new external revenues may increasingly be an institutional response to the financial crisis on the part of higher education institutions. It was already a response to impoverished universities in most Central and Eastern European economies in the 1990s, following the collapse of communism. Certainly, the introduction of fees or their higher levels will be in the spotlight in most systems in which universities will be seeking additional non-state funding. The post-war (Continental) European tradition was

9 The increasing financial austerity, one of several global megatrends in higher education financing, is also brought on by what D. Bruce Johnstone termed “the diverging trajectories of sharply rising costs and slowly rising (or even declining) revenues” (Johnstone and Marcucci 2007: 58). Other megatrends include the massification of higher education, cost-sharing (or shifting of higher education costs to parents and/or students), other-than governmental revenues, private colleges and universities, the privatization of the public sector, and management and budget reforms (Johnstone and Marcucci 2007: 46-63).

tax-based higher education, and (high-level) fees still look non-traditional in most systems.¹⁰

Trends in European demographics (especially the aging of European societies, see the decade-long OECD *Public Pensions Series*) will directly affect the functioning of the welfare state (and public sector institutions) in general, with strong country-specific variations. In most European countries, demographics will only affect universities indirectly, through the growing pressures on public expenditures in general, and the growing competition for all public funding. In some countries, such as Central Europe (especially in Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, Hungary and Slovakia; Poland, with powerfully declining demographics, faces projections for the number of students as dwindling between 2008 and 2025 by one million, Kwiek 2012), the indirect impact on all public services will be combined with the direct impact on educational institutions. Strong higher education institutions will be able to steer the future changes in funding patterns for higher education in their countries – rather than to merely drift with them.

Thirdly, the possible redefinition of higher education from a public (and collective) good to a private (and individual) good is a tendency which may further undermine the idea of heavy public subsidization of higher education in Europe in the future (as it is in the US, see Massy 2003; for a powerful defence of higher education as a public good see especially Calhoun 2006, Marginson 2006, Rhoten and Calhoun 2011: 1-33, and Marginson 2011). In a “stakeholder society”, the fundamental relationship between higher education institutions and their stakeholders has always been “conditional” – which introduces, from a financial perspective, an element of “inherent instability” (as Guy Neave put it, 2002: 22). The economic rationale for higher education is changing: Philip Altbach stressing that in a global context, “the private-good argument largely dominates the current debate”, which results from a combination of economics, ideology, and philosophy (Altbach 2007: xx).¹¹

10 For a powerful rationale for the universal introduction of fees, see Johnstone’s work throughout the last two decades, in particular recently in Johnstone 2006 and Johnstone and Marcucci 2010. For a changing rationale for the introduction of fees under severely declining demographics, as in Poland, see Kwiek, forthcoming. In the context of the changing public/private dynamics in higher education, the role of fees may have a fundamental importance: in Poland, the future of the private (“independent-private” by OECD standards) sector in the next 15 years, under declining demographics, depends entirely on the political decision to introduce universal fees in the (so far tax-based) public sector, see Kwiek 2012a, Kwiek and Maassen 2012.

11 William F. Massy concluded almost a decade ago about American colleges that “it may be a ticket to the good life, but its benefits for democracy and culture no longer command a top priority for the public purse. Higher education increasingly is viewed as a private

Fourthly, in the last half century, despite immense growth in enrolments, public higher education in Europe remained relatively stable from a qualitative point of view. Its fundamental structure remained unchanged. Currently, the forces of change worldwide are similar (see Johnstone 2006) and they are pushing higher education systems into more market-oriented and more competitive arenas (as well as towards more state regulation, possibly combined with less state funding, available on a more competitive basis, Teixeira *et al.* 2004). As Fazal Rizvi observed from a global perspective, privatization has become globally pervasive, “increasingly assumed to be the only way to ensure that public services, including education, are delivered efficiently and effectively”; furthermore, “public institutions in most parts of the world have been encouraged, if not compelled, to adopt the principles of market dynamics in the management of their key functions” (Rizvi 2006: 65). This is also the case in Europe, and perhaps especially in Central Europe, Poland included.

For centuries, “the market” had no major influence on higher education: the majority of modern universities in Europe were created by the state and were subsidized by the state. Over the last 200 years, most students in Europe attended state-funded public institutions and most faculty members worked in state-funded public institutions (within all major models of the university in Europe which served as “templates” for other parts of the world). Today market forces in higher education are on the rise worldwide and the non-core non-state income of universities is on the rise too (see a recent report by CHEPS 2010, Shattock 2008). While the form and pace of these transformations are different across the world, they are of a global nature and are expected to have a powerful impact on higher education systems in Europe.

3. Conflicting demands and the teaching/research divide in European universities

The second question of the present panoramic view is about new (or rather substantially more powerful than before) stakeholders in higher education and the changing teaching/research nexus in university missions.

Universities under conditions of massification are increasingly expected to be meeting not only the changing needs of the state but also the changing needs of students, employers, the labour market and industry, as well as the regions in

rather than a public good: very important for those who get it, but something most government officials can safely take for granted” (Massy 2003: 4). The diagnosis is “the erosion of trust” (Massy 2003: 3-28) and “the diminishing of public purpose” (Zemsky, Wegner and Massy 2006: 1-14).

which they are located (Jones, McCarney, and Skolnik 2005). The demands put on academics are increasingly conflicting. Globally, for the vast majority of academics, the traditional combination of teaching, research, and service is beyond reach: as a whole, globally, the academic profession is becoming a predominantly teaching profession; gravitating toward more emphasis on teaching is also the case, to varying degrees, in both Europe and in the US (Schuster 2011). The expected developments in the next decade may fundamentally alter the relationship between various stakeholders, with a decreasing role for the state (for example, and perhaps especially, in terms of funding), the increasing role of students and the labour market (for the more teaching-oriented sector of higher education), and the increasing role of industry and the regions (for the more research-oriented sector of higher education). These processes are already advanced to varying degrees in different European countries.

On a more general level, the massification of higher education is tied up with the growing significance of these new (or only re-emergent as powerful, as is the case of students under the Bologna Process transformations) stakeholders (Palfreyman and Tapper 2009). At the same time, let it be stressed here, in the midst of reforms, in order to flourish, universities, and especially research universities, also need to continue to be meeting the needs (either traditional or re-defined) of academics, the core of the university (Clark 1987, Clark 1983). As pointed out throughout the last two decades by Philip G. Altbach:

The academic profession is central to the success of the university everywhere. A research university requires a special type of professor – highly trained, committed to research and scholarship, and motivated by intellectual curiosity. Full-time commitment and adequate remuneration constitute other necessities. A career path that stresses excellence and at the same time offers both academic freedom and job security are required. Academics at research universities need both the time to engage in creative research and the facilities and infrastructures to make scholarly research possible (Altbach 2007: 106-107).

Increasingly differentiated student needs – resulting from differentiated student populations in massified systems – have already led to largely differentiated institutional systems (and, in a parallel manner, a largely differentiated academic profession). The expected differentiation-related developments in the next decade may fundamentally alter the academic profession in general, further increase its heterogeneity, and have a strong impact on the traditional relationships between teaching and research at European universities, especially in second-tier institutions. And the relationship between teaching and research is, as Peter Scott put it, “among the most intellectually tangled, managerially complex, and politically contentious issues in mass higher education systems” (Scott 2005: 53).

Such questions as: how to combine teaching and research in university missions, in which types of institutions should they be combined, and based on which funding streams (e.g. mostly public or mostly private) – will become crucial in the next decade. For the time being, most non-elite and demand-absorbing institutions in Europe (and especially private institutions in Central and Eastern Europe) are already teaching-oriented while traditional elite research universities are still able to combine teaching and research. Research funding seems to be increasingly competitive in most systems, with competitive calls for proposals for research teams, rather than with mostly undifferentiated lump sums for institutions, to be internally distributed. The funding for research in European universities has been undergoing a transformation from being allocated on a “predominantly recurrent, block grant, basis” to being dependent on “success in competitive bidding for project grants”. This has led to the changing authority relationships in the sciences, including “the changed authority relationships governing the selection of scientific goals and evaluation of results in many OECD countries” (Whitley 2010: 5). At the same time, institutions are expected to be far more student-centred. Students as university stakeholders are becoming increasingly powerful, also through being reconceptualised as “clients” by institutions and as a future well-trained graduate labour force by governments.

University missions are already being strongly redefined, and their redefinition may require a fundamental reconstruction of the roles of educational institutions (as well as a reconstruction of the tasks of academics). The main characteristics of current European university systems – the combination of teaching and research as the core institutional mission – may be under ever greater pressures. Consequently, the implications of the Bologna process at both European, national, institutional and individual (i.e. academics) levels seem still not to be fully realized. Bruce Johnstone and Pamela Marcucci discuss the issue from a global perspective and come to fairly pessimistic conclusions regarding the future of research at universities: “research may fall to only a few universities, or fall mainly to the universities and research institutes in the advanced countries ... or may fall mainly to business and private investment” (Johnstone and Marcucci 2007: 3). The concentration of research funding in an ever smaller number of top institutions is observed throughout European higher education and research systems: there are gainers and losers in these processes for the allocation of financial resources, in accordance with what Robert K. Merton described in the 1960s as the “Mathew effect” in science (“the richer get richer at a rate that makes the poor relatively poorer”, Merton 1973: 457).

The social, political, and economic contexts in which universities function are changing, and so are student populations changing as well as educational

institutions (increasingly compelled to meet their changing demands). Higher education is subject to powerful influences from all sides and all – new and old alike – stakeholders: the state, the students, the faculty, employers, and industry, and on top of that, it is becoming a very costly business.¹²

The complexity of the academic enterprise in the next decade is that different stakeholders may increasingly have different needs from those they traditionally had, and their voice is already increasingly taken into account (as in the case of students, especially under Bologna-inspired reforms in Europe). Institutions are thus expected to transform themselves to maintain public trust (and to have a good rationale for using public subsidies). As Guy Neave described it, the passage to the “Stakeholder Society” involves a redefinition of the “community in terms of those interests to which the university should be answerable” (Neave 2002: 12). The role of the market in higher education (or of government-regulated “quasi-markets”, see Teixeira *et al.* 2004) seems so far to be growing, because the market seems to be increasingly affecting our lives as humans, citizens, workers, and finally as students/faculty.

Never before has the institution of the university for so long been under the changing (and increasingly conflicting) pressures of different stakeholders. Never before has it been perceived by so many, all over the world, as an institutional failure in meeting the needs of students and the labour market (the literature on the supply/demand mismatch is substantial, and growing). Therefore the question as to which directions higher education systems will be taking while adapting to new social and economic realities in which the role of the market is growing and the educational credentials received by graduates are increasingly linked to their professional and economic futures – seems to be open.

Following the transformations of other public sector institutions, universities in Europe – traditionally publicly-funded and traditionally specializing in both teaching and research – may soon be under powerful pressures to review their missions in view of the permanent need to cope with the financial austerity facing all public sector services (see Pierson, 2001). Universities may soon be under pressures to compete more fiercely for financial resources with other public

12 Research universities are especially expensive: in 2004, ten American public and private universities had total annual revenues of 2 billion USD or more, with three private universities in the lead. The top three were Harvard University (6.3 billion USD), Stanford University (3.5 billion USD) and Yale University (3.4 billion USD). The valid question is: how to compete (Brint 2007: 94)? And at the same time, three and a half decades ago, in the 1970s, the future of elite private universities in the USA was uncertain, and the policy questions then were under which conditions the sector should be assisted to survive the pressures of declining demographics (see e.g. Carnegie report on *The States and Private Higher Education*, Carnegie 1977, and Breneman and Finn, 1978).

services, also heavily reliant on the public purse. Public priorities are changing throughout the world, and new funding patterns and funding mechanisms are being experimented with (Central Europe, Poland included, has long been experimenting with various forms of privatization in public services).¹³ The rationale for European university research funding has been changing throughout the last two decades, often with “negative unintended consequences” (Geuna 2001).

The consequences for the teaching/research agenda at universities regarding the growing competition for public resources are far-reaching. The trend towards the concentration of research in selected institutions is powerful in several countries (Poland included: in 2009, 80 per-cent of research funds were concentrated in 20 institutions, in a system of about 100 public and 330 private institutions). The trend for disconnecting teaching and research in higher education has already started: as Stephan Vincent-Lancrin from OECD (2006: 12) summarizes in his analyses of OECD datasets, “academic research might just become concentrated in a relatively small share of the system while the largest number of institutions will carry out little research, if any” (which is challenging the traditional Humboldtian principle of the unity of research and teaching, see the German idea of the university in Kwiek 2006: 81-138). The perspective of further future delinking of teaching and research, especially in first-tier institutions, runs counter to traditional expectations of the academic profession as studied over the decades, both globally, in Europe, and in the USA. Only research has been traditionally related to prestige, and prestige-seeking is the core of the academic enterprise. Reputation is “the main currency for the academic” (Becher and Kogan 1980: 103) and it derives from research rather than from teaching (Clark 1983, 1987, Altbach 2007). In the developing countries, research and teaching have always been separated except for national flagship institutions. Further differentiated academic professions can be expected to emerge, of which only small segments will be involved in (usually in the higher education sector and state-funded) research.¹⁴

13 In higher education, see the different implications of internal and external privatization in Kwiek 2008c, 2010a, and, especially, Kwiek 2012c.

14 The importance to academic communities in Europe of the university research mission has been recently confirmed empirically by a set of national surveys conducted in the framework of both CAP (Changing Academic Profession) and EUROAC (The Academic Profession in Europe) research projects.

4. Academics and their transforming institutions

The third question regarding the present panorama is to what extent meeting the conflicting demands of new and evolving stakeholders is a major challenge to the academic profession.

Massified educational systems (and an increasingly massified academic profession) unavoidably lead towards various new forms of system differentiation and stratification. Universities in most European countries seem still quite faculty-centred and their responsiveness to student and labour market needs is reported to be low (this line of criticism has been presented by the European Commission, including in the recent communication and its accompanying documents, for instance: “the capacity of higher education institutions to integrate research results and innovative practice into the educational offer, and to exploit the potential for marketable products and services, remains weak”, or as a memo accompanying its release explained explicitly: “higher education must be more closely aligned to the needs of the labour market, and more open to cooperation with business, including the design of curricula, improving governance and injecting additional funding”, EC 2011a, EC 2011c). The broadening of the debate about the social and economic roles of universities (and especially about graduates’ employability) with employers, students, parents and other stakeholders can be expected in the next decade. And employability is bound to be a key notion in rethinking the attractiveness of European institutions to both European and international students in the future, especially if viewing higher education as a private good becomes prevalent.

European research universities will be attractive if they are able to meet current (sometimes conflicting) differentiated needs. These needs sometimes seem to run counter the traditional twentieth-century social expectations of the academic profession in continental Europe, though.

Consequently, attractive European higher education systems will have to find a fair balance in their expected transformations so that the academic profession is not deprived of its traditional voice in university management and governance; the professoriate still unmistakably belongs to the middle classes; and universities are still substantially different in their operations from the business sector, being somehow, although not necessarily traditionally, “unique” or “specific” organizations (see Musselin 2007a, Perkin 1969, Maassen and Olsen 2007). Close relationships with industry, responsiveness to labour market needs and meeting students’ vocational needs – have not traditionally been associated with the core values of the academic profession in continental Europe (despite perhaps the verbal declarations of the academic community and despite universities’ mission statements). It is unclear to what extent these core values are al-

ready under renegotiation in massified systems. The academic profession may find future transformations of higher education systems – and of their own institutions – surprising at best; appalling at worst. But it must be taken for granted, no matter what transformations are in place, that academics are in the very centre of the academic enterprise. As Jack H. Schuster gloomily summarized his recent book chapter on “The Professoriate’s Perilous Path”:

The immediate outlook, given the economic woes pressing upon higher education, is replete with formidable challenges. In the longer term, sweeping changes from within and without will inevitably lead to substantial academic restructuring. Higher education is nothing if not resilient. But, in all, the effectiveness of higher education and the contributions that will accrue to the nation are inextricably linked to the future attractiveness of academic careers (Schuster 2011: 15).

Increasingly differentiated student populations in Europe also require increasingly differentiated institutions, and (possibly) increasingly differentiated types of academics. The academic profession is clearly becoming a myriad of academic professions, even within the same national system, not to mention cross-country differences. This might mean the decline of the high social prestige of higher education graduates (counted today in millions) and of the high social prestige of most academics (counted today in hundreds of thousands in major European economies). The universalization of higher education is already having a profound impact on the social stratification of academics, especially in those countries where the expansion in enrolments is especially high.

The point is that the academic profession is at the core of the academic enterprise, as relentlessly proclaimed over the decades by Burton Clark and Philip G. Altbach (it is, as Harold Perkin (1969: 227) put it, “the key profession in modern society”, “the profession which educates the other professions”).¹⁵ The institutional capital of universities is in academics rather than in buildings, laboratories, libraries and student halls. Academics are not “replaceable” in the way industrial workers are replaceable in the industrial sector under the conditions of globalization, with industry or service jobs often going to cheaper la-

15 The academic profession has traditionally been viewed, as in Perkin, as “the sole profession which has the time, the means and the skill not merely to make new discoveries, as distinct from applications of old ones, in learning, science and technology, but to do society’s fundamental thinking for it, not least about the nature and purposes of society itself”. Traditionally, it has been clear that “both the State and the profession know that at the bottom the service is indispensable and must be paid for” (Perkin 1969: 227-228, 231). See also what Altbach called a “benchmark” in the social science-based studies of the profession. For similar views see: *The Academic Man. A Study in the Sociology of a Profession* by Logan Wilson (1942/1995). Traditional rationales seem to be increasingly questioned by policy makers, though.

bour force destinations.¹⁶ The very idea of the university rests with the academic profession; it is inherently present in its rules, norms and values; habits, procedures, and routines. Universities are linking the world of learning and the world of work (Teichler 2009), as well as research and innovation (Dill and Van Vught 2010). But universities may become much less significant in the knowledge-driven economy if the academic profession is not fully committed to academic missions (and wholly optimistic about its own career opportunities in the future). This is what the logic in the political economy of higher educational reforms suggests in our “highly reformistic” modern society (Brunsson 2009: 1). We will discuss the theme of academic optimism under increasingly diversified pressures and ever-more conflicting demands in more empirical detail below.

The changes in the academic profession in Europe occur in a specific context defined by the common realities faced by European higher education systems: they include processes related to financial constraints, differentiation, accountability, societal relevance, as well as market and competitive forces. As Enders and Musselin pointed out,

we live in times of uncertainty about the future development of higher education and its place in society and it is therefore not surprising to note that the future of the academic profession seems uncertain, too (Enders and Musselin 2008: 145).

In all on-going reform initiatives throughout Europe, there is the hidden dynamics of changes in the relationships between the state, or the major sponsor of teaching and research, and academics, or the major beneficiaries of state sponsorship in the academic enterprise. The academic profession has a fiduciary role to play: the institution of the university is, following James March and Johan P. Olsen’s normative institutionalism, a relatively enduring “collection of rules and organized practices embedded in structures of meaning and resources that are relatively invariant in the face of the turnover of individuals and relatively resilient to the idiosyncratic preferences and expectations of individuals and changing external circumstances. Constitutive rules and practices prescribe appropriate behaviour of specific actors in specific situations” (Olsen 2008: 27). Constitu-

16 The delinking of universities and public good may lead to the increasing vulnerability of universities as publicly-subsidized institutions. As Simon Marginson pointed out, higher education needs a “foundational public purpose”, devoid of the public good it may become replaceable: “if higher education is emptied out of common public purpose its long-term survival is uncertain” (Marginson 2011: 3; see a recent defence of the public mission of the research university in Rhoten and Calhoun 2011, especially Calhoun 2011: 1-33). Also Ulrich Teichler, noting that the European research university is more endangered than ever before, states that “research can emigrate just as well as advanced academic training. Even the credentialing power of the university could vanish” (Teichler 2006: 169).

tive rules and practices are not easily changeable, they take time to root and take time to change. The modernization of the institution of the European university (including a recent EU “agenda for the modernization of Europe’s higher education systems”, see EC 2011a and EC 2011b) means changes in the rules constituting its identity. Institutions are defended by insiders and validated by outsiders and because their histories are encoded into “rules and routines”, their internal structures cannot be changed or replaced arbitrarily (March and Olsen 1989). The “Great expectations” shared by higher education reformers has traditionally led to “mixed results” in terms of their implementation, and reforming higher education is closely linked to reforming the states in which it operates (Cerych and Sabatier 1980). As remarked by Clark Kerr who spent several decades in reforming higher education in California,

If the question is, does the reform meet the “great expectations” of its original proponents, then “success” is never likely – original expectations are almost always excessive. I should like to propose two more modern tests: did the reform serve a good purpose at the time? ... is the continuing situation better than it otherwise would have been? However, I have come to doubt the use of the word “reform”. Reform means “new and improved”. ... Thus I have come to prefer the word change, leaving to later the question of whether or not the change turned out to be an improvement as its proponents, of course, expect (Kerr, in his foreword to Cerych and Sabatier 1980: xvi).

Assuming, following Clark and Altbach, that academics are the core of the academic enterprise, we refer to an empirical account of their current self-reported social and economic position. We refer here again to Schuster’s intuition that the future of universities is inextricably linked to the future attractiveness of academic careers.

Thus, finally, a note on the changing academic profession in Europe is needed, based on recent large-scale empirical studies. The empirical data is drawn from the EUROAC project dataset (an “Academic Profession in Europe” which follows the global format of a CAP “Changing Academic Profession” project, based on country data from 12 European countries, with over 20,000 returned surveys and 600 semi-structured in-depth interviews (the present author has been coordinating the Polish EUROAC project which included more than 3,500 returned surveys and 60 semi-structured interviews)¹⁷. We focus now briefly on the “academic optimism” theme, viewed through the proxy of “job satisfaction” and related parameters empirically studied throughout Europe, with the general idea that optimism among academics regarding their current and future careers

¹⁷ The research team also included Dr. Dominik Antonowicz. Research conducted in Poland in 2009-2011 was coordinated by Ulrich Teichler of Kassel University and funded by the European Science Foundation.

will be one of the most important dimensions of successful on-going and future reforms in higher education.¹⁸

Overall, academic professionals in Europe in the countries studied seem to derive relatively high satisfaction from their work in universities. On a scale from 1 = “very high” to 5 = “very low”, senior academics in Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Italy rate their job satisfaction in the 1.9-2.1 range; in Austria, Finland, Poland and Norway they rate it as 2.2; and in Germany it is rated 2.3. As Table 1 below shows, the ratings are 2.4 each in Portugal and Ireland, while the mean of 2.6 in the UK expressed the highest level of dissatisfaction in Europe. The ratings by junior staff are slightly less positive (2.4 as compared to 2.2) across countries. Junior staff differ from senior staff most visibly in the lower degree of satisfaction in Portugal (2.8 vs. 2.4), in Switzerland (2.2 vs. 1.9) and in Germany (2.6 vs. 2.3). Again, the most dissatisfied junior academics work in Portugal and in the UK (a satisfaction rate of 2.8 each).

Table 1: Job Satisfaction: How would you rate your overall satisfaction with your current job? (arithmetic mean, all higher education institutions).

	2010					2007/08						
	AT	CH	IE	PL	NL	DE	FI	IT	NO	PT	UK	
Arithmetic mean												
Senior	2,2	1,9	2,4	2,2	2,1	2,3	2,2	2,1	2,2	2,4	2,6	
Junior	2,4	2,2	2,5	2,4	2,2	2,6	2,3	2,4	2,3	2,8	2,8	

Question B6: How would you rate your overall satisfaction with your current job? (Scale of answer 1 = Very High to 5 = Very Low, universities and other higher education institutions combined).¹⁹

18 The environment for the academic profession worldwide is reported to be generally “discouraging”. As a recent 2009 report for the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education by Philip Altbach *et al.* put it, “no university can achieve success without well-qualified, committed academic staff. Neither an impressive campus nor an innovative curriculum will produce good results without great professors. Higher education worldwide focuses on the ‘hardware’ – buildings, laboratories, and the like – at the expense of ‘software’ – the people who make any academic institutions successful” (Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley 2010: 85). The academic profession is crucial in a global race for “world-class” universities: what matters, as summarized by Jamil Salmi of the World Bank, are three factors: a concentration of talent, abundant resources, and favourable governance. “The first and perhaps foremost determinant of excellence is the presence of a critical mass of top students and outstanding faculty. World-class universities are able to select the best students and attract the most qualified professors and researchers” (Salmi 2011: 228; see also Altbach and Balán 2007).

19 The following three tables and their brief analysis is extracted from a forthcoming paper written by Marek Kwiek and Dominik Antonowicz, “Changing academic work and

The respondents were also asked to react to the following statement: “This is a poor time for any young person to begin an academic career in my field”. As Table 2 below shows, this view is shared most frequently by both senior and junior academics in universities in Austria and Italy (1.8-2.0). The most optimistic views regarding academic career opportunities for young people come from Norway, Switzerland and the Netherlands (Norwegian junior and senior academics showing the highest optimism in Europe, rated at 3.7 and 3.4, respectively). It is interesting to note that the career opportunities are not viewed most pessimistically in those countries where academics express a low degree of job satisfaction. Academics in the United Kingdom and Portugal – i.e. the countries with a low average job satisfaction – do not view the future of young academics as especially bleak.

Table 2: *Junior and senior academics’ assessment of young persons’ academic career prospects (arithmetic mean, universities)*

	2010					2007/08						
	AT	CH	IE	PL	NL	DE	FI	IT	NO	PT	UK	
Senior academics	1.8	3.2	2.6	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.5	2.0	3.4	2.9	2.6	
Junior academics	1.8	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.7	1.8	3.7	2.9	2.6	

Question B5: Please indicate your views on the following question: “This is a poor time for any young person to begin an academic career in my field”. Responses 1 and 2 on a scale from 1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree.

Job satisfaction was also addressed by an additional statement posed in the questionnaire: “If I had it to do over again, I would not become an academic”. Actually, on average across countries, 15% of the senior academics and 17% of the junior academics stated that they would not do again. As Table 3 below shows, the most negative views are expressed in this respect by academics at universities in the United Kingdom (22% among seniors and 30% among juniors). It is worth noting the responses by academics in Finland: while senior academics respond very positively to this statement with only 9% of negative responses, juniors were among those reacting quite negatively (20%).

working conditions in Europe from a comparative quantitative perspective”, in: Ulrich Teichler and Ester Ava Höhle (eds.), *The Work Situation, the Views and the Activities of the Academic Profession: Findings of a Questionnaire Survey in Twelve European Countries*. Dordrecht: Springer (2012).

Table 3: *Junior and senior academics views on whether they would become academics again (per-cent, universities)*

	2010					2007/08					
	AT	CH	IE	PL	NL	DE	FI	IT	NO	PT	UK
Senior academics	16	13	14	17	18	17	9	9	15	15	22
Junior academics	17	14	13	18	15	19	20	15	17	15	30

Question B5: Please indicate your views on the following question: “If I had it to do over again, I would not become an academic”. Responses 1 and 2 on a scale from 1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree.

Overall, the European picture of the academic profession differs considerably from the American picture where the share of contingent faculty has been substantially increasing, first (as reported by Finkelstein 2010: 214) as part-time appointments (in the 1970s and the 1980s) and then (in the 1990s and the 2000s) as full-time non-tenure track appointments. The phenomenon of increasing numbers of contingent staff is much less prominent in European systems where full-time employment dominates and therefore higher job stability is reported. Viewed from a global perspective, already in the 1990s, European academic employment patterns were substantially different from American ones: as Philip Altbach reported about global developments a decade ago, “a growing portion of the profession is part time, and many full-time academics are employed in positions that do not lead to long-term appointments. The traditional full-time permanent academic professor, ‘the gold standard’ of academe, is increasingly rare” (Altbach 2000: ix). Europe, by comparative standards, still provides globally unique academic workplaces (as it provides a unique, although under renegotiation, European welfare state model).

There are two crucial dimensions in the context of the attractiveness of academic careers in European systems. Firstly, it is linked to academic income. Secondly, it is linked to the combination of, or balance between, teaching and research (as the EU communication rightly stresses, “the reform and modernization of Europe’s higher education depends on the competence and motivation of teachers and researchers”, EC 2011a: 5; motivation clearly referring to both dimensions). The academic income is an important factor determining the overall shape of the academic profession: it is connected to the ability of academic institutions to attract and to retain able individuals (Schuster and Finkelstein 2006: 234). Competitive salaries can also be expected to draw the brightest graduates and doctoral students to the academic profession, especially that universities, following the New Public Management rationales, are increasingly treated like other organizations from both the public and private sectors. The prestige of the

academic profession in Europe is still relatively high but, globally, it is diminishing (Altbach *et al.* 2009). Young academics are being compared to young professionals, and university professors are being compared to advanced professionals (a unique study comparing incomes of researchers and professionals in European Union countries was published in 2007: *Remuneration of Researchers in the Public and Private Sectors*, EC 2007). High job security and a relatively friendly, non-competitive work place is increasingly less common globally, but this is also true throughout Europe, as reported by such EUROAC/CAP indicators as personal stress, individual affiliations, academic freedom along with pressures to publish or pressures to obtain competitive, outside funding.

Academic salaries are crucial parameters of working conditions; they are crucial for maintaining optimism among academics and among those recruited to the academic profession in the future. And they are crucial for those nations which realistically consider having “world-class” institutions (Altbach and Salmi 2011; see Schuster and Finkelstein 2006: 234-286). University professors in Europe and in North America have traditionally been members of the middle classes and their financial status in the post-war period was relatively stable. In most European countries, though, over the last two decades, academic incomes seem not to have caught up with the incomes of other professionals. References to the “proletarianisation” of the academic profession have been heard ever more strongly within higher education research in the last decade (see, for instance, Amaral 2007, Fulton and Holland 2001, Fulton 2000, Enders and de Weert 2009), and the financial instability of the professoriate may grow higher under the conditions of a global financial crisis.

The growing complexity of the academic enterprise discussed throughout this chapter may change the professional optimism among academics and the resulting academic commitment to university missions, still prevailing in most European systems. And optimism and commitment is needed in the midst of ongoing and envisaged reforms.

So far, the general rules regarding the academic status and remuneration have been clear: “along with full-time commitment, salaries must be sufficient to support a middle-class lifestyle. ... professors must be solid members of the middle class in their country”, as Altbach (2007: 105) put it. In all the European countries studied, the above condition still seems to be met for senior academics. But in ever more complicated settings, overburdened, overworked, and frustrated academics would not be able to make European universities attractive. With a new, more pessimistic academic mind-set, the complexity of the academic enterprise would be even more complex than assumed here.

Attractive higher education systems should be able to offer academics competitive career opportunities. The widening of the gap between the economic

status of academics and other professionals in Europe (visible to varying degrees in different countries, in some academic disciplines more than in others, EC 2007) needs to be stopped, at least in top national research institutions, to avoid further “graying” of the academic profession and to make universities a possible career option for the best young talents. Stopping the process of this widening gap would consequently stop what Alberto Amaral recently called “the gradual proletarianisation of the academic professions – an erosion of their relative class and status advantages” (Amaral 2007: 8).

Traditionally, the role of research in academia was clearly defined: as Burton Clark formulated it, “it is research, as a task and as a basis for status, that makes the difference. ... The minority of academics who are actively engaged in research lead the profession in all important respects. Their work mystifies the profession, generates its modern myths, and throws up its heroes” (Clark 1987: 102). And the attractiveness of European higher education, and especially of European research universities, has traditionally been in its ability to combine the two core missions (teaching and research). The academic prestige and institutional promotions in research universities are still related exclusively to research achievements. There is no difference between a few decades ago and today: as Clark put it in his study of the academic profession:

the prestige hierarchy dictates that the research imperative propels the system. ... Individual professors and their institutions ascend in the hierarchy to any substantial degree by investing in research and offering some new results. If the lower reaches of the hierarchy exhibit an unparalleled massive commitment to open-access teaching, the commanding heights insist on an intense commitment to research (Clark 1987: 101).

Research is done “in time freed from teaching”, professors are “saving hours for research” and time spent on teaching is “time diverted”: “it may be mandated, but it steals away from something more basic and is seen as more of a burden; more time for research is not. Time spent on administration, we may note, is widely viewed as wasted, often not even regarded as a legitimate demand” (Clark 1987: 72-73).²⁰ These perceptions seem to be valid in the European

20 Time is critical: there appears to be an issue here of the possible “cross-subsidization of research by teaching”, not in terms of financial resources but of faculty time. Faculty members, particularly in research universities, value research over teaching because, as Dill argues, among other things, “in competitive research and labour markets, which are becoming more common around the world, time spent on research can lead to increased grant revenue and future earnings for the individual faculty member” (Dill 2005: 181). In Europe, in the EUROAC/CAP survey, academics were asked to show their preferences in the two areas of their academic work: research and teaching activity. The majority of ac-

university sector, and especially in European research-intensive universities. Therefore more differentiation and a stronger segmentation of the academic profession is needed, as is more intra-institutional and inter-institutional differentiation as well as stronger segmentation in national higher education systems (e.g. flagship universities or flagship faculties, with additional public funding).²¹ These perceptions seem to be still cherished by those academics who view their primary interest as research: time spent on teaching competes directly with time spent on research, considering that the time spent on administration cannot be easily reduced, and there are powerful tensions between both university missions, with the resulting personal stress revealed through the EUROAC survey (on the trade-offs between teaching and research time being central to European universities, see Enders and Teichler 1997, and Bonaccorsi *et al.* 2007: 166).

The complexity of the academic enterprise is also increasing because academic activities are becoming increasingly diversified: the ability to raise money and to manage research projects based on external funding, as Musselin points out with reference to Germany and the US, “is no longer something academics can do: it is something they must do” (Musselin 2007b: 177). Not surprisingly, “the traditional job of the professor is expanding to include entirely new kinds of responsibilities” (Altbach 2007: 153). This seems to be increasingly the case throughout most competitive European higher education systems. Consequently, this is “blurring boundaries between traditional roles and quasi-entrepreneurial roles” (Enders and Musselin 2008: 145).

The concentration of research funding in selected research areas and in selected institutions or their constituent parts, supported strongly by the ideas of world-class universities and various national research schemes directed to existing or emergent flagship universities – leading to the further differentiation, stratification, and segmentation of higher education – may put the academic profession in the eye of the storm. While further systematic concentration of talent and resources in the most competitive academic places is unavoidable, it also means the deprivation of other, less competitive places, of

academics in most countries in the university sector declared that they prefer “both teaching and research” but with a strong emphasis on research.

- 21 The concerns of the 2000s have not been different from those of the past: as Gareth Williams showed referring to the 1980s where the concerns were (1) the amount of public expenditure, (2) changing priorities within higher education, (3) sources of funds, and (4) mechanisms of resource allocation (Williams 1992: 1). The Polish reforms of 2008-2011 can be summarized along these four financial lines.

academic talents and resources (see Geuna 2001 on the unintended consequences of a competitive rationale in research funding).²²

To sum up this final section: almost all the emergent complexities of the academic enterprise expected in the coming decade, directly or indirectly, refer to the academic profession. Both academics and academic institutions are highly adaptable to external circumstances and change has always been the defining feature of national higher education systems. Academics are clever creatures and operate within clever academic institutional cultures, with the necessary balance of change and stability always at play. But the sweeping changes potentially expected now are far-reaching indeed, and go to the very heart of academia. Traditionally, universities demonstrated what Ulrich Teichler called a “successful mix of effective adaptation and resistance to the adaptations it was called to make” but today the research university in Europe is more endangered than ever before (Teichler 2006: 169). It might even become a “historical parenthesis”, as a subtitle of a book on *The European Research University* runs (Neave, Blücker and Nybom 2006). From the perspective of the academic profession, the interplay of change and stability, or change and continuity, and its perceptions by the academic community, is one of the most important parameters for the on-going higher education reforms. The “modernization agenda of European universities” promoted in the last few years by the European Commission, to be successful, needs to take into account the specificity of the academic sector and the specificity of the academic profession.

5. Conclusions

There are several conclusions to be drawn. First, the scope of changes envisioned regarding all major aspects of higher educational operations (management, governance, funding, missions, human resources) is much bigger than commonly believed. The changes contemplated by policymakers, at both national and especially supranational levels, are structural, fundamental and go to the very heart of the academic enterprise. The university business is becoming more complex than ever in history due to a variety of interrelated factors.

22 Jack H. Schuster referred to the increasingly stratified academic status as one of the features of an emergent new paradigm in higher education (which he terms the “stratified university”). It represents “a kind of reversion to a more highly layered, even more castelike university of long ago”, and is characterized by off-track full-time academic appointments, a serious threat to tenure, and more sharply differentiated compensation packages for faculty (within institutions, by institutional types, and across institutions by disciplines, Schuster 2011: 8).

Second, the current complexity of the academic enterprise is related to the biggest public investments in this sector in history; the highest numbers of those involved, students and academics alike, in history; and its high and increasing relevance to economic growth and job creation in knowledge-driven economies. It is also related to the increasing expectations from society and policymakers.

And third, there are no one-size fits all types of answer, across all European systems, to the dilemmas indicated at the beginning of this chapter. But at the same time – due to globalization, Europeanization and internationalization – idiosyncratic, specifically national answers to them are ever more problematic in an increasingly interconnected world. Europe, and its emergent common higher education and research areas, provides a perfect example of seeking common answers to the questions posed by the increasing complexity of the academic enterprise.²³

References

- Aldrich, H. E. (1979/2008). *Organizations and Environments*. Stanford Business Books: Stanford.
- Altbach, P. G. (2007). *Tradition and Transition: The International Imperative in Higher Education*. Chestnut Hill: CIHE.
- Altbach, P. G., ed. (2000). *The Changing Academic Workplace: Comparative Perspectives*. Chestnut Hill: CIHE Boston College.
- Altbach, P. G., ed. (2002). *The Decline of the Guru: The Academic Profession in Developing and Middle-Income Countries*. Chestnut Hill: CIHE Boston College.
- Altbach, P. G., L. Reisberg, L. E. Rumbley (2009). *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution. A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Altbach, P. G. and J. Balán, eds. (2007). *World Class Worldwide. Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Altbach, P. G. and J. Salmi, eds. (2011). *The Road to Academic Excellence. The Making of World-Class Research Universities*. Washington DC: the World Bank.
- Amaral, A. (2007). “Higher Education and Quality Assessment. The Many Rationales for Quality”. In: Lucien Bollaert *et al.* (eds.), *Embedding Quality Culture in Higher Education*. Brussels: EUA.
- Amaral, A., and I. Bleiklie, C. Musselin, eds. (2008). *From Governance to Identity*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Amaral, A., G. Neave, Ch. Musselin and P. Maassen (2009). *European Integration and the Governance of Higher Education and Research*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Barr, Nicholas (2004). *Economics of the welfare state*. (4th ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

23 *Acknowledgement: the author gratefully acknowledges the support of the National Research Council (NCN) through its grant DEC-2011/02/A/HS6/00183.*

- Becher, T. and M. Kogan (1980). *Process and Structure in Higher Education*. London: Heinemann.
- Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the Marketplace. The Commercialization of Higher Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bonaccorsi, A. and C. Daraio, eds. (2007). *Universities and Strategic Knowledge Creation. Specialization and Performance in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bonaccorsi, Andrea, Cinzia Daraio and Léopold Simar 2007. Efficiency and Productivity in European Universities: Exploring Trade-offs in the Strategic Profile. In: A. Bonaccorsi and C. Daraio (eds.), *Universities and Strategic Knowledge Creation. Specialization and Performance in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. 144-207.
- Breneman, D. W. and Ch. E. Finn, eds. (1978). *Public Policy and Private Higher Education*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Brint, S. (2007). "Can Public Research Universities Compete?". In: R. L. Geiger, C. L. Colbeck, R. L. Williams and C. K. Anderson (eds.), *Future of the American Public Research University*. Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense. 91-120.
- Brunsson, N. (2009). *Reform as Routine. Organizational Change and Stability in the Modern World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brunsson, N. and J. P. Olsen (1998). "Organizational Theory: Thirty Years of Dismantling, and then...?". In: N. Brunsson and J. P. Olsen (eds.), *Organizing Organizations*. Copenhagen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Brunsson, N. and J. P. Olsen (1993). *The Reforming Organization*. Copenhagen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Calhoun, C. (2006). "The University and the Public Good". *Thesis Eleven*. No. 84. February 2006.
- Calhoun, C. (2011). The Public Mission of the Research University. In: D. Rhoten, C. Calhoun (eds.), *Knowledge Matters. The Public Mission of the Research University*. New York: Columbia UP. 1-33.
- Carnegie Report (1977). *The States and Private Higher Education. Problems and policies in a New Era. A Report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cerych, L. and P. Sabatier (1986). *Great Expectations and Mixed Performance. The Implementation of Higher Education Reforms in Europe*. Trentham: Trentham Books.
- CHEPS (2010). *Progress in Higher Education Reform Across Europe. Funding Reform*. Enschede: CHEPS.
- Clancy, P. and D. D. Dill, eds. (2009). *The Research Mission of the University. Policy Reforms and Institutional Response*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Sense.
- Clark, B. (1983). *The Higher Education System. Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clark, B. (1987). *The Academic Life. Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clark, B. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities. Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- De Weert, E. (2009). "The Organised Contradictions of Teaching and Research: Reshaping the Academic Profession". In: J. Enders and E. de Weert (eds.), *The Changing Face of Academic Life. Analytical and Comparative Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave. 134-154.

- Dill, D. D. (2005). "The Degradation of the Academic Ethic: Teaching, Research and the Renewal of Professional Self-Regulation". In: R. Barnett (ed.), *Reshaping the University. New Relationships between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*. Maidenhead: Open University Press. 178-191.
- Dill, D. D. and F. A. Van Vught, eds. (2010). *National Innovation and the Academic Research Enterprise*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP.
- EC (2011a). "Supporting Growth and Jobs – an Agenda for the Modernisation of Europe's Higher Education". Brussels: COM(2011) 567 final.
- EC (2011b). Commission Staff Working Document accompanying the document "Supporting Growth and Jobs – an Agenda for the Modernisation of Europe's Higher Education". Brussels: SEC(2011) 1063 final.
- EC (2011c). "An EU Strategy for Modernising Higher Education – Questions and Answers". Brussels: Memo/11/615.
- EC (2006). "Delivering on the Modernisation Agenda for universities: Education, Research, and Innovation". Brussels: COM(2006) 208 final.
- EC (2007). *Remuneration of Researchers in the Public and Private Sectors*. Brussels: the European Commission.
- Enders, J. and C. Musselin (2008). "Back to the Future? The Academic Professions in the 21st Century". In: OECD, *Higher Education to 2030. Volume 1: Demography*. Paris: OECD. 125-150.
- Enders, J. and E. de Weert (2004). *The International Attractiveness of the Academic Workplace in Europe*. Frankfurt: GEW.
- Enders, J. and E. de Weert (2009). "Towards a T-shaped Profession: Academic Work and Career in the Knowledge Society". In: J. Enders and E. de Weert (eds.), *The Changing Face of Academic Life. Analytical and Comparative Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave. 251-272.
- Enders, J. and E. de Weert, eds. (2009). *The Changing Face of Academic Life. Analytical and Comparative Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave.
- Enders, J. and O. Fulton, eds. (2002). *Higher Education in a Globalising World. International Trends and Mutual Observations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Enders, J. and U. Teichler (1997). "A Victim of Their Own Success? Employment and Working Conditions of Academic Staff in Comparative Perspective". *Higher Education*. Vol. 34. 347-374.
- Enders, J., ed. (2000). *Employment and Working Conditions of Academic Staff in Europe*. Frankfurt: GEW.
- Enders, J., ed. (2001). *Academic Staff in Europe. Changing Contexts and Conditions*. Westport and London: Greenwood Press.
- Finkelstein, M. (2010). "The Balance between Teaching and Research in the Work Life of American Academics, 1992-2007: is it changing?". In: RIHE (2010). 213-233.
- Foray, D. (2006). *The Economics of Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: the MIT Press.
- Fulton O. and C. Holland (2001). "Profession or Proletariat: Academic Staff in the United Kingdom after Two Decades of Change". In: J. Enders (ed.), *Academic Staff in Europe. Changing Contexts and Conditions*. Westport and London: Greenwood Press.
- Fulton, O. (2000). "Academic Staff in the United Kingdom". In: J. Enders (ed.), *Employment and Working Conditions of Academic Staff in Europe*. Frankfurt a/Main: GEW.

- Geiger, R. L. (2004). *Knowledge and Money. Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Geiger, R. L., C. L. Colbeck, R. L. Williams and C. K. Anderson, eds. (2007). *Future of the American Public Research University*. Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense.
- Geuna, A. (2001). "The Changing Rational for European University Research Funding: Are There Negative Unintended Consequences?". *Journal of Economic Issues*. Vol. XXXV. No. 3. 607-632.
- Geuna, A. (1999). *The Economics of Knowledge Production. Funding and Structure of University Research*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Hannan, M. T. and J. Freeman (1989). *Organizational Ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hannan, M. T., L. Pólos and G. R. Carroll (2007). *Logics of Organization Theory. Audiences, Codes, and Ecologies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Iversen, T. (2005). *Capitalism, Democracy, and Welfare*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Jakobi, A., K. Martens and K.D. Wolf (2010). *Education in Political Science. Discovering a Neglected Field*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnstone, D. B. (2006). *Financing Higher Education. Cost-Sharing in International Perspective*. Boston: CIHE.
- Johnstone, D. B. (2007). "Financing the American Public Research University: Lessons from an International Perspective". In Geiger *et al.* 55-70.
- Johnstone, D. B. and P. N. Marcucci (2007). *Worldwide Trends in Higher Education Finance: Cost-Sharing, Student Loans, and the Support of Academic Research*. Prepared for the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education. Available from: www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/IntHigherEdFinance.html
- Jones, G. A., P. L. McCarney and M. K. Skolnik, eds. (2005). *Creating Knowledge, Strengthening Nations. The Changing Role of Higher Education*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kahin, B. and D. Foray, eds. (2006). *Advancing Knowledge and the Knowledge Economy*. Cambridge: the MIT Press.
- Kogan, M. and S. Hanney (2000). *Reforming Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Krücken, G. and F. Meier (2006). "Turning the University into an Organizational Actor". In: Drori *et al.* (2006).
- Krücken, G., A. Kosmützky and M. Torca, eds. (2007). *Towards a Multiversity? Universities between Global Trends and National Traditions*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.
- Kwiek, M. (2005). "The University and the State in a Global Age: Renegotiating the Traditional Social Contract?" *European Educational Research Journal*. Vol. 4. No. 4. December 2005. 324-341.
- Kwiek, M. (2006). *The University and the State. A Study into Global Transformations*. Frankfurt a/Main and New York: Peter Lang.
- Kwiek, M. (2007a). "The University and the Welfare State in Transition. Changing Public Services in a Wider Context". In: D. Epstein *et al.* (eds.), *World Yearbook of Education 2008: Geographies of Knowledge, Geometries of Power*. New York: Routledge. 32-50.
- Kwiek, M. (2007b). "The Future of the Welfare State and Democracy: the Effects of Globalization from a European Perspective". In: E. Czerwinska-Schupp (ed.), *Globalisation and Ethical Norms*. Frankfurt – New York: Peter Lang. 2007. 147-172.

- Kwiek, M. (2008a), "On Accessibility and Equity, Market Forces and Entrepreneurship: Developments in Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe". *Higher Education Management and Policy*. Vol. 20, issue 1 (March). 89-110.
- Kwiek, M. (2008b), "Entrepreneurialism and Private Higher Education in Europe". In: M. Shattock (ed.), *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy: Diversification and Organizational Change in European Higher Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press. 100-120.
- Kwiek, M. (2008c). "The Two Decades of Privatization in Polish Higher Education. Cost-Sharing, Equity and Access". In: J. Knight (ed.), *Financing Higher Education: Equity and Access*. Sense Publishers: Rotterdam. 35-56.
- Kwiek, Marek (2008d). „Academic Entrepreneurship vs. Changing Governance and Institutional Management Structures at European Universities”. *Policy Futures in Education*. Vol. 6. No. 6. 2008.
- Kwiek, M. (2009). "The Changing Attractiveness of European Higher Education". In: B. Kehm, J. Huisman and B. Stensaker (eds.), *The European Higher Education Area: Perspectives on a Moving Target*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Sense Publishers. 107-124.
- Kwiek, M. (2010a). "Creeping Marketization: Where Polish Private and Public Higher Education Sectors Meet". In: R. Brown (ed.), *Higher Education and the Market*. New York: Routledge. 133-146.
- Kwiek, M. (2010b). *Transformacje uniwersytetu. Zmiany instytucjonalne i ewolucje polityki edukacyjnej w Europie*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Kwiek, M. (2011a). "The Public/Private Dynamics in Polish Higher Education: demand-absorbing private growth and its implications". *Higher Education Forum*. Vol. 8. March 2011. 121-146.
- Kwiek, M. (2011b). "Universities and Knowledge Production in Central Europe. In: P. Temple (ed.), *Universities in the Knowledge Economy. Higher Education Organisation and Global Change*. New York: Routledge. 176-195.
- Kwiek, M. (2012a). "Public-Private Intersectoral Competition: Fees and Declining Demographics". *Compare. A Journal of Comparative and International Education*. Vol. 42. No. 1. 153-157.
- Kwiek, M. (2012b). "Universities, Regional Development and Economic Competitiveness: the Polish Case". In: R. Pinheiro, P. Benneworth and G. Jones (eds.), *Universities and Regional Development. A Critical Assessment of Tensions and Contradictions*. New York: Routledge. 69-85.
- Kwiek, M. (2012c). "Changing Higher Education Policies: From the Deinstitutionalization to the Reinstitutionalization of the Research Mission in Polish Universities". *Science and Public Policy*. Vol. 39. Issue 5. 1-14 (doi:10.1093/scipol/scs042).
- Kwiek, M. (2012c). *Knowledge Production in European Universities. States, Academics, and Academic Entrepreneurialism*. Frankfurt and New York: Peter Lang.
- Kwiek, M. and P. Maassen, eds. (2012). *National Higher Education Reforms in a European Context: Comparative Reflections on Poland and Norway*. Peter Lang: Frankfurt and New York.
- Kwiek, M. and D. Antonowicz (2012). "Changing academic work and working conditions in Europe from a comparative quantitative perspective". In: U. Teichler and E. A. Höhle (eds.), *The Work Situation, the Views and the Activities of the Academic Profession: Findings of a Questionnaire Survey in Twelve European Countries*. Dordrecht: Springer.

- Levine, A. and Associates (1990). *Shaping Higher Education's Future: Demographic Realities and Opportunities, 1990-2000*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Leydesdorff, L. (2006). *The Knowledge-Based Economy: Modeled, Measured, Simulated*. Boca Raton: Universal Publishers.
- Lutz, W. and C. Wilson (2006). "Introduction". In: W. Lutz, R. Richter and C. Wilson (eds.), *The New Generations of Europeans. Demography and Families in the Enlarged European Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maassen, P. and J. P. Olsen, eds. (2007). *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- March, J. and J. P. Olsen (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions. The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: The Free Press.
- Marginson, S. (2006). "Putting 'Public' Back into the Public University". *Thesis Eleven*. No. 84. February 2006.
- Marginson, S. (2007). "The Public/Private Divide in Higher Education: A Global Revision". *Higher Education*. No. 53.
- Marginson, S. (2011). "Higher Education and Public Good". *Higher Education Quarterly* (in press).
- Martens, K. and A. K. Nagel, M. Windzio, A. Weymann (2010). *Transformation of Education Policy*. New York: Palgrave.
- Martens, K. and A. Rusconi, K. Leuze (2007). *New Arenas of Education Governance*. New York: Palgrave.
- Massy, W. F. (2003). *Honoring the Trust. Quality and Cost Containment in Higher Education*. Bolton: Anker.
- McMahon, W. (2009). *Higher Learning, Greater Good. The Private and Social Benefits of Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP.
- Merton, R. K. (1973). "The Matthew Effect in Science". In: R. K. Merton, *The Sociology of Science. Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.
- Millett, J. D. (1962). *The Academic Community. An Essay on Organization*. McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organization*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Musselin, C. (2007a). Are Universities Specific Organizations?. In: G. Krücken, A. Kosmützky and M. Torca (eds.), *Towards a Multiversity? Universities between Global Trends and National Traditions*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.
- Musselin, C. (2007b). Transformation of Academic Work: Facts and Analysis. In: M. Kogan and U. Teichler (eds.), *Key Challenges to the Academic Profession*. Paris and Kassel: INCHER. 175-190.
- Neave, G. (2002). "On Stakeholders, Cheshire Cats and Seers: Changing Visions of the University". In: *The CHEPS Inaugural Lectures 2002*. Enschede: CHEPS.
- Neave, G. and F. A. van Vught, eds. (1991). *Prometheus Bound. The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Europe*. Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press.
- Neave, G. and F. A. van Vught, eds. (1994). *Government and Higher Education Relationships Across Three Continents. The Winds of Change*. Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press.

- Neave, G., K. Blücker and T. Nybom, eds. (2006). *The European Research University. An Historical Parenthesis?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Novoa, A. and M. Lawn (2002). *Fabricating Europe. The Formation of an Educational Space*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- OECD (2008). *Higher Education to 2030. Volume 1. Demography*. Paris: OECD.
- Olsen, J. P. (2008). "Change and Continuity. An institutional approach to institutions of democratic government". ARENA Working Paper No. 15, June 2008.
- Olsen, J. P. (1998). "Institutional Design in Democratic Contexts". In N. Brunsson and Johan P. Olsen (eds.), *Organizing Organizations*. Copenhagen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Paradeise, C., E. Reale, I. Bleiklie, E. Ferlie, eds. (2009). *University Governance. Western European Comparative Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Palfreyman D. and T. Tapper, eds. (2009). *Structuring Mass Higher Education. The Role of Elite Institutions*. London: Routledge.
- Perkin, H. (1969). *Key Profession. The History of the Association of University Teachers*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Pestieau, P. (2006). *The welfare state in the European Union: Economic and social perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pierson, P. (2001). "Coping with Permanent Austerity: Welfare State Restructuring in Affluent Democracies". In: Pierson (ed.), *The New Politics of the Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 410-456.
- Pfeffer, J., G. R. Salancik (2003). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Powell, J., J. Hendricks, eds. (2009). *The Welfare State in Post-Industrial Society. A Global Perspective*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Ramirez, F. O. (2006). "The rationalization of universities". In: M.-L. Djelic, K. Sahlin-Andersson (eds.), *Transnational Governance: Institutional Dynamics of Regulation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 225-244.
- Rizvi, F. (2006). "The Ideology of Privatization in Higher Education: A Global perspective". In: D. M. Priest, E. P. St. John (eds.), *Privatization and Public Universities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 65-84.
- Rothblatt, S., B. Wittrock, eds. (1993). *The European and American university since 1800: Historical and sociological essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rüegg, W., ed. (2011). *A History of the University in Europe. Volume IV: Universities since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schuster, J. H. (2011). "The Professoriate's Perilous Path", in J. C. Hermanowicz (ed.), *The American Academic Profession. Transformation in Contemporary Higher Education*. Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins UP.
- Schuster, J. H. and M. J. Finkelstein (2006). *The American Faculty. The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Scott, P. (2005). "Divergence or Convergence? The Links between Teaching and Research in Mass Higher Education". In: R. Barnett (ed.), *Reshaping the University. New Relationships between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*. Maidenhead: Open University Press. 53-66.
- Scott, W. R., R. Levitt and R. J. Orr, eds. (2011). *Global Projects: Institutional and Political Challenges*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Shattock, M., ed. (2008). *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy. Diversification and Organizational Change in European Higher Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press and SRHE.
- Slaughter, S. and G. Rhoades (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy. Markets, State, and Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stehr, N. (2002). *Knowledge and Economic Conduct. The Social Foundations of the Modern Economy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2000). *Economics of the Public Sector. Third Edition*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Taylor-Gooby, P., ed. (2004). *New Risks, New Welfare. The Transformation of the European Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Teichler, U. (2006). "Has the Research University in Europe a Future?". In: G. Neave, K. Blücker and T. Nybom (eds.), *The European Research University. An Historical Parenthesis?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 165-176.
- Teichler, U. (2007). *Higher Education Systems. Conceptual Frameworks, Comparative Perspectives, Empirical Findings*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Teichler, U. (2009). *Higher Education and the World of Work. Conceptual Frameworks, Comparative Perspectives, Empirical Findings*. Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Teichler, U. and Y. Yagci (2009). "Changing Challenges of Academic Work: Concepts and Observations". In: V. Lynn Meek Ulrich Teichler, and Mary-Louise Kearney (eds.), *Higher Education, Research and Innovation: Changing Dynamics*. Kassel: Incher. 83-146.
- Teixeira, P., and B. Jongbloed, D. Dill, A. Amaral, eds. (2004). *Markets in Higher Education. Rhetoric or Reality?* Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2006). "What Is Changing in Academic Research? Trends and Future Scenarios". *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 41. No. 2. June 2006.
- Weber, L. and J. J. Duderstadt, eds. (2004). *Reinventing the Research University*. London: Economica.
- Whitley, R. (2010). "Reconfiguring the Public Sciences. The Impact of Governance Changes on Authority and Innovation in Public Science Systems". In: R. Whitley, J. Gläser and L. Engwall (eds.), *Reconfiguring Knowledge Production. Changing Authority Relationships in the Sciences and Their Consequences for Intellectual Innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whitley, R., J. Gläser and L. Engwall, eds. (2010). *Reconfiguring Knowledge Production. Changing Authority Relationships in the Sciences and Their Consequences for Intellectual Innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, G. (1992). *Changing Patterns of Finance in Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open UP.
- Williams, G. (2008). "Finance and Entrepreneurial Activity in Higher Education in a Knowledge Society". In: M. Shattock (2008).
- Wilson, L. (1942/1995). *The Academic Man. A Study in the Sociology of a Profession*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Welch, A., ed. (2007). *The Professoriate. Profile of a Profession*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zemsky, R., G. R. Wegner, and W. F. Massy (2004). *Remaking the American University. Market-Smart and Mission-Centered*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

**Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche
Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the
Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is
available in the internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

This publication was funded by
the European Commission and the Ministry
of Science and Higher Education in Warsaw.

ISSN 2193-7613

ISBN 978-3-631-63796-8

© Peter Lang GmbH

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Frankfurt am Main 2012

All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any
utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without
the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to
prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions,
translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in
electronic retrieval systems.

www.peterlang.de

Table of Contents

Notes on Editors.....	7
Notes on Contributors	9
<i>Barbara Kudrycka</i> Preface.....	15
<i>Jan Truszczyński</i> Foreword and Message	17
Introduction <i>Andrzej Kurkiewicz and Marek Kwiek</i> Academic Responses to the Modernisation Agenda of European Universities	19
Chapter 1 <i>Marek Kwiek</i> The Growing Complexity of the Academic Enterprise in Europe: A Panoramic View	27
Chapter 2 <i>Maria Helena Nazaré</i> People and Their Ideas: The Foundation for Inclusive European Growth.....	61
Chapter 3 <i>Peter Maassen</i> System Diversity in European Higher Education	79
Chapter 4 <i>Maria Hulicka</i> External and Internal Sources of financing for Universities. The Practice of Good Governance	97
Chapter 5 <i>Dominik Antonowicz</i> Europe 2050. New Europeans and Higher Education.....	113

Higher Education Research and Policy (HERP) · 1

Series editor

Marek Kwiek, Center for Public Policy Studies, University of Poznan, Poland

Editorial Board Members

Daniel C. Levy, Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, State University of New York, Albany, USA

Peter Maassen, Department of Educational Research, University of Oslo, Norway

Paul Temple, Centre for Higher Education Studies (CHES), Institute of Education, University of London, London, United Kingdom

Pavel Zgaga, Centre for Educational Policy Studies (CEPS), Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

The *Higher Education Research and Policy* (HERP) series is intended to present both research-oriented and policy-oriented studies of higher education systems in transition, especially from comparative international perspectives. Higher education systems worldwide are currently under multi-layered pressures to transform their funding and governance structures in rapidly changing environments. The series intends to explore the impact of such wider social and economic processes as globalization, internationalization and Europeanization on higher education institutions, and is focused on such issues as the changing relationships between the university and the state, the changing academic profession, changes in public funding and university governance, the emergent public/private dynamics in higher education, the consequences of educational expansion, education as public/private goods, and the impact of changing demographics on national systems. Its audience includes higher education researchers and higher education policy analysts, university managers and administrators, as well as national policymakers and the staff of international organizations involved in higher education policymaking



PETER LANG

Frankfurt am Main · Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

Marek Kwiek / Andrzej Kurkiewicz (Eds.)

**The Modernisation
of European Universities**
Cross-National Academic Perspectives



PETER LANG

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften