

Marek Kwiek

## **Reforming European Universities: The Welfare State as a Missing Context**

### **Introduction**

This chapter is focused on the links between reform agendas and their rationales in higher education and in welfare state services in Europe. Lessons learnt from past and ongoing, and recently accelerating welfare state reforms, following the fiscal crisis, can be useful in understanding ongoing and future higher education reforms. Research on reforming European welfare states is a missing context in research on reforming European universities. We intend to fill this gap and explore briefly possible links between the two largely isolated policy and research areas.

European universities and European welfare states are closely linked today because they are heavily dependent on public funding – and the competition for public funding between the different claimants to it is on the rise. Reforms of both sectors are also closely linked to increasing intergenerational conflicts over public resources in aging societies, and pressures on both sectors are linked to the shrinking tax base, the power of the neoliberal ideology, and changing social attitudes to both welfare and universities. Problems of both sectors (which are high-spenders in terms of public funding) and solutions to them are increasingly being defined at a global level through transnational reform discourses. The indirect impact of aging societies on all public sector services will lead, it is argued, to growing pressures on all public expenditures and to the increased competition for all public funding. A new context of university reforms in Europe is therefore welfare state reforms. Thinking about university reforms in isolation from ongoing public sector reforms, from the ongoing fierce competition for public funding caused by the aging of European societies, and from future intergenerational conflicts over public resources, is potentially harmful to the university sector. The myth of exceptionalism of higher education among other public sector institutions and of its immunity from global public-sector reform trends increases the chances that higher education will be reformed mostly from the outside rather than mostly from the inside. We believe that it is important for the academic community to understand reforms in the higher education sector – and their rationales – in a wider social, political and economic context, so that the academic community can steer the changes rather than drift with them. Without such wider understanding of changing social realities, the sector may be more vulnerable to externally-driven instrumental reforms.

Higher education in its traditional European forms has been largely publicly-funded. Its post-war period of growth in Europe coincided with the development of post-war welfare states across the continent. Massification processes in European higher education were closely linked to the growth and consolidation of European welfare states. Currently, while massification (and universalization) processes in higher education are in full swing across Europe (Marginson 2016a, 2016b) – welfare states are under the most far-reaching restructuring in their postwar history (Bonoli and Natali 2012, Powell and Hendricks 2009, Hemerijck 2013, Palier 2010, Häusermann 2010, and Connelly and Hayward 2012). On top of that, European welfare states may be at risk of becoming a “crisis casualty in the cascade of violent economic, social, and political aftershocks, unleashed by the global financial crisis” (Hemerijck 2013: 1). Reforming European universities and reforming European welfare states go hand in hand: drivers of change are parallel, and overall reform agendas and rationales (financial and ideological) are similar. Universities, increasingly treated as public sector organizations rather than traditionally exceptional academic institutions, are expecting new waves of reforms. On the one hand, “modern society is highly reformistic” (Brunsson 2009: 1), and, consequently, “reforms tend to generate new reforms. Reforms often result from previous reforms, and the outcome of reforms is often new reforms: reforms tend to be self-referential” (Brunsson and Olsen 1993: 42–47). But on the other hand, a notion that changes in higher education can be mandated is “simplistic” (Kezar 2014: xiii). This is clearly the case of most European higher education systems today.

Despite changes in governance, management and funding of European universities of the last thirty years, policymakers across the continent seem systematically focused on further structural changes (Horta et al. 2008). European-level developments and European-level and global debates (such as the Bologna Process, Europe 2020 Strategy, “agenda for the modernization of Europe’s higher education systems” or OECD’s AHELO: “Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes” etc.) powerfully support these reformist attitudes (Maassen and Olsen 2007). The emergent picture is clear: “the rate of intended change has accelerated to unprecedented levels” (Enders et al. 2011: 1) and “the signs and portents of change are everywhere (Schuetze 2012: 4, Kwiek 2013a). With a clear reservation, though: “reform is not equivalent to change. An organization may undergo several reforms and emerge with little change. During a certain limited time, some people may merely describe the organization in a new way, with no other consequences for the organization’s activities” (Brunsson 2009: 6). While this is not the case for welfare state architectures in most European countries, this might be the case for higher education architectures in some of them

(and Poland until recently was a perfect example of higher education reforms not leading to a reformed system or its institutions; not any more, see Kwiek 2012, 2016).

On reading national governmental strategies and international and transnational reports on the future of higher education, one can conclude that profound transformations of both the higher education sector in general and of the sector of research universities in particular are still ahead of us (EC 2011). The “modernization agenda” of European universities is strongly linked to wider organizational transformations in public sector services (Maassen and Olsen 2007, Kwiek and Kurkiewicz 2012). “Transformation” or “transformational change” is different from three other forms of change (adjustment, isolated change, and far-reaching change), though: “The depth of the change affects those underlying assumptions that tell an institution what is important; what to do, why, and how; and what to produce”, as Peter D. Eckel and Adriana Kezar note (2003: 31–33).

### **Global agenda-setting and global diffusion of ideas: between transnational and national reform priorities**

Processes of reforming universities across Europe in the last two or three decades did not lead to their “complete” reforms. They rather led to further, deeper and more structural reforms. As Enders and colleagues (2011: 1) put it recently, “nowhere today is higher education undergoing more substantial change than in Europe”. While detailed arguments in favor of reforms in the two areas studied in this chapter vary over time and across European countries, overall they seem to be increasingly convergent, especially at transnational levels represented by the OECD and the World Bank, as well as, increasingly following the 2008 economic crisis, the European Commission. The former two organizations have been the major providers of analytical frameworks, definitions, large-scale comparative datasets and extended analyses of pensions, healthcare, and higher education in the last decade, as numerous analysts show in detail. Global interests lead to global agendas and the global diffusion on the one hand and the global data collection and analysis on the other hand (Jakobi 2009 and Martens et al. 2007). The role of “international incentives for national policy-making” increases (Martens and Jakobi 2010). The OECD is a global health actor, a global pensions actor, and a global education actor. It singles out important issues and sets agendas, presents visions and values, develops scenarios, and defines guiding principles and concepts; finally, “it identifies present tendencies and future problems that are later discussed at national level” (Martens and Jakobi 2010: 9). It is able to produce and analyze large quantitative and comparative data sets and

indicators. From a global perspective, the state of education, of pensions, and of healthcare is analyzed through concepts and definitions used in major OECD publications: huge *Education at a Glance*, *Pensions at a Glance*, *Health at a Glance*, and dozens of accompanying books. Not surprisingly, in the education sector, education policy statements, including aims and means, “sound increasingly and astonishingly similar all over the world” (Jakobi 2009: 2).

Reforming welfare state and reforming higher education can be viewed from both research-focused and policy-focused angles. Apart from arguments locating higher education within the welfare state apparatus at a research level, at a policy level, with an increasingly globally convergent set of discourses, ideas, concepts, and indicators – referring increasingly to globally-produced comparable data – welfare state reforms are a useful reference point for higher education reforms. Pension, healthcare and higher education (as well as labor market) reforms across the globe are supported by global analyses of “the political economy of reforms”, with key determinants of successful structural reforms explained and case studies provided (OECD 2009), and global studies of “making reforms happen” in such areas as education, health systems and pensions (OECD 2010). Soft mechanisms involved in “OECD governance” include “idea production”, “policy evaluation”, and “data production” (Martens and Jakobi 2010: 266–268). However, global pressures and global scripts (Gornitzka and Maassen 2011) are always filtered through national cultures (Christensen et al. 2014).

The OECD (as well as the World Bank) for many years has been involved in the process of conceptualization of the aging of societies in the context of reforms of pension systems (e.g. through its *Private Pensions Series*, published for a decade). While, as it seems, for the academic world dealing with pension systems in the international comparative welfare state studies, the ten years of work of the OECD and the World Bank as an academic reference point appears to be relatively insignificant, in the world of politics (and actual policy implementation) those concepts and works are of key importance (suffice it to see a marginal role of concepts and definitions from both organizations in two recent comprehensive academic accounts of changes in healthcare in the OECD area: Rothgang et al. 2010 and Pavolini and Guillén 2013; and see a marginal role of concepts from leading European political economists involved in international comparative welfare state research in publications of both organizations). Also the relationships between research and policymaking in higher education research look quite similar, even though the contribution of the OECD (far beyond the provision of standardized comparative educational statistics) has also been substantial in the last decade. An increasing gap between research and policymaking communities in the sectors studied, however, would require a separate analysis.

Thus apart from a large and increasing body of academic work on welfare states (and especially pensions, by, for instance, Nicholas Barr, Giuliano Bonoli, Peter Taylor-Gooby, Fritz W. Scharpf and Vivien A. Schmidt, Torben Iversen, Jonas Pontusson, Paul Pierson and others), there is also a vast amount of conceptualizations of pension reforms emerging from non-academic fields, closely related to policymaking – especially in the work of OECD and World Bank experts. Pension reforms are accelerating across OECD countries; as recent *Pensions at a Glance 2013* argues in its editorial,

In OECD countries, the pension landscape has been changing at an astonishing pace over the past few years. After decades of debate and, in some cases, political standstill, many countries have launched significant pension reforms, including higher retirement ages, changes in the way entitlements are calculated and other measures to introduce savings in their pension systems (OECD 2013: 9).

Higher education in Europe has been under powerful reform pressures in the last three decades (Maassen et al. 2017, Schuetze 2012, Stensaker et al. 2012, Carvalho and Santiago 2015, Enders et al. 2011) and prominent higher education researchers viewed the changes as “dramatic”, “critical” or “fundamental”. Reforms increasingly, and throughout the European continent, tend to produce “further reforms”, though, as shown in organizational studies (Brunsson 2009: 91; Brunsson and Olsen 1993). “Many reforms of organizations are attempts to make the existing organization more like a ‘true’ one, resembling what we think an organization should be” (Brunsson 2009: 41). The modern world likes “true” and “complete” organizations, as part of its dream of rationality:

We hope to bring about agreement between the way things are and the way things ought to be. ... Through various types of reforms, we hope to change our practice in accordance with our wishes and our glowing principles. The modern world is full of such reform projects. Modern society is frantically reformative (Brunsson 2006: 11).

Despite relatively convergent global and European-level arguments in favor of reforms in higher education, there are different directions of current and projected academic restructuring in different national systems and different directions of their implementation (Kwiek 2013a, Kwiek and Maassen 2012, Kwiek and Kurkiewicz 2012). Certainly, the unpredictability and ambiguity of reform attempt is high as reforming universities “is not only about changing social structures, but also about mindsets and values of individuals” – which is not a “straightforward task” (Stensaker et al. 2012: 5). Policy implementation literature shows, though, that the role of governments in reforms and change in higher education is of critical importance; as Ase Gornitzka, Maurice Kogan and Alberto Amaral argued, “if it had been left to academics, few of the major

structural changes would have occurred” (Gornitzka et al. 2007: 10). What is clear, though, is that higher education is under powerful and accelerating reform pressures and the end of reforms, not to mention their final product, reformed systems and institutions, cannot be envisaged today. For the academic profession, permanent reforms mean high levels of stress and insecurity.

## **Aging societies and intergenerational conflicts**

We expand in this chapter the traditional scope of the term “welfare state” and instead of focusing on what some analysts term its “semantic core” (such as old-age security or healthcare), we discuss one of its “sub-fields”: namely, education (Nullmeier and Kaufmann 2010: 89). Consequently, recent paradigmatic changes in viewing welfare state futures are seen here as inevitably linked to possibly equally paradigmatic changes in viewing higher education futures. Historically, the dramatic growth of higher education coincided with the dramatic growth of welfare states in postwar Europe. Now the restructuring of the foundations of the latter may change the way both policymakers and European societies view the former (see Carvalho and Santiago 2015, Pinheiro et al. 2016).

What Stephan Leibfried and colleagues term “the golden-age constellation” of the four components of the modern nation-state (the territorial state, the constitutional state, the democratic welfare state and the interventionist state) is threatened today: “different state functions are threatened to a greater or lesser degree, and subjected to pressures for internationalization of varying intensity” (Hurrelmann et al. 2007: 9). One of the dimensions of the “golden-age constellation” under renegotiations today are higher education policies. Therefore, we move back and forth in this chapter between the institution of the university and the institution of the state, especially the welfare state: problems perceived and solutions sought for the latter institution bring about problems perceived and solutions sought for the former institution. They become as inextricably linked as never before.

New ideas leading to changes in the overall functioning of the state and public sector services in Europe can have far-reaching consequences for the functioning of European universities because of, among others, their fundamental financial dependence on tax-based state subsidization. Both the welfare state and higher education in (Continental) Europe are still heavily dependent on the public purse: what matters is the availability of public funding, the internal competition between the different claimants to public funding, and social attitudes to priorities for public funding. Changing attitudes may lead to changing priorities, and attitudes are linked to such wider processes as intergenerational competition for public resources (Kwiek 2015a, Fowles 2014).

In aging societies, priorities of older generations (such as healthcare and pensions) may be stronger than ever before, leaving higher education (rather than general education) lower on the list of social priorities (Garfinkel et al. 2010: 193). Resources can be steered “toward pensions and health care and away from educational investments for younger generations. As age conflict increases, the possibilities for age integration decline” (Dumas and Turner 2009: 51). Reforms of both sectors may be parallel but their outcomes may be depended on wider social intergenerational conflicts. In an overall context of welfare state expenditures, health care in comparison with pensions and unemployment benefits has not shown signs of retrenchment, at least until the recent crisis (Pavolini and Guillén 2013: 276, Rothgang et al. 2010: 247). But it is “in a state of permanent transformation” (Rothgang et al. 2010: 3). In general, attitudes toward the welfare state and other public institutions (including universities), following Stefan Svallfors (2012: 2), can be seen as “central components of social order, governance, and legitimacy of modern societies”. Changing attitudes may lead to changing founding ideas of social institutions, and reforms of public institutions may be – although do not have to be – a reflection of changing attitudes. If changing environments combine with changing attitudes, reforms may be deeper and policy changes – more abrupt. This may be the European case.

## Globalization and welfare state

Reforms of both sectors were accelerated by globalization pressures. Globalization powerfully affects both welfare state futures and higher education futures (Kwiek 2006, 2007). Challenges of globalization to all public sector services are also accompanied by powerful demographic challenges. As Leibfried and Mau emphasize in their introduction to a three-volume *Welfare States: Construction, Deconstruction, Reconstruction* (2008: xii), since the oil crises in the mid-1970s,

[t]he welfare state has been grappling with deep-rooted challenges. A series of major economic, social and political shifts – such as globalization, demographic pressures, individualization, persistent high unemployment, greater social diversity and fiscal scarcity – have raised the question: How sustainable is the welfare state in the long run?

In general terms, Europe is witnessing more general attempts at a reformulation of the post-war social contract which gave rise to the welfare state as we know it (with mass or universal public higher education as we know it). Europe is facing a simultaneous renegotiation of the postwar social contract concerning the welfare state in Europe (in its major variants) and the accompanying renegotiation of the modern social pact between the university and the nation-state (for a full picture, see Kwiek 2006, 2013a: 107–190). “Nation-states must balance the demands of competing claimants – leaving them with fewer options, but to make

hard choices” (Powell and Hendricks 2009: 10). The renegotiation of the (nation) state/university pact is not clear outside of the context of the changing welfare state contract, as state-funded higher education formed one of the bedrocks of the European welfare system in its major forms, and state-funded higher education remains one of its foundations. Welfare state reforms mean what was termed “modernization in hard times”:

*modernization* refers to the adaptation of existing institutional arrangements to the economic and social structures of post-industrialism: the transition to a (high-skill) service economy, high rates of temporary or long-term unemployment, flexible labor markets, the spread of atypical and female employment, family instability, and mounting demands for individualization and gender equality. The *hard times* result from the gap between declining resources and the growing (financial) needs that these modernization processes entail (Häusermann 2010: 1).

Education, including higher education, is viewed in this chapter as a significant component of the traditional welfare state. We are thereby following here Joseph E. Stiglitz’s *Economics of the Public Sector*, Nicholas Barr’s *Economic Theory and the Welfare State*; we are also following such social theorists and welfare scholars as Richard Titmuss, Francis G. Castles, Harold L. Wilensky, Peter H. Lindert, Marius R. Busemeyer and Rita Nikolai, and Irwin Garfinkel, Lee Rainwater and Timothy Smeeding; see Titmuss 1968, Castles 1989, Wilensky 2002, Barr 2004, Castells and Himanen 2002, Lindert 2004, Busemeyer and Nikolai 2010, and Garfinkel et al. 2010). Transformations to the state, and the welfare state in particular, affect – both directly and indirectly – public higher education systems in Europe. Drivers of change in both sectors are parallel, and rationales, especially at a transnational level, are structurally similar, with similar financial and ideological dimensions involved.

All wealthy nations are welfare states (Garfinkel et. al 2010: 2) and a hallmark objective of welfare state institutions is to reduce economic insecurity:

Education, health, and some forms of insurance all reduce economic insecurity. ... social welfare transfers in the form of education, health, and social insurance flow to citizens as a matter of law or entitlement and are paid for by other members of the community by law or requirement.

In knowledge-driven economies, consistently with human capital theories, higher education can be increasingly viewed as a major instrument to reduce economic insecurity, at least at an individual level. “Knowledge, and therefore education may be the single most important ingredient in reducing uncertainty and risk. ... What better way to equip citizens to cope with the economic insecurity produced by a vibrant capitalist economy than to educate them?” (Garfinkel



et al. 2010: 23). In knowledge economies, higher education can be increasingly linked to strategies of coping with individual economic insecurity and, consequently, be closer to a traditional pool of welfare services. Ongoing higher education reforms across Europe clearly see this point, stressing graduate employability and high wage premium from higher education. In very general terms, though, the question of higher education reforms is about “normative” and “operational” modes of higher education being in tune or out of phase across European systems (in Becher and Kogan’s terms: these are the two major dimensions to study higher education, Becher and Kogan 1980):

As long as the normative and operational modes are in phase with one another, the system as a whole can be said to be in dynamic equilibrium – if not in harmony, then at least in a state of balanced tension. But when the two modes become significantly out of phase, some kind of adjustment is necessary to avoid breakdown and to restore the possibility of normal functioning (Becher and Kogan 1980: 17–18).

Currently, the two modes across Europe are viewed to be out of phase (mostly by policymakers, by European societies at large, or sometimes by both; much less often by the academic community). Therefore reform pressures are strong, as “a predisposition for change is created when the normative and operational elements at any level become significantly out of phase. The situation will usually give rise to some appropriate change in belief or practice designed to restore normal functioning” (Becher and Kogan 1980: 120). Reform pressures on the welfare state provision are equally strong, if not stronger (see Kwiek 2013a for a wider panorama).

It is hardly possible to view transformations to the institution of the university without viewing transformations to the social fabric in which it has been embedded. The modern university, the product of modernity, is under the very same pressures as other modern institutions and other modern social arrangements. The possible decline of the historical exceptionality of the modern institution of the university (at least compared with the post-war period) results from the same pressures as those affecting other modern institutions – including the institutions of the state, its agencies and public services, international or supranational institutions, and institutions of the private corporate world (see Held and McGrew 2007, Hay et al. 2006, Djelic and Quack 2010 and Campbell 2004). These pressures are often lumped together as “globalization” or “knowledge economy”, both closely interrelated.

As known from organizational studies, reforms need problems and reforms need solutions: a supply of problems needs to be complemented with a supply of solutions, preferably more or less ready solutions (Brunsson and Olsen 1993: 34–42). As Brunsson argues:

Solutions, like problems, can be fabricated by those who wish to pursue reforms; but the task of reformers is easier if a supply of more or less ready solutions is available. Solutions can exert an attraction on those who pursue reforms and on those who are affected by them (Brunsson 2009: 96).

Problems of the two sectors studied are analyzed in discourses formulated at a global level, and a set of general solutions to them is also provided at a global level. Transnational reform discourses conceptualize the same problems across the developed world, provide agenda-setting and policy diffusion, supported by consistent data generation. These processes, if not directly result from globalization, are at least intensified by it.

The question debated today is not whether recasting the European welfare state has come to be seen as necessary by the national governments of most affluent Western democracies, international organizations, and global organizations and development agencies. The question rather is why it is seen as necessary, and the answers include globalization-related economic integration, demographic changes, changes in societal norms, changes in family patterns etc, and, more recently, the financial crisis. As Maurizio Ferrera explained a decade ago the fundamental logic that is guiding policy solutions to the reform processes of the welfare state: “system-wide searches for novel, economically viable, socially acceptable and politically feasible policy solutions are underway” (Ferrera 2005: 596). Solutions should thus be both fundable and socially and politically acceptable. Transition from industrial to post-industrial societies has “fundamentally challenged social policy arrangements of Western welfare states. ... In particular, the state is no more able (or willing) to protect citizens against new social risks. ... The effects of globalization on the development of welfare state are unclear. We do not yet know the specific extent to which globalization will alter socio-political systems and indeed change the course of the entire welfare state models”, as Sipilä et al. (2009: 181) emphasize.

Both higher education services and public sector services are heavily dependent on the social fabric in which they are embedded (Thomson et al. 2015). They are closely linked to individual countries (nation-states) and their shrinking or at least increasingly insufficient tax base. Their modes of governance and funding are always changeable. There is a complex interplay of influences between institutions and their environments, and different schools of thought related to change (Kezar 2014: 24–25, Eckel and Kezar 2003, and Bastedo 2012). Institutional and neo-institutional theorists show universities as perfect examples of the powerful connectedness between changes in institutions and changes in the outside world (from which they draw their resources, founding

ideas, and social legitimacy). The institution of the university in Europe may thus be undergoing a fundamental transformation – along with the traditional institution of the state in general, and the welfare state in particular.

### **“Welfare attitudes” and “university attitudes”**

Institutions change over time, and social attitudes to institutions change over time, too. What we term here “university attitudes” in European societies today may be studied in parallel to recently studied “welfare attitudes”. Stefan Svallfors’ large-scale comparative research project on “welfare attitudes” studied the legitimacy of current welfare state arrangements across European countries and the USA:

Attitudes toward the welfare state and other public institutions should be seen as central components of social order, governance, and legitimacy of modern societies. They tell us something about whether or not existing social arrangements are legitimate. Are they accepted only because people see no alternatives or think that action is futile, or are they normatively grounded? Are institutions considered to be fundamentally just or not? (Svallfors 2012: 2).

In a similar vein, questions about the existing social arrangements in higher education today – including institutional autonomy (Maassen et al. 2017) -leading to ever deeper structural reforms, are about these arrangements’ legitimacy, justice, and normative grounding (or about higher education’s institutional “raison d’être”, Olsen 2007).

Reforming higher education systems has been high on the lists of national reform agendas across the continent for twenty to thirty years now and it has often been associated with theoretical and practical attempts to reform the state, especially with reforming state-provided public services. New ideas leading to changes in the overall functioning of the state and public sector services in Europe can have far-reaching consequences for the functioning of European universities because of, among others, their fundamental financial dependence on tax-based state subsidization (unlike, for example, in the USA where the dependence on public funding has traditionally been considerably weaker). Ideas matter – what matters in this case is the last two decades of neoliberal thinking about public services and private provision of traditionally public sector services, New Public Management ideas about the public sector, and ideas associated with the state’s changing roles under globalization and European integration processes. These ideas seem to have directly and indirectly influenced policymakers’ reformistic urge to change higher education systems.

## Post-industrial societies and the foundations of the welfare state

Research literature in political sciences shows that the state is being *repositioned, recontextualized, transformed, reconstituted, re-engineered, restructured, displaced, rearticulated, relocated, re-embedded, decentered, reconfigured, reshaped, eroded* etc. We are witnessing its *end, hollowing out, withering away, demise, decline, collapse* etc. (Kwiek 2006). Many reservations need to be made but, in very general terms, the economic role of the state is changing, and the “government versus markets” issue is as pertinent today as it was one and two decades ago. Will the trend be toward continuously growing public spending and higher taxes – or toward less spending and lower taxes? Unfortunately, “no crystal ball exists that can provide us with answers to these questions” (Tanzi 2011: 7). And the direction of the trend in advanced economies matters enormously for the future of welfare states and higher education systems, and reforms of both sectors are determined to follow the trend in spending and taxes. Going against the trend for both high-spenders in the long run seems improbable, even despite favorable welfare and university attitudes.

The loyalty of citizens to their nation-states was always related to a bilateral agreement (never fully codified) about various services nation states provided, including welfare state services. Should the nation-state be threatened, so also will be its role as the primary guarantor of citizenship rights. Redefinitions of what is fair and just in a society within an array of benefits of the welfare state seem to be the easiest way out for policymakers should the welfare state be deemed non-sustainable (the “challenge of sustainability” being at the core of European capitalist welfare societies, as Frericks and Maier rightly argue, 2012). But large-scale restructuring undermines the “personal sense of security and identity as well as social solidarity.” There appear powerful tensions between “social protection” and “global connection”; as a result of globalization processes, there appears “an unprecedented pattern of social risk” (Powell and Hendricks 2009: 8–10), as the editors of *The Welfare State in Post-Industrial Society. A Global Perspective* argue. Renegotiations of the foundations of the welfare state affect the roots of the nation-state – especially the foundations of the social citizenship. And the link between the nation-state, welfare state and nation-state oriented and welfare-state supported higher education has traditionally been very close in the 20th century. As Gøsta Esping-Andersen (2009: 1) summarized recent changes,

The past few decades have been marked by turbulent change. Turbulent indeed, since the well-trodden corner stones of society, as described in any standard textbook, are eroding as new principles of social life emerge with a thrust that few would have

expected. The “logic of industrialism” used to be a forceful synthetic concept for what propelled our life as workers, our place within the social hierarchies, and the kind of life course we could expect to follow. As, now, two-thirds of economic activity is centred on servicing, the concept is clearly outmoded.

The post-industrial society shatters the foundations of welfare state assumptions of the industrial society, with new social risks and new social challenges. All four previously mentioned dimensions of the modern state are affected (the territorial state, the constitutional state, the democratic nation state, and the interventionist state, Hurrelmann et al. 2007). The golden-age nation-state is thus hugely affected by internationalization and globalization processes (Hurrelmann et al. 2007: 193–205). Globalization processes and increasing international economic integration seem to be changing the role of the nation-state: the nation state is gradually losing its power as a direct economic player and, at the same time, it is losing a significant part of its social legitimacy as it appears not to be willing, or able, to provide the welfare services seen as the foundation of postwar welfare states. Nation-states seem to prefer not to use the financial space of maneuver still left to them, even if they could be much more pro-active than reactive with respect to the impact of globalization on public services, including higher education. At the same time, “continental welfare states are hard cases for successful welfare state reform: they face both the most urgent need for modernization and the most adverse conditions for that very modernization” (Häusermann 2010: 2).

## **Institutions and their supportive discourses**

The power of the modern university in the last two hundred years resulted from the power of the accompanying discourse of modernity in which the university held a central, highlighted, specific (and carefully secured) place in European societies (Rothblatt and Wittrock 1993, Wittrock 2003, Kwiek 2006). Any relocation of the institution in the social, cultural and economic architecture of European nations requires a new discourse which legitimizes and justifies it and sustains public confidence, without which, in the long run, it is hard to maintain a high level of public trust (and, consequently, a high level of public funding).

Therefore, the struggles over future forms of the institution are also, perhaps above all, the struggles over discourses which legitimize its place: in the last decade, those struggles have intensified and for the first time became global, with the strong engagement of international and transnational organizations and institutions.

To a large extent, the future of European universities and of the levels of their public subsidization will depend on the social and political acceptance of new

legitimizing discourses currently produced around them, especially at supranational levels increasingly accepted in policymaking communities across Europe, with stronger or lighter “national filters” (see Gornitzka and Maassen 2011). Early formulations of those discourses are already being translated into national contexts, fuelling reform programs in many countries (postcommunist new EU members being prime examples of national translations of OECD reform recommendations, see Kwiek 2012). Widely accepted supportive discourses for public universities seem to be still in the making, amidst the transformations of their environments (Välismaa and Hoffman 2008).

The whole idea of the welfare state is under renegotiations, and the conditions for access to, and eligibility, for various tax-based public services are under discussions (Kwiek 2009a). It is increasingly related to possible individual contributions (co-funding and private policies in healthcare, multi-pillar schemes in pensions, and cost-sharing in higher education). Transforming governments have been following in the last two decades the rules of a zero-sum game: higher expenditures in one sector of public services or public programs (pensions or higher education) occurred at the expense of expenditures in other sectors of public services (healthcare), programs or public infrastructure (roads, railroads, law and order etc.). What was evident in the period of growth in Europe become even more evident in the recent period of economic crisis: the allocation of budget cuts is different in different countries, with higher education most affected in Hungary, Lithuania, Greece and the UK (also due to a new funding architecture of increased fees). In more general terms, the aftermath of the global financial crisis may mark a “stress test” for the whole construction of the welfare state in Europe (Hemerijck 2012: 68) and the welfare state might be “financial crisis casualty” (Hemerijck 2013: 1). The same logic applies to higher education in Europe (see Cattaneo et al. on the crisis and study choices).

The financial dimension of changes in both welfare state and higher education seems crucial, especially that costs generated by all welfare state components and each of them separately cannot be easily reduced. Carlo Salerno formulated the dilemma from the perspective which links resources to changeable social expectations. Salerno discussed an increasingly influential model of the university as a “service enterprise” (one of Johan P. Olsen’s four models of university organization, Maassen and Olsen 2007):

Society values what the University produces relative to how those resources could be used elsewhere; ... The “marketization” produces a set of relative prices for each [service] that reveals, in monetary terms, just how important these activities are when compared to issues such as healthcare, crime, social security or any other good/service that is funded by the public purse. It does nothing to reduce universities’ roles as bastions of

free inquiry or their promotion of democratic ideals; it only recasts the problem in terms of the resources available to achieve them (Salerno 2007: 121).

Current reformulations of social objectives of welfare states are occurring at a time when traditional social obligations of the state are under sustained, fundamental revisions, and some activities and objectives viewed today as basic could be redefined as remaining outside of traditional governmental duties (Hovey 1999: 60), or as being in need of substantial individual co-funding. Privatization in higher education (Kwiek 2016) is accompanied by privatization of all public services (Obinger et al. 2016, Van de Walle and Groeneveld 2016). The higher education sector is a good example here: it has to compete permanently with a whole array of other socially attractive forms of public expenditures. And it has to be attractive for academic careers (Teixeira 2017, Leisyte and Dee 2012, Kwiek 2009b), including attractive academic salaries (Angermuller 2017 and Kwiek 2017). In postcommunist Europe (much more than in Western European countries), the sector has to successfully compete with social needs whose public costs have been permanently growing (see Kwiek 2014 on the applicability of typologies of higher education organization and welfare state regimes to Central and Eastern Europe). The ever fiercer battle between the claimants continues and can only intensify in the future.

Viewing state subsidization of higher education in the context of other competing welfare state claimants to the public purse introduces the “doing more with less” theme to the higher education reform agenda. State-funded services and programs have traditionally included healthcare, pensions, and education; but today the costs of healthcare and pensions are expected to be escalating in aging Western societies while education, and especially higher education, is increasingly expected to show its “value for money”.

Higher education may be expected to cut its costs, according to the zero-sum logics of competing services and programs (especially under the fiscal crisis) and to draw ever more non-core non-state funding. The increase in the share of non-core non-state income in European universities has already been substantial, as various comparative data show (Shattock 2009).

The welfare state after the “Golden Age” of the 1960s and early 1970s entered an era of austerity (Blyth 2013) that forced it “off the path of ever-increasing social spending and ever-expanding state responsibilities” (Leibfried and Mau 2008: xiii). Similarly, public higher education and research sectors in Europe also stopped being a permanent “growth industry” (Ziman 1994), with ever increasing numbers of institutions and faculty. The transformation paths of welfare states and higher education show close affinities, the difference is in scale and in sequence only. Pensions and healthcare mean huge public spending and

higher education is only part of the overall education spending. The global co-funding agenda for all public sector services seems on the rise today, with fees and loans being implemented or discussed across Europe.

### **Financial pressures, ideological pressures, and changing social beliefs**

The first type of pressures on public services is financial. The costs of both teaching and research are escalating across Europe, as are the costs of maintaining advanced healthcare systems (Rothgang et al. 2010) and pension systems for aging European populations. As Alex Dumas and Bryan S. Turner (2009: 50) argue, “it is well recognized that the welfare states of Europe have rested on an explicit social contract between generations”. Any changes in the contract will produce both winners and losers among different welfare state components. Some state responsibilities in some policy areas may have to be scaled down. One of possible areas for social renegotiations is clearly the mass public subsidization of higher education. Even though their outcome is still undetermined, in many European countries the pressure to invest more private funding to higher education through fees and business contracts has been mounting, with the UK as a prime example.

The second type of pressures on public services is ideological. It comes mainly from global financial institutions and international organizations involved in the data collection and analysis of broader public sector services, especially the World Bank (although not its higher education sector, Kwiek 2013a, 2007). They tend to disseminate the view – in different countries to different degrees – that, in general, the public sector is less efficient than the private sector; its maintenance costs may exceed social benefits brought by it; and, finally, that it deserves less unconditional social trust combined with unconditional public funding. Public perceptions of the public sector in general (just like public “welfare attitudes” towards welfare services) may gradually influence public perceptions of European universities and the ways they will be funded in the future. New “university attitudes” – focusing on private benefits and individual goods rather than public benefits and collective goods produced in universities – may be gradually formed; they may be more hostile to traditional European full subsidization of public universities and more open to high-fees high-loans mechanisms prevalent in the USA (Kwiek 2009b).

So alongside with dealing with financial pressures and ideological pressures, universities simultaneously have to deal with the effects of changes in the beliefs of European electorates (both “welfare attitudes” in general and what we termed



“university attitudes” in particular), of key importance for changes in positions of leading national political parties.

In the times of the possible reformulation of most generous types of welfare state regimes in Europe (Powell and Hendricks 2009, Palier 2010a, Häusermann 2010), 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 – on the levels of public funding for higher education. And overall trends in welfare state restructuring seem relatively similar worldwide, as Paul Pierson stressed more than a decade ago, long before the recent financial crisis came: “while reform agendas vary quite substantially across regime types, all of them place a priority on cost containment” (Pierson 2001: 456). Or as Castles et al. highlight in their “Introduction” to a recent handbook on the welfare state in a similar vein, the two decades of neoliberal intellectual attack “increasingly challenged the optimistic faith in the beneficial effects of big government on which the post-war welfare state consensus had rested”. In the context of mature welfare states in the European Union, the deepening of European integration “not only imposed constraints on fiscal and monetary policy, which precluded the practice of traditional Keynesian macroeconomic policies at the national level, it also created ‘semi-sovereign’ welfare states which became imbedded in an emerging multilevel social policy regime” Castles et al. (2010: 11). The same effects are felt in new EU member states.

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). The competition for tax funding between various social needs and different public services is bound to grow, regardless of the fact when the current financial crisis will be overcome. The reason is simple, as both students of welfare and students of demography show: 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 (Teixeira and Koryakina 2016). This is the core of academic entrepreneurialism: more autonomy through more non-core non-state income (Shattock 2009, Kwiek 2013a; see the concepts of “academic capitalism” in Cantwell and Kauppinen 2014 and Cantwell 2016; and of “entrepreneurial university” in Pinheiro and Stensaker 2014). The postwar (Continental)

European tradition was tax-based higher education, and (high-level) fees still look non-traditional in most systems. The future of fees has a financial, ideological, and social dimension, and the role of “university attitudes” shared by particular European nations is as important as spending and tax trends and global agenda-setting in higher education and the global/national dynamics in policy implementation.

Finally, trends in European demographics (especially the aging of European societies, see a series of OECD books from its *Public Pensions Series*) will be affecting directly the functioning of the welfare state (and public sector institutions) in general, with strong country-specific variations. In most European countries, demographics will be affecting universities only indirectly, through the growing pressures on all public expenditures in general, and growing competition for all public funding. In some countries, such as several countries in Central Europe (especially Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, Hungary and Slovakia; and Poland, with powerfully declining demographics, facing projections of the number of students dwindling between 2008 and 2025 by one million, Kwiek 2016, Kwiek 2013b, Antonowicz 2012, Antonowicz et al. 2017), the indirect impact on all public services will be combined with the direct impact on educational institutions. Strong higher education institutions under the combination of unfavorable circumstances will be able to steer the future changes in funding patterns for higher education in their countries. But steering the future changes is becoming an increasingly arduous task, especially that the academic faculty is usually a heavily divided interest group (see a generational approach to academics across Europe in Kwiek 2019).

The impact of the recent economic crisis on both European welfare states and higher education systems is hard to predict. But as Colin Hay and Daniel Wincott (2012: 224–225) argue in a concluding section of their *Political Economy of European Welfare Capitalism*, “the most generous welfare states the world has ever known – the Nordic and Continental European welfare states – are here to stay and they are likely to retain their distinctiveness. But they are unlikely to remain as generous as they have been. ... benefit levels and eligibility criteria will be toughened still further”. We do not know its impact on higher education (Cattaneo et al. 2016, Carvalho and Santiago 2015) and on healthcare (Pinheiro et al. 2016, Thomson et al. 2015) but we can easily imagine that “welfare attitudes” will not differ substantially from “university attitudes”, and global funding solutions for mass higher education systems will be more popular in Europe than individual national funding solutions, except perhaps for some small and ultra rich European countries.

## Conclusions

There are several conclusions to be drawn. First, public higher education worldwide is a much less exceptional part of the public sector than it used to be a few decades ago: both in public perceptions and in organizational and institutional terms (governance and funding modes). This disappearing – cultural, social, and economic – exceptionality of the institution of the university will heavily influence its future relationships with the state which, on a global scale, is increasingly involved in reforming all its public services according to transnational agendas, goal-setting and priorities.

Second, further reforms of higher education systems in Europe seem inevitable, as policy communities promoting changes are global in nature and their recommendations are similar in kind throughout Europe. The forces of change in Europe seem structurally similar, although they seem to act through various “national filters” (Gornitzka and Maassen 2011). National governments still have considerable power in shaping the regulatory frameworks and incentive structures (Enders et al. 2011: 8–9) but national and international policy thinking about higher education becomes increasingly convergent. Mass (and often universal, Marginson 2016a) higher education is no longer a dominant goal of governments as it has already been achieved: there are many other, competing, social needs. To maintain high public subsidies, universities need to be able to produce and defend strong “supportive discourses” and favorable “university attitudes”. It has to be clear why mass higher education systems unconditionally deserve mass public funding. Nationally-specific answers to this question may matter only to some extent in the context of the global agenda-setting and discourse-production. The separation of academic research and transnational expert research (and academic and transnational expert communities) in the two sectors studied is symptomatic for the declining role of the former for the purposes of structural reforms; this is especially clear in the case of higher education research and higher education policy research, to which national and European-level policies have seemed largely immune so far (Maassen and Olsen 2007, Kwiek and Maassen 2012).

Third, it is increasingly difficult to understand the dynamics of possible future transformations of European higher education without understanding the transformations of the wider social world. In particular, transformations to the state in general, and European welfare states in their major variants.

Fourth, the notion of the increasingly competitive nature of public funding made available to different public services is very useful to study higher education: the allocation of public resources among competing public services is

increasingly based on understanding relative advantages of different public expenditures. Social outputs of spending in one policy area are increasingly assessed, globally and nationally, against social outputs of spending in competing policy areas. Additionally, both “welfare attitudes” and “university attitudes” are expected to matter more than ever before in prioritizing social spending.

And finally, it is hard to imagine that the university would not follow transformations of all other public sector institutions and of the foundations of modern European welfare states. New ideas of functioning of the state indirectly give life to new ideas of functioning of universities – which in Continental Europe have traditionally been heavily, in both teaching and research, dependent on public funding. The dynamics of current reforms of European welfare states can be mirrored in the dynamics of current reforms of European universities. We suggest here that the better we understand the former, the better we understand the latter. Which provides fertile ground for both higher education research and higher education policy research.

## Acknowledgement

The author gratefully acknowledges the support of the National Research Council (NCN) through its MAESTRO grant DEC-2011/02/A/HS6/00183 (2012–2017).

## References

- Angermuller, J. (2017). “Academic Careers and the Valuation of Academics. A discursive perspective on status categories and academic salaries in France as compared to the U.S., Germany and Great Britain”. *Higher Education*. Vol. 73. 963–980.
- Antonowicz, D. (2012). “External influences and local responses. Changes in Polish higher education 1990–2005”. In: M. Kwiek, P. Maassen (eds.), *National Higher Education Reforms in a European Context: Comparative Reflections on Poland and Norway*. Frankfurt and New York: Peter Lang.
- Antonowicz, D., J. Kohoutek, R. Pinheiro, M. Hladchenko (2017). “The Roads of ‘Excellence’ in Central and Eastern Europe”. *European Educational Research Journal*. Vol. 16. No. 5. 547–567.
- Barr, N. (2004). *Economics of the Welfare State*. (4th ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barr, N., ed. (2001). *Economic Theory and the Welfare State*. 3 volumes. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Bastedo, M. N., ed. (2012). *The Organization of Higher Education: Managing Colleges for a New Era*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Becher, T., M. Kogan (1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education*. Second Edition. London: Routledge.
- Blyth, M. (2013). *Austerity. The History of a Dangerous Idea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonoli, G. and D. Natali (2012). *The Politics of the New Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brunsson, N. (2009). *Reform as Routine: Organizational Change and Stability in the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brunsson, N. (2006). *Mechanisms of Hope: Maintaining the Dream of the Rational Organization*. Liber: Universitetsforlaget.
- Brunsson, N., J. P. Olsen (1993). *The Reforming Organization*. Copenhagen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Busemeyer, M. R., R. Nikolai (2010). "Education". In: F. G. Castles, S. Leibfried, J. Lewis, H. Obinger, Ch. Pierson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State*. New York: Oxford University Press. 494–508.
- Campbell, J. L. (2004). *Institutional Change and Globalization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cantwell, B., I. Kauppinen, eds. (2014). *Academic Capitalism in the Age of Globalization*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cantwell, B. (2016). "The New Prudent Man: Financial-Academic Capitalism and Inequality in Higher Education". In: Sh. Slaughter and B. J. Taylor, eds., *Higher Education, Stratification, and Workforce Development: Competitive Advantage in Europe the US, and Canada*. Cham: Springer. 173–192.
- Carvalho, T., R. Santiago, eds. (2015). *Professionalism, Managerialism and Reform in Higher Education and the Health Services. The European Welfare State and the Rise of the Knowledge Society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Castles, F. G., ed. (1989). *The Comparative History of Public Policy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Castles, F. G., S. Leibfried, J. Lewis, H. Obinger, Ch. Pierson (2010). "Introduction". In: F. G. Castles, S. Leibfried, J. L., H. Obinger, Ch. Pierson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1–15.
- Cattaneo, M., H. Horta, P. Malighetti, M. Meoli, S. Paleari (2016). "Effects of the Financial Crisis on University Choice by Gender". *Higher Education*. Vol. 74. No. 5. 775–798.

- Christensen, T., Å. Gornitzka and P. Maassen (2014). "Global Pressures and National Cultures: A Nordic University Template?". In: P. Mattei (ed.), *University Adaptation in Difficult Economic Times*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 30–51.
- Connelly, J., J. Hayward, eds. (2012). *The Withering of the Welfare State: Regression*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Djelic, M.-L., S. Quack, eds. (2010). *Transnational Communities: Shaping Global Economic Governance*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Dobbins, M. (2010). "Comparing higher education policies in Central and Eastern Europe". In: A. P. Jakobi, K. Martens, K. D. Wolf (eds.), *Education in Political Science: Discovering a neglected field*. London: Routledge. 38–55.
- Drazen, A. (1998). "The Political Economy of Delayed Reform". In: F. Sturzenegger, M. Tommasi (eds.), *The Political Economy of Reform*. Cambridge & London: The MIT Press. 39–60.
- Dumas, A. and B. S. Turner (2009). "Aging in Post-Industrial Societies: Intergenerational conflict and solidarity". In: J. Powell and J. Hendrick (eds.), *The Welfare State and Postindustrial Society: A Global Analysis*. New York: Springer. 41–56.
- EC. European Commission (2011). "Supporting Growth and Jobs – an Agenda for the Modernisation of Europe's Higher Education Systems". Communication from the European Commission. Brussels. COM(2011) 567 final.
- Eckel, P. D., A. Kezar (2003). *Taking the Reins: Institutional Transformation in Higher Education*. Westport: Praeger.
- Enders, J., Ch. 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., H. F. de Boer and D. F. Westerheiden, eds. (2011). *Reform of Higher Education in Europe*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2009). *The Incomplete Revolution. Adapting to Women's New Roles*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ferrera, M. (2005). *The Boundaries of Welfare: European Integration and the New Spatial Politics of Social Protection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fowles, J. (2014). "Funding and Focus: Resource Dependence in Public Higher Education". *Research in Higher Education*. Vol. 55. 272–287.
- Frericks, P. and R. Maier (2012). *European Capitalist Welfare Societies*. New York: Palgrave.

- Garfinkel, I., L. Rainwater, T. Smeeding (2010). *Wealth and Welfare States: Is America a Laggard or Leader?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gornitzka, Å., M. Kogan, A. Amaral (2007). *Reform and Change in Higher Education: Analysing Policy Implementation*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Gornitzka, Å. and P. Maassen (2011). "University governance reforms, global scripts and the 'Nordic Model'. Accounting for policy change?" In: J. Schmid, K. Amos; J. Schrader and A. Thiel (eds.), *Welten der Bildung? Vergleichende Analysen von Bildungspolitik und Bildungssystemen*. Baden Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft. 149–177.
- Hay, C. and D. Wincott (2012). *The Political Economy of European Welfare States*. New York: Palgrave.
- Hay, C., M. Lister, D. Marsh, eds. (2006). *The State: Theories and Issues*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Häusermann, S. (2010). *The Politics of Welfare State Reform in Continental Europe: Modernization in Hard Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Held, D., A. McGrew, eds. (2007). *Globalization Theory. Approaches and Controversies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hemerijck, A. (2013). *Changing Welfare States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hovey, H. (1999). "State Spending for Higher Education in the Next Decade. The Battle to Sustain Current Support". Report for the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Horta, H., J. Husiman, M. Heitor (2008). "Does Competitive Funding Encourage Diversity in Higher Education?". *Science and Public Policy*. Vol. 35. No. 5. 146–158.
- Hurrelmann, A., S. Leibfried, K. Martens, P. Mayer, eds. (2007). *Transforming the Golden-Age Nation State*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jakobi, A. P. (2009). *International Organizations and Lifelong Learning: From Global Agendas to Policy Diffusion*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kezar, A. (2014). *How Colleges Change. Understanding, Leading and Enacting Change*. New York: Routledge.
- Kezar, A. J. (2012). "Organizational Change in a Global, Postmodern World". In: M. N. Bastedo (ed.), *The Organization of Higher Education: Managing Colleges for a New Era*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press. 181–221.
- Kogan, M., M. Bauer, I. Bleiklie, M. Henkel (2000). *Transforming Higher Education: A Comparative Study*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

- Kwiek, M. (2006). *The University and the State. A Study into Global Transformations*. Frankfurt a/Main and New York: Peter Lang.
- Kwiek, M. (2007). "The University and the Welfare State in Transition. Changing Public Services in a Wider Context". In: D. Epstein, R. Deem et al. (eds.), *World Yearbook of Education 2008*. New York: Routledge. 32–50.
- Kwiek, M. (2009a). "Globalisation: Re-Reading Its Impact on the Nation-State, the University, and Educational Policies in Europe". In: M. Simons, M. Olssen, M. E. Peters (eds.), *Re-Reading Education Policies. A Handbook Studying the Policy Agenda of the 21st Century*. Rotterdam: Sense. 195–215.
- Kwiek, M. (2009b). "The Changing Attractiveness of European Higher Education: Current Developments, Future Challenges, and Major Policy Issues". In: B. Kehm, J. Huisman, B. Stensaker (eds.), *The European Higher Education Area: Perspectives on a Moving Target*. Rotterdam: Sense. 107–124.
- Kwiek, M. (2012). "Changing Higher Education Policies: From the Deinstitutionalization to the Reinstitutionalization of the Research Mission in Polish Universities". *Science and Public Policy*. Vol. 39. 641–654.
- Kwiek, M. (2013a). *Knowledge Production in European Universities. States, Markets, and Academic Entrepreneurialism*. Frankfurt and New York: Peter Lang.
- Kwiek, M. (2013b). "From System Expansion to System Contraction: Access to Higher Education in Poland". *Comparative Education Review*. Vol. 57. No. 3. 553–576.
- Kwiek, M. (2014). "Changing higher education and welfare states in postcommunist Central Europe: New contexts leading to new typologies?". *Human Affairs*. Vol. 24. No. 1. 48–87.
- Kwiek, M. (2015a). "Competing for Public Resources: Higher Education and Academic Research in Europe. A Cross-Sectoral Perspective". In: J. C. Brada, W. Bienkowski and M. Kuboniwa (eds.), *International Perspectives on Financing Higher Education*. Palgrave Macmillan. 6–24.
- Kwiek, M. (2015b). "European Universities and Educational and Occupational Intergenerational Social Mobility". In: H.-O. Otto (ed.), *Facing Trajectories from School to Work. Towards a Capability-Friendly Youth Policy in Europe*. Dordrecht: Springer. 87–114.
- Kwiek, M. (2016). "From Privatization (of the Expansion Era) to De-privatization (of the Contraction Era). A National Counter-Trend in a Global Context". In: S. Slaughter and B.J. Taylor (eds.) *Higher Education, Stratification, and Workforce Development: Competitive Advantage in Europe, the US and Canada*. Dordrecht: Springer. 311–330.



- Kwiek, M. (2017). "Academic top earners. Research productivity, prestige generation, and salary patterns in European universities". *Science and Public Policy*. Vol. 45. No. 1. 1–13.
- Kwiek, M. (2019). *Changing European Academics: A Comparative Study of Social Stratification, Work Patterns and Research Productivity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kwiek, M., A. Kurkiewicz, eds. (2012). *The Modernisation of European Universities. Cross-National Academic Perspectives*. 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*. Frankfurt and New York: Peter Lang.
- Leibfried, S., H. Obinger (2001). "Welfare State Futures. An Introduction". In: S. Leibfried (ed.), *Welfare State Futures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1–13.
- Leibfried, S., S. Mau, eds. (2008). *Welfare States: Construction, Deconstruction, Reconstruction*. 3 volumes. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Leisyte, L. and Jay R. D. (2012). "Understanding Academic Work in a Changing Institutional Environment. Faculty Autonomy, Productivity, and Identity in Europe and the United States". *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. Vol. 27. 123–206.
- Lindert, P. H. (2004). *Growing Public. Social Spending and Economic Growth Since the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lutz, W., Ch. Wilson (2006). "Introduction". In: W. Lutz, R. Richter, Ch. Wilson (eds.), *The New Generations of Europeans: Demography and Families in the Enlarged European Union*. London: Earthscan. 3–17.
- Maassen, P., J. P. Olsen, eds. (2007). *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Maassen, P., Å. Gornitzka, T. Fumasoli (2017). "University Reform and Institutional Autonomy: A Framework for Analysing the Living Autonomy". *Higher Education Quarterly*. Special Issue, June 2017. 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12129>.
- Marginson, S. (2016a). "The worldwide trend to high participation higher education: dynamics of social stratification in inclusive systems". *Higher Education*. Vol. 72. 413–434.
- Marginson, S. (2016b). High Participation Systems of Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education*. Vol. 87. No. 2. 243–271.

- Martens, K., A. P. Jakobi, eds. (2010). *Mechanisms of OECD Governance: International Incentives for National Policy-Making?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martens, K., A. Rusconi, K. Leuze, eds. (2007). *New Arenas of Education Governance: The Impact of International Organizations and Markets on Educational Policy Making*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nullmeier, F., F.-X. Kaufmann (2010). "Post-War Welfare State Development". In: F. G. Castles, S. Leibfried, J. Lewis, H. Obinger, Ch. Pierson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State*. New York: Oxford University Press. 81–101.
- Obinger, H., C. Schmitt and S. Traub (2016). *The Political Economy of Privatization in Rich Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- OECD (2013). *Pensions at a Glance. OECD and G20 Indicators*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2010). *Making Reform Happen: Lessons from OECD Countries*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2009). *The Political Economy of Reform: Lessons from Pensions, Product Markets and Labour Markets in Ten OECD Countries*. Paris: OECD.
- Olsen, J. P. (2007b). "The Institutional Dynamics of the European University". In: P. Maassen, J. P. Olsen (eds.), *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer. 25–54.
- Palier, B., ed. (2010). *A Long Goodbye to Bismarck? The Politics of Welfare Reform in Continental Europe*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Pavolini, E. and A. M. Guillén, eds. (2013). *Health Care Systems in Europe under Austerity. Institutional Reforms and Performance*. New York: Palgrave.
- Pierson, P. (2001). "Coping with Permanent Austerity: Welfare State Restructuring in Affluent Democracies". In: P. Pierson (ed.), *The New Politics of the Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Pinheiro, R., L. Geschwind, F. O. Ramirez, K. Vrangbaek, eds. (2016). *Towards a Comparative Institutionalism: Forms, Dynamics and Logics across the Organizational Fields of Health Care and Higher Education*. Bingley: Emerald.
- Pinheiro, R., B. Stensaker (2014). "Designing the Entrepreneurial University: The Interpretation of a Global Idea". *Public Organization Review*. Vol. 14. 497–516.
- Powell, J., J. Hendricks, eds. (2009). *The Welfare State in Post-Industrial Society. A Global Perspective*. Dordrecht: Springer.

- Rothblatt, Sh., B. Wittrock, eds. (1993). *The European and American university since 1800: Historical and sociological essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothgang, H., M. Cacace, L. Frisina, S. Grimmeisen, A. Schmid, C. Wendt (2010). *The State and Healthcare: Comparing OECD Countries*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Salerno, C. (2007). "A Service Enterprise: The Market Vision". In: P. Maassen, J. P. Olsen (eds.), *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer. 119–132.
- Schäfer, A. and W. Streeck (2013). "Introduction: Politics in the Age of Austerity". In: A. Schäfer and W. Streeck (eds.), *Politics in the Age of Austerity*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 1–25.
- Schuetze, H. G. (2012). "University Governance Reform: The Drivers and the Driven". In: H.G. Schuetze, W. Bruneau and G. Grosjean (eds.), *University Governance and Reform. Policy, Fads, and Experience in International Perspective*. New York: Palgrave. 3–10.
- Schuster, J. H. (2011). "The Professoriate's Perilous Path". In: J. C. Hermanowicz (ed.), *The American Academic Profession. Transformations in Contemporary Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 21–43
- Sipilä, J., A. Anttonen, and T. Kröger (2009). "A Nordic Welfare State in a Post-industrial Society". In: J. Powell and J. Hendricks (eds.), *The Welfare State in Post-Industrial Society. A Global Perspective*. Dordrecht: Springer. 181–200.
- Shattock, M. (2009). *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy. Diversification and Organizational Change in European Higher Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press and SRHE.
- Stensaker, B., J. Välimaa and C. S. Sarrico, eds. (2012). *Managing Reform in Universities. The Dynamics of Culture, Identity and Organizational Change*. New York: Palgrave.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2000). *Economics of the Public Sector*. Third Edition. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Svallfors, S. (2012). "Welfare States and Welfare Attitudes". In: S. Svallfors (ed.), *Contested Welfare States: Welfare Attitudes in Europe and Beyond*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1–24.
- Tanzi, V. (2011). *Government versus Market: The Changing Economic Role of the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Teixeira, P. N. (2017). "A Bastion of Elitism or an Emerging Knowledge Proletariat? Some Reflections about Academic Careers with an Economic Slant". In: M.d.L. Machado-Taylor, V.M. Soares, U. Teichler

- (eds.), *Challenges and Options: The Academic Profession in Europe*. Cham: Springer. 29–48.
- Teixeira, P. and T. Koryakina (2016). “Political Instability, Austerity and Wishful Thinking: Analyzing Stakeholders’ Perceptions of Higher Education’s Funding Reforms in Portugal”. *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 51. No. 1. 126–39.
- Thomson, S., J. Figueras, T. Evetovits et al. (2015). *Economic Crisis, Health Systems and Health in Europe. Impact and implications for policy*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Titmuss, R. M. (1968). *Commitment to Welfare*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Välismaa, J., D. Hoffman (2008). “Knowledge Society Discourse and Higher Education”. *Higher Education*. Vol. 56. 265–285.
- Van de Walle, S. and S. Groeneveld, eds. (2016). *Theory and Practice of Public Sector Reform*. New York: Routledge.
- Wilensky, H. L. (2002). *Rich Democracies. Political Economy, Public Policy, and Performance*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wittrock, B. (1993). “The Modern University: The Three Transformations”. In: Sh. Rothblatt and B. Wittrock (eds.), *The European and American university since 1800: Historical and sociological essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 303–362.
- Ziman, J. (1994). *Prometheus Bound. Science in a dynamic steady-state*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Bibliographic Information published  
by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

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

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for  
at the Library of Congress.

ISSN 2193-7613

ISBN 978-3-631-66275-5 (Print)

E-ISBN 978-3-631-79306-0 (E-PDF)

E-ISBN 978-3-631-79304-6 (EPUB)

E-ISBN 978-3-631-79305-3 (MOBI)

DOI 10.3726/b15764

© Peter Lang GmbH

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Frankfurt am Main 2016

2nd revised edition Berlin 2019

All rights reserved.

Peter Lang – Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York ·  
Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

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.

This publication has been peer reviewed.

[www.peterlang.com](http://www.peterlang.com)