

Chapter 47

Diversity of Higher Education in Europe and the Findings of a Comparative Study of the Academic Profession

Ulrich Teichler

47.1 The Theme “Diversity”

The extent to which higher education is varied or homogeneous or should be substantially varied or only varied to a moderate extent is not only a theme of constant controversial debate. But, also, all observers addressing this thematic area agree that higher education is constantly on the move towards increasing or towards reducing the extent of the previously existing variety.

The issue of diversity of higher education is touched upon in so many analyses that it is impossible to provide a comprehensive overview. However, only a few scholars have addressed this thematic area repeatedly and based on a very broad knowledge of the issue in a multitude of European countries; one might name primarily – in alphabetical order – Jeroen Huisman (1995, 2009), Guy Neave (1989, 1996, 2000), Peter Scott (1996, 2008), and Ulrich Teichler (1988, 2008) in this context. Moreover, two major studies were published in Europe in recent years concerning the issue of diversity in higher education (Teichler 2007; Reichert 2009). They both aim to provide a conceptual map of the issues addressed and give an account of the existing extent of variety in various countries.

Scholars agree that there are concurrently a multitude of forces which either increase or reduce the extent of diversity within national systems of higher education, sometimes favoring international convergence, at other times, promoting specific national options. Meek et al. (1996) argue that explanatory concepts of the causes for the change of higher education systems can be classified into three perspectives: According to *internal perspectives*, dynamics within higher education play a major role (for example, the increase of student numbers or the trend towards

U. Teichler (✉)
International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER-Kassel),
University of Kassel, Kassel, Germany
e-mail: teichler@incher.uni-kassel.de

specialization disciplines, e.g. Clark 1996); according to *systemic perspectives*, powerful actors try to shape it according to their views and values (Neave 1996); according to *environmental perspectives*, external social, political and economic forces affect the configuration of the higher education (van Vught 1996). Teichler (2007, pp. 124–125) identifies four “developmental theories” to explain the dynamics of structural change: the “*expansion and diversification theories*”, according to which higher education is bound to get more diverse in the process of expansion in order to serve the diversifying needs (cf. Trow 1974); the “*drift theories*”, according to which the majority of actors in higher education is not faithful to the specific “missions” of their sector, but try to imitate those concepts which they consider the most successful ones (Neave 1979); according to the “*flexibilization theories*”, higher education seeks soft compromises between contradictory forces; according to the “*cyclical theories*”, certain patterns of the higher education system come and go just in response to efforts to counteract the most visible “mistakes” of the last generation of diversity in higher education.

Teichler intends to provide an account on the changing concepts and actual developments in a broad range of economically advanced countries since about the 1960s; his notions and own interpretations are also summarized in the overview article “Diversity in Higher Education” in the International Encyclopedia of Education (Teichler 2010a). According to this most recent account, most of the discourse on “diversity” addresses the quantitative-structural patterns of national systems of higher education: the “shape and the size” of higher education systems. There are exceptions, though, where the term “diversity” is employed to discuss also organizational differences (e.g. the steering and governance), the financial regime (e.g. public versus private higher education), and the modes of educational delivery (e.g. distance education). He points out that the shape of the system customarily is classified *vertically* (according to “quality” or “prestige”) or *horizontally* (according to programmatic thrusts), whereby either formal descriptors (e.g. *types* of higher education institutions or types of programs and *levels* of programs) or informal descriptors (e.g. *rankings*) are employed. Moreover, a distinction is occasionally made between diversity *within higher education institutions* (internal, intra-institutional, or program diversity) or *between higher education institutions*.

Teichler, finally, argues that the discourse on “diversity” is often *biased through terminology issues*. The term “diversity” sounds as if a high degree of variety was desirable. Some advocates of steep hierarchical higher education systems even claim that there is only a choice of counterproductive homogeneity or “diversity”, thereby assuming that maximum variety is desirable, or – more moderately phrased: “More diversified systems, generally speaking, are thought to be ‘better’ than less diversified systems” (CHEPS 2008, p. 8). Instead, there is a range of choice between “moderate” and “steep” diversity, whereby the strengths and weaknesses of any position of such a possible spectrum has to be taken into consideration. And he argues that most efforts to measure the existing diversity are disguised efforts to “sell” certain models as desirable or even to put pressure on higher education to move into such a direction (Teichler 2011b).

Second, Sybille Reichert (2009) analyzed the institutional diversity of higher education in some European countries in a study for the European University Association. In this framework, she carefully analyzed the academic and political discourse on diversity, and she voices three directions of critique as regards the dominant inclinations of this discourse:

- First, the persons involved in the debate on diversity advocate *strong normative positions* to attach certain values to different aspects of diversity at different levels in higher education. As a consequence, she considers it necessary that the sound analyses of the issue of diversity in higher education have to make “the values of diversity themselves an object of inquiry” (ibid., p. 12).
- Second, the discussions on the diversity of higher education often suggest that *a certain type of diversity or a certain principle of diversity has to rule*, whereas others have to fade away or have to be given up. This seems to be most pronounced in the concepts in favor of steep vertical diversity of higher education which does not accept any genuine diversity of missions and functions.
- Third, Reichert argues that most studies had “focused exclusively on *external diversity* of institutional types or profiles” (ibid., p. 13). She suggests to take into consideration as well “*internal diversity*, i.e. diversity within higher education institutions” (ibid.) – for example, how individual institutions serve deliberately a broad range of students.

On the basis on five country studies, Reichert clearly shows that there are no moves towards a coherent simple model of diversities. Forces are in play both underscoring the horizontal and the vertical dimensions of diversity. There is a coexistence of pressures and efforts towards growing and reduced diversity (called “convergence” in this study) and towards both an important role of inter-institutional and internal diversity. Change of the higher education systems is underway in all European countries in one way or other, and the mixes of systems eventually emerging are not the product of a single targeted policy, but rather the result of multiple forces.

The author of this article suggests here that there are three highly influential political approaches as regards the extent and the character of diversity in higher education in Europe in the first decade of the twenty-first century. All three are strongly pursued, interact de facto and contribute to increased controversy and tension in higher education in Europe.

The first approach might be named *the Bologna approach*. We identify the following elements of this approach: (a) An increasing international similarity of the patterns of national higher education systems is taken for granted or/and it is advocated. (b) The levels of study programs are believed to be a very important dimension of the institutional patterns of higher education; they obviously are expected to overrule the strong role types of higher education it was expected to play in the preceding decades (cf. OECD 1991; Scott 1996). (c) The Bologna approach implicitly opposes any steep vertical and any extreme horizontal mobility, because the “zones for mutual trust” for student exchange and intra-European partnerships

would be extraordinarily small if substantial vertical and horizontal variety was in place (cf. Teichler 2008).

The second approach might be called the *world-class university approach or ranking approach* (cf. its presentation by its advocates in Sadlak and Liu (2007) and its critique in Shin et al. 2011; Kehm and Stensaker 2009). (a) An increasing international similarity of the patterns of the higher education system is taken for granted and certainly is advocated. (b) Institutions of higher education are viewed to be the clearly overarching dimension of diversity; the academic quality of the individual scholar and the individual units of teaching and research is seen to be strongly influenced by the quality of the higher education institution as a whole. (c) This approach concentrates fully on vertical diversity, whereby it might vary according to the number of variables and groupings of vertical diversity. (d) The approach is characterized by the assumption that a steep vertical stratification of the higher education system is beneficial.

The third approach might be named *managerial approach* (cf. Kogan 2004). (a) As in the case of the second approach, institutions of higher education are viewed to be the clearly overarching dimension of diversity. (b) The University management, in reflecting the institutional context as well as the institutional potentials, is free, in principle, to strive for re-allocation of the institution's vertical and horizontal positions on the map of the overall national higher education system or of higher education all over the world and ought to use its power to push the institution of higher education to the desired position on the map. (c) Implicitly, this approach seems to assume that intra-institutional diversity should be moderate.

47.2 The Implications of Diversity of Higher Education in the Academics' Views and Activities

The analyses of the pattern of diversity of higher education systems have concentrated in the past on institutional dimensions (types of institutions of higher education, types of programs, individual institutions and departments, etc.) as well as on the input, process and outputs with respect to the core functions and activities of higher education (number of graduates, graduates' competences, publications, etc.). They have also discussed the roles of policy makers such as governments, external "stakeholders", university management, and the "market" in trying to shape the quantitative-structural patterns. Much less attention has been paid to the academic profession of actors as regards diversity, and hardly any attention has been paid to the views and activities of academics as indications of the actually existing extent and the actually existing modes of diversity in higher education.

The following analysis is an attempt to describe the extent and the modes of similarity or diversity within higher education as reflected in the views and activities of academics. The responses to representative survey questionnaires mostly undertaken in the year 2007 in seven European countries with altogether more than 8,000 respondents will be taken as an information basis for describing the extent and variety of

views and activities of the academics who are employed in institutions of higher education. The results are analyzed according the following differentiating criteria:

- *country within Europe*: Are academics alike across European countries or very much distinct by country?
- *status within academic career*; for example: Are junior academics more internationally oriented and active than those in professorial positions?
- *type of higher education institution*; for example: Do professors in other higher education institutions more or less share the same views as university professors about the roles and functions of higher education?
- *inter-individual differences*: Are some professors more strongly research-oriented than others, and how does this affect the character of their academic work in various respects?

The data base for this comparison of seven European countries has been collected in the framework of the study “The Changing Academic Profession (CAP)” covering almost 20 countries from all over the world; actually, surveys were undertaken predominantly in 2007 and additionally in 2008 (according the conceptual basis in Kogan and Teichler 2007; Locke and Teichler 2007; the results published on the selected theme in the Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University 2008, 2009, 2010; Diversification of Higher Education and the Academic Profession 2010; Locke et al. 2011; first country reports available in Coates et al. 2009; Aarrevaara and Pekkola 2010; Bentley et al. 2010; Jacob and Teichler 2011). In some thematic areas, a comparison can be undertaken regarding the academics’ views and activities in the early 1990s, when the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Princeton, NJ, U.S.) initiated the first comparative study on the academic profession (see Boyer et al. 1994; Enders and Teichler 1995; Altbach 1996; Teichler 1996). It might be added here that a similar survey has been undertaken in six additional European countries in the framework of the project “The Academic Profession in Europe” (EUROAC). The results of this project, supported by the European Science Foundation (ESF), will be available in 2012.

In this article, about 20 aspects addressed in the CAP survey of the academic profession will be examined to establish the extent of similarity and diversity across countries as well as between and within the dimensions named above. This will provide the basis for a final discussion of the findings: how far is higher education in Europe similar or diverse, what roles do institutional types play, etc. with respect to the individual dimensions?

47.2.1 Career

As regards the academic careers, information will be presented on five aspects: the proportions of the academics having obtained a doctoral degree, the age of the award of a degree, the frequency of inter-institutional mobility, and the extent of part-time and of short-term employment.

A *doctoral degree* is more or less a “must” for an academic career in universities in various, but not in all European countries: more than 90% of university professors have been awarded a doctoral degree in Portugal, Germany and Finland; the respective proportion is somewhat lower in Norway (85%), the Netherlands (83% at present – clearly lower than in 1992: 90%) and the United Kingdom (78%), and, in Italy, only a minority of professors are doctoral degree holders (33%). As regards senior academics in other institutions, however, we note a more polarized situation – with more than 80% doctoral degree holders in Germany, Norway and Portugal and a minority in Finland (41%) and the Netherlands (only 17%).

It is widely assumed that the award of a doctoral degree marks a similar stage of the academic career across Europe. Therefore, we could assume that the average *age at the award of a doctoral degree* does not substantially differ between European countries. The university professors in the seven European countries surveyed were 34 years old on average at the award of the doctoral degree, but this varies strikingly between the relatively low average age of 30 years in Germany and 31 years in the United Kingdom on the one hand and relatively high age of 36 years in Finland and 37 years in Norway on the other hand.

In many countries of the world, the *inter-institutional mobility of academics* is viewed as a healthy phenomenon, and spending the whole academic career in a single institution is often pejoratively called “inbreeding”. There are countries as well, though, where spending the whole academic career in a prestigious institution is most highly respected, while inter-institutional mobility might indicate detours on the way to academic success. We note that inter-institutional mobility is more or less a “must” in Germany, and only 8% of the university professors have never worked in another higher education institution. In Norway and the UK, about a quarter, but in Italy and the Netherlands about a half of the professors have never changed the university.

Part-time employment and short-term employment of university professors were exceptional in the early 1990s. This continues to hold true for part-time employment with the Netherlands as the only exception (14% in 1992 and 23% in the most recent study). However, the tradition of permanent employment of professors has been somewhat shaken in recent years in Finland (34% employed on a short-term basis), the Netherlands (16%) and Portugal (13%). The situation of senior academics in other higher education institutions does not differ substantially from that of the university professors in those respects.

Part-time and short-term employment is far more widespread among junior staff in universities than among professors (the former including assistant professors and the latter associate professors). This tends to be viewed as indispensable in highly selected careers; it is often advocated as a beneficial component of an incentive system, and it is often criticized as undermining the motivation of young scholars. Whatever the discourse about the strengths and weaknesses of a less stable situation of academic junior staff may say, one cannot note any common trend of change among the European countries having participated in both surveys. Heterogeneity across Europe persists: in the recent survey, part-time employment ranges from 2% in Italy and 6% in Finland to 31% each in Germany and the

Table 47.1 Part-time and short-term employment of academics^a in selected European countries 1992 and 2007 (percentage)

		DE	FI	NL	NO	IT	PT	UK
<i>Senior academics at universities</i>								
2007	Part-time	0	4	23	6	3	3	5
	Short-term	3	34	16	4	•	13	2
(1992)	Part-time	(2)	•	(14)	•	•	•	(6)
	Short-term	(2)	•	(3)	•	•	•	(9)
<i>Junior academics at universities</i>								
2007	Part-time	31	6	31	11	2	12	13
	Short-term	80	50	41	75	•	69	29
(1992)	Part-time	(25)	•	(34)	•	•	•	(6)
	Short-term	(79)	•	(44)	•	•	•	(28)
<i>Senior academics in other higher education institutions</i>								
2007	Part-time	6	10	41	10	•	2	14
	Short-term	2	7	11	12	•	16	13
(1992 ^b)	Part-time	(7)	•	(51)	•	•	•	•
	Short-term	(6)	•	(15)	•	•	•	•

Source: Survey “The Changing Academic Profession” (CAP) (August 2011 data set)

DE Germany, FI Finland, NL Netherlands, NO Norway, IT Italy, PT Portugal, UK United Kingdom

^aData on junior staff are not included in the tables and not addressed in the text, because this status is very heterogeneous

^b1992 data combined for all academics at institutions of higher education

Netherlands. Also, short-term employment differs substantially between 29% in the United Kingdom and 41% in the Netherlands and 75% in Norway and 80% in Germany (see Table 47.1).

Altogether, the information chosen from the comparative surveys of the academic profession suggests that the career settings for academics in Europe are enormously diverse by country, and the comparison between the surveys does not indicate any convergent trend. On the contrary: Some countries moved toward more than exceptional short-employment of university professors, while others did not move in this direction, thereby increasing the European variety of academic career settings.

47.2.2 Academic Work

Four themes of academic work addressed in the comparative study are chosen here for the discussion of diversity: the number of weekly working hours, the academics’ preferences for teaching and research, the proportion of time spent on teaching and research as well as the assessment of the infrastructure for academic work.

We could have expected that the actual *weekly working time* of university professors is similar across European countries. The standard working time of employees in the European countries does not differ substantially, and university

Table 47.2 Preferences in teaching and research of academics in selected European countries 2007 (percentage)

	DE	FI	NL	NO	IT	PT	UK
<i>University professors</i>							
Primarily in teaching	5	2	5	2	2	3	8
In both, but leaning towards teaching	20	19	17	18	22	36	23
In both, but leaning towards research	63	61	55	60	67	48	48
Primarily in research	12	18	23	20	10	14	22
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Junior academic staff in universities</i>							
Primarily in teaching	7	8	5	2	3	6	9
In both, but leaning towards teaching	22	12	17	14	22	41	24
In both, but leaning towards research	38	39	49	44	60	47	37
Primarily in research	33	42	30	40	15	6	30
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Professors in other higher education institutions</i>							
Primarily in teaching	42	15	16	3	•	11	•
In both, but leaning towards teaching	35	49	33	22	•	43	•
In both, but leaning towards research	22	26	40	58	•	37	•
Primarily in research	1	10	11	17	•	9	•
Total	100	100	100	100	•	100	•

Abbreviations of country and source: see Table 47.1

professors are viewed as being strongly devoted to their professional work task and, thus, could be considered likely to work more than the time usually required. However, the average working hours vary substantially by country: university professors in Germany report 52 h on average, followed by their colleagues in various countries between 44 and 47 h, and, finally, university professors in Portugal with 41 h and in Norway with only 38 h. Thus, we note a range of about 30% if not more at all than lasts the normal work time of an employee. Junior academics in universities as well as both senior and junior academics in other higher education institutions report that they work some hours less than university professors, but the variation between countries is similar.

University professors are in charge of both teaching and research, but it is widely assumed that more professors have a *preference for research* than for teaching. However, according to conventional wisdom, university professors in some European countries tend to be more strongly devoted to teaching than in other countries. Indeed, the study reveals relatively little variety in this respect. Asked about their actual preferences and interests, the proportion of professors stating a clear preference for research varies by country only between 10% (Italy) and 22% (United Kingdom). In summing up the statements of such a clear preference and a somewhat stronger leaning toward either research or teaching (see Table 47.2), we note a stronger research than teaching orientation by about three quarters or more of the university professors in most European countries surveyed, slightly fewer in the United Kingdom (70%) and clearly fewer in Portugal (62%). As compared to the early 1990s, the emphasis on research increased slightly in Germany, remained unchanged in the Netherlands and decreased slightly in the United Kingdom.

Table 47.3 Annual weekly work time spent on various academic functions of academics in selected European countries 2007 (percent, only full-time employed academics)

	DE	FI	NL	NO	IT	PT	UK
<i>Senior academics in universities</i>							
Teaching	28	33	30	33	31	34	31
Research	38	37	40	37	45	38	35
Service	11	5	5	5	8	6	4
Administration	14	17	18	18	11	15	22
Other activities	9	7	7	7	5	8	8
Total percentage	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Junior academics in universities</i>							
Teaching	21	35	27	16	32	41	25
Research	51	45	56	69	48	42	43
Service	16	3	5	2	8	3	2
Administration	7	9	8	8	7	9	22
Other activities	5	7	5	6	5	5	8
Total percentage	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Senior academics in other HEIs</i>							
Teaching	41	52	•	38	33	42	•
Research	20	24	•	33	39	18	•
Service	5	7	•	4	8	2	•
Administration	27	12	•	16	13	28	•
Other activities	6	5	•	9	7	10	•
Total percentage	100	100	•	100	100	100	•

Abbreviations of country and source: see Table 47.1

A stronger emphasis on research than on teaching holds true in a similar way for junior academics in universities. The responses of professors and junior staff in the individual countries hardly differ except for Portugal, where an even lower proportion of junior staff puts emphasis on research (53%).

Senior academics in other institutions of higher education, as one could expect, lean to a lesser extent to research. Two countries stand out as contrasts: Germany with a very low quota of senior academics at Fachhochschulen favouring research (22%) and Norway with a very high quota of senior academics in colleges leaning towards research (65%).

The *proportion of the work time* university professors spend – on average of the whole year – on *teaching* is fairly homogeneous. It only varies from 28% in the case of Germany to 34% in the case of Portugal (calculated for full-time employed academics). Correspondingly, the proportion of time spent on *research* varies among most of the European countries surveyed only from 35% to 40% (with an exceptionally high proportion – 45% – in Italy). In all seven countries analyzed, university professors spend somewhat more time on research than on teaching – between 1.1 times and 1.4 times (see Table 47.3).

In contrast, junior staff's involvement in teaching varies substantially by country, i.e. between 16% in Norway and 41% in Portugal. In Norway, the junior staff in universities spends a clearly lower proportion of the work time on teaching than

professors; in some countries, this difference is smaller – in Germany, Finland and the United Kingdom; in Italy, no difference exists between senior and junior staff in this respect, while in Portugal and the Netherlands, the junior staff spends a higher proportion of time on teaching than senior staff. In comparing the time taken for research to that for teaching, we note that the junior staff in Norway spends more than four times as much time on research and those in Germany and Finland more than twice as much time, while the junior staff in Portugal spends about the same proportion of the work time on research as on teaching.

The proportion of time spent on teaching by senior academics in other institutions of higher education does not vary as much by country as in the case of junior academics in universities, but more than in the case of university professors. Senior academics in other institutions of higher education in the Netherlands and Germany spend a substantially higher proportion of their time, those in Norway and Portugal somewhat more time, but those in Finland the same proportion of time on teaching as university professors.

The *assessment of the infrastructure of academic work* varies somewhat by the academics' country. Of the eight aspects addressed in the questionnaire (such as technology for teaching, laboratories or library facilities), university professors in Finland rate 5.6 and those in Norway and Netherlands slightly more than 5.0 as positive in contrast to 3.6 in Italy and 3.5 in the United Kingdom. The junior staff in universities rates the infrastructure similarly to senior academics of their respective country. Also, the ratings by academics from other institutions do not differ substantially from those in universities.

In sum, it is not possible to generalize about the extent and the major dimensions of diversity across the four aspects of academic work discussed. We might assume that university professors in most European countries are full-time employees, are expected to care more or less equally for teaching and research, should appreciate both teaching and research as major components of their work tasks and should be equipped to do their work decently. From that point of view, the differences observed are by no means negligible: in one country on the top of the respective ranking, university professors work almost one third more hours on average than in the country on the bottom; similarly, the proportion of those leaning more to research than to teaching, when asked about their preferences, is almost one third higher in one extreme than in the other. The proportion of the work time is about one fifth higher in one extreme than in the opposite extreme. And those most satisfied with the infrastructure of their work name about 1.6 as many aspects of the infrastructure as positive as those who are least satisfied.

The junior staff in universities is most similar to senior staff in the assessment of the infrastructure of academic work. Junior academics – also those employed full-time – spend on average fewer weekly hours on their work than senior academics, and they reserve a higher proportion of their time to research and have stronger preference for teaching on average across the seven countries analyzed. But there are variations across countries in the extent of similarity or difference: in one country, senior and junior academics spend about the same proportion of their time on research; in another country, the time devoted to research by the junior staff is about 1.8 times higher than the time spent by university professors.

In comparing the responses of senior academics in other institutions of higher education with those of university professors, we note a surprisingly similar assessment of the infrastructure of academic work. On average, across countries, academics in other institutions of higher education work fewer weekly hours, and they lean less strongly towards research in their preferences and spend a smaller proportion of their time on research. In considering the prevailing notion of the functional differences between universities and other types of higher education institutions, we might have expected a more striking difference. Just to illustrate: one would not have expected that senior academics of other institutions of higher education spend only 12% less of the weekly work time (27% as compared to 39%) on research – on average across countries – than university professors. Again, however, we note substantial differences by country: in one extreme, senior academics in other higher education institutions spend a similar proportion of their work time on research as those in universities; in other cases, only about a half of the proportion of the work time is spent by the former on research as by the latter.

47.2.3 Teaching

Three aspects of teaching will be addressed: the regulatory framework of teaching, the respondents' attitudes towards teaching and the variety of teaching modes.

In response to the question of how much teaching is *regulated or steered* (for example, by workload settings in teaching, funding according to the number of graduates or considering the quality of teaching in personnel decisions), only one third of the professors note such steering efforts in four countries, but somewhat more in Norway and even about a half in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The responses by junior staff are quite similar to those by senior academics. Senior academics in other institutions of higher education in Finland and Germany consider themselves – in contrast to university professors of their respective country – also as relatively highly regulated.

Attitudes towards teaching and teaching-related issues vary substantially by country as well, as Table 47.4 shows. For example, among university professors,

- About three quarters underscore a practice-oriented approach in Germany and Portugal, but only about a half in Norway, four out of ten in the Netherlands and less than one third in Finland.
- About 70% often address issues of values in classes in Portugal and the United Kingdom, but only about 40% in Italy.
- Similarly, almost all professors in the United Kingdom warn against cheating, but only about one third in Norway and Italy.

Again, the responses by the junior staff in universities are similar to those of the professors in the respective countries. As one might expect, scholars in other institutions of higher education underscore more strongly a practice-oriented approach and somewhat less strongly an international approach.

Table 47.4 Attitudes towards teaching and teaching-related activities by academics in selected European countries 2007 (percentage^a)

	DE	FI	NL	NO	IT	PT	UK
<i>Seniors in universities</i>							
Practice-oriented approach	75	31	40	49	54	75	69
International approach	79	63	64	69	62	90	66
Value-oriented approach	57	53	48	45	40	71	69
Honesty approach	53	41	53	36	32	78	94
Meritocratic approach	72	95	54	78	79	55	87
<i>Juniors in universities</i>							
Practice-oriented approach	77	48	42	51	54	77	67
International approach	50	46	60	60	60	82	60
Value-oriented approach	36	41	44	36	34	71	70
Honesty approach	41	38	58	36	28	88	86
Meritocratic approach	59	89	59	71	81	53	79
<i>Senior academics in other higher education institutions</i>							
Practice-oriented approach	93	79	84	57	•	81	•
International approach	60	52	58	61	•	68	•
Value-oriented approach	54	53	71	39	•	73	•
Honesty approach	58	60	67	41	•	72	•
Meritocratic approach	80	98	42	80	•	47	•

Practice-oriented approach: “practically oriented knowledge and skills are emphasized in your teaching”; *International approach:* “in your courses you emphasize international perspectives or content”; *Value-oriented approach:* “you incorporate discussions of values and ethics into your course content”; *Honesty approach:* “you inform students of the implications of cheating or plagiarism in your courses”; *Meritocratic approach:* “grades in your courses strictly reflect levels of student achievement”

Abbreviations of country: see Table 47.1

^aResponses 1 and 2 on a scale from 1 = “Strongly agree” to 5 = “Strongly disagree”

There are noteworthy differences by country as well regarding the variety of *teaching activities*. In response to a list of seven types of activities beyond classroom instruction (e.g. learning in projects, electronic communication with students and individualized instruction), professors in German institutions mention on average only 2.8 types, while their colleagues in Finland report 4.4 and in the United Kingdom 4.5. The junior staff in universities reports somewhat fewer types of activities and, in contrast, the staff in other institutions of higher education more types of activities, but the variety by country is similar.

Altogether, the teaching scene in the universities in the various European countries does not seem to be more or less alike. According to the university professors’ perception, the regulatory conditions for teaching have remained varied by countries. Even though the power of higher education management is widely assumed to have grown in all European countries and even though this seems to be linked with a stronger inclination of those in power to influence the efficiency of academic work through regulations or through incentives and sanctions, academics themselves characterize the extent to which their activities are steered in such a way quite

Table 47.5 Views regarding research and scholarship by academics in selected European countries 2007 (percentage^a)

	DE	FI	NL	NO	IT	PT	UK
<i>University professors</i>							
Original research	83	68	80	92	73	81	68
Synthesis of findings	61	69	44	56	45	59	68
Application	62	74	41	59	57	77	69
Societal relevance	61	65	45	50	62	73	58
<i>Junior academic staff in universities</i>							
Original research	69	61	82	86	74	74	66
Synthesis of findings	67	59	41	61	49	62	63
Application	67	84	42	65	64	76	65
Societal relevance	44	58	46	51	61	73	59
<i>Senior academics in other higher education institutions</i>							
Original research	56	54	67	88	•	80	•
Synthesis of findings	72	75	52	68	•	57	•
Application	87	92	63	56	•	88	•
Societal relevance	63	78	74	56	•	66	•

Original research: “scholarships are best defined as the preparation and presentation of findings on original research”; Synthesis of findings: “scholarships include the preparation of reports that synthesize the major trends and findings in my field”; Application: “scholarships include the application of academic knowledge in real-life settings”; Societal relevance: “the faculty in my discipline have a professional obligation to apply their knowledge to problems in society”

Abbreviations of country and source: see Table 47.1

^aResponses 1 and 2 on a scale from 1 = “Strongly agree” to 5 = “Strongly disagree”

differently according to European countries. They differ also in the way they characterize their basic understanding of teaching and in the variety of teaching modes they employ. Junior staff in universities in the various countries does not differ substantially in their perceptions of the conditions of teaching and their understanding of teaching, but they employ a somewhat smaller spectrum of teaching activities than university professors. Senior academics in other institutions of higher education feel more strongly steered by regulations and incentives than university professors; on the other hand, they employ a broader range of teaching activities.

47.2.4 Research

Academics vary by country in their *views of the tasks of scholarship*, as Table 47.5 shows:

- Even their understanding of scholarships as preparation and presentation of findings of *original research* ranges from 92% in Norway to 73% in Italy.
- More considerable differences are visible regarding the task of *synthesizing findings and trends*: we note a range from less than a half in Italy and the Netherlands to more than two thirds in Finland and the United Kingdom.

Table 47.6 Number of publications completed in the most recent 3 years by academics in selected European countries 1992 and 2007 (index^a)

	DE	FI	NL	NO	IT	PT	UK
University professors 2007	56	38	41	27	40	44	38
(University professors 1992)	(33)	•	(50)	•	•	•	(29)
Junior ac. staff in universities 2007	20	16	27	12	29	23	15
(Junior ac. staff in universities 1992)	(14)	•	(20)	•	•	•	(20)
Senior ac. in other HEIs 2007	19	10	21	41	•	29	•
(Academics in other HEIs 1992)	(9)	•	•	•	•	(8)	•

3 points each for scholarly books (co)authored and co(edited); 2 points each for articles published in academic books or journals and research reports, 1 point each for papers presented at conferences and articles written in newspapers/magazines

Abbreviations of country and source: see Table 47.1

^aArithmetic mean

- The emphasis on the *application* of academic knowledge in real life settings even varies from clearly less than a half in the Netherlands to about three quarters in Portugal and the Finland.
- Finally, the *societal relevance of research* is again only emphasized by less than a half of the university professors in the Netherlands, but by three quarters in Portugal.

The responses of junior staff in universities again are similar to those of the professors in their respective country. This confirms the overall impression that junior academics in the individual European countries hardly differ from senior academics as regards their professional views and attitudes.

Altogether, senior academics in other institutions of higher education differ, as far as their understanding of research is concerned, on average clearly from that of university professors. They underscore original research less often and application and societal relevance more often. Again, a substantial variety can be observed by countries. Senior academics in other institutions of higher education in Norway clearly differ from their colleagues in other countries in harboring more or less the same views as professors of their country. As has been shown above, senior academics in Norwegian colleges also spend much more time on research than their colleagues in other countries and are also close in this respect to university professors in Norway (according to the interpretation of the Norwegian case in Kyvik (2009)).

Public debates suggest that academics in all countries are increasingly expected to be visibly productive. One could assume that the volume of publication is generally on the rise. A comparison of the findings of the survey conducted in the early 1990s with those of the most recent survey shows an overall growth trend, but we note a growth of more than half in Germany and of less than half in the United Kingdom and a reduction by about one fifth in the Netherlands. Although the expectation to be more visibly productive seems to be a global phenomenon, publication activities vary substantially. According to an index developed in the framework of the CAP project referred to in this analysis, German university professors publish more than twice as much as their colleagues in Norway (see Table 47.6).

Junior staff in universities publishes only about half as much as university professors. Again, the variety by country is striking: those in the Netherlands publish more than twice as much as those in Norway.

Publications play a completely different role in other institutions of higher education. Senior academics in Portugal and Norway do not publish much less than university professors in their respective country. But their colleagues in the Netherlands do not publish one fifth as much as the university professors in their country. Thus, those publishing most, i.e. senior academics in other institutions of higher education in Portugal, publish more than five times as much as their colleagues in the Netherlands.

University professors in the various European countries seem to differ in their views on the tasks of their research as much as in their views regarding teaching. Although it is widely claimed that increased pressures for visible academic productivity are more or less a global phenomenon, the publication activities vary strikingly by country. As one might expect, senior academics in other institutions of higher education underscore on average application and social relevance of research more strongly and publish less than university professors. But the borderlines between the two types of institutions are not consistent across Europe. In some countries, the university professors are, on average, more application-oriented than senior academics in other institutions of higher education in other European countries. In some countries, senior academics in other institutions of higher education publish more than university professors in other European countries. Finally, junior academics in universities might differ in their activities – in this case in the number of publications – from their seniors, but not in their views.

47.2.5 *Internationality*

The extent to which internationality varies will be examined with respect to three aspects: the international mobility of the academics, their international activities and the use of foreign languages.

The proportion of university professors who have *migrated* or who have been *mobile* in the course of their academic learning and work varies substantially by country. As the first five lines each show in Table 47.7, this proportion is even higher than one third among university professors in Portugal and one third in Norway, but only one out of seven or eight in Finland, Italy and the Netherlands. We note a similar range among senior academics in other institutions of higher education: on the one hand, more than one third in Norway and about one third in Portugal and, on the other hand, less in Finland and the Netherlands.

University professors in the majority of European countries included in the CAP study report on average a similar degree of *international activities*; only those in the United Kingdom and Italy seem to be less international in their activities. Junior academics in universities are less active internationally than their seniors, and senior academics in other institutions of higher education even less so, but, in both cases, we note a higher variation across countries than in the case of university professors.

Table 47.7 Migration and mobility of academics in selected European countries 2007 (percentage)

	DE	FI	NL	NO	IT	PT	UK
<i>University professors</i>							
Early immigrants	4	1	3	6	1	1	3
PhD immigrants	2	2	0	5	0	0	4
Professional migrants	4	3	6	5	0	0	10
Study mobile academics	9	2	4	9	0	19	3
PhD mobile academics	2	4	2	8	11	16	1
Non-mobile academics	79	88	86	67	87	63	78
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Senior academics in other HEIs</i>							
Early immigrants	8	2	1	18	•	5	•
PhD immigrants	2	1	0	3	•	0	•
Professional migrants	1	1	1	5	•	2	•
Study mobile academics	5	3	7	10	•	10	•
PhD mobile academics	3	2	0	5	•	15	•
Non-mobile academics	81	92	90	60	•	67	•
Total	100	100	100	•	100	100	•

Mobility during course of study or the doctoral phase of immigrants is not taken into consideration

Abbreviations of country and source: see Table 47.1

Table 47.8 International activities of academics in selected European countries 2007 (arithmetic mean of number of activities)

	DE	FI	NL	NO	IT	PT	UK
University professors	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.2	3.5	4.7	3.9
Junior academic staff in universities	2.6	3.3	4.1	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.3
Senior academics in other HEIs	2.2	2.9	1.9	4.1	•	3.6	•
Junior academic staff in other HEIs	1.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	•	3.0	•

International activities: international content in teaching, teaching many international graduate students, teaching abroad, international research collaboration, international research funding, joint publications with authors abroad, publishing abroad; international scope of research

Abbreviations of country and source: see Table 47.1

For example, senior academics of other institutions of higher education in Norway report on average that they are involved in four of the eight international activities addressed in the questionnaire, while their colleagues in Germany and the Netherlands state only two of those activities (Table 47.8).

Finally, the most dramatic variation across European countries can be observed with regard to the *use of foreign languages in academic work*. 42% of university professors in the Netherlands report that their home country language – Dutch – is neither the dominant language of their teaching nor of their research activities. The respective proportions are: 19% in Finland and 12% in Norway, and only 5% in Italy, 4% in Germany and 2% in Portugal. As one might expect, no British professors report to do their academic work predominantly in a language other than English. The range of responses is quite similar among junior academics in universities.

Teaching and conducting research predominantly in a foreign language is by far less frequent among senior academics in other institutions of higher education. Only 13% of the Dutch respondents report that they teach primarily in a foreign language, and a further 1% mentions that both teaching and research are undertaken in a foreign language. The two figures altogether are considerably smaller in other European countries.

In sum, ironically, one notes the very small extent of international similarity with respect to the visible international character of academia. Migration and mobility, visible international activities and the use of foreign languages varies dramatically in universities by country. Universities in small European countries are most international in those respects, and major English-speaking countries least international, corroborating the findings of an earlier study that the major Anglo-Saxon countries pursue “internationalization by import” (Enders and Teichler 1995).

Junior academics in universities are, in some respects, similarly international as seniors and, in some respects, less international, where they have had fewer opportunities in the course of their career or due to a more limited influence in the university. These findings suggest that there is not any sudden leap forward in the new generations as far as the internationality of academic work is concerned. Finally, we note that academics in other institutions of higher education are clearly, to a lesser extent visibly international than their colleagues.

47.2.6 Institutional Management

It is widely assumed that the institutional management in higher education has substantially changed in most European countries in the recent 2 years. Undoubtedly, the power of the university management seems to have grown to shape and steer the inner life of the institutions of higher education, and various means of evaluation seem to have become omnipresent. This was taken for granted in the survey “The Changing Academic Profession” (see Kogan 2007; Musselin 2007), and the responses to the question about evaluation clearly indicate a growth of evaluation activities as compared to the early 1990s, when the predecessor survey was undertaken.

However, a possibly similar worldwide trend in higher education policy does not necessarily mean that the internal environment within higher education institutions becomes very similar. In the framework of the study “The Changing Academic Profession”, the respondents were provided a relatively long list of *characteristics of management style* in their institution of higher education. In one of the subsequent analyses, these items were classified into four groups:

- “the academic university”, i.e. the university characterized by a strong influence of the academics,
- “the managerial university”, characterized by a strong performance orientation, a strong emphasis on the institution’s mission and a top-down management style,

Table 47.9 Perception of the higher education institutions’ management style by university professors in selected European countries 2007

University with	+	~	–
Researchers’ orientation	DE, US	FI, IT, PT, AU	NO, JP, UK
Management orientation	FI, AU, UK, US	JP	DE, NO, IT, PT
Service orientation	JP, US	DE, FI, NO, AU, UK, US	PT
Collegial orientation	FI, NO	DE, IT, PT, AU, JP, US	UK

Source: Teichler (2011a) (based on the survey “The Changing Academic Profession” (CAP), 2010 data set)

Managerial university: “a strong performance orientation”, “a strong emphasis on the institution’s mission”, “a top-down management style”. Collegial university: “students should have a stronger say in determining policy that affects them” (in reverse scale order); “I am kept informed about what is going on in this institution”, “collegiality in decision-making processes”, “good communication between management and academics”, “lack of faculty involvement is a real problem” (in reverse scale order); Supportive university: “the administration supports academic freedom”, “a supportive attitude of administrative staff towards teaching activities”, “a supportive attitude of the administrative staff towards research activities”, “professional development for administrative/management duties for individual faculty”, “a cumbersome administrative process” (in reverse scale order)

Abbreviations of country: see Table 47.1

- “the collegial university”, where strong emphasis is placed on good information for everybody, collegiality in decision-making processes and students’ participation, and, finally,
- “the supportive university”, where the leaderships supports academic freedom, administrative staff shows a supportive attitude towards teaching and research activities and where opportunities are provided for the professional development of the individual academics.

Table 47.9 summarizes the findings for six European and three other economically advanced countries. In summing the responses according to these four dimensions of management style, we note that university professors:

- in Germany consider their university to be shaped by a strong academic emphasis and a weak management,
- in Finland perceive their university as both management-oriented and collegial,
- in Norway view their university characterized by a strong collegial emphasis and low managerial as well as academic orientation in its managerial style,
- in Italy consider their universities not being managerial universities,
- in Portugal note both a low managerial and supportive emphasis, and
- in the United Kingdom consider their universities to have a strong managerial emphasis, while the academic and collegial orientation is viewed to be weak.

Thus, the findings certainly do not support the view that the universities in the various European countries have become very similar in their managerial styles.

One of the major managerial approaches in recent years has been a growing emphasis placed on the individual institution of higher education. University managers tend to develop “mission statements” and “visions” of individual institutions;

Table 47.10 Academics' affiliation to their own higher education institution in selected European countries 2007 (arithmetic mean*)

	DE	FI	NL	NO	IT	PT	UK
University professors 2007	2.6	2.1	2.6	2.6	2.3	1.8	2.9
(University professors 1992)	(2.6)	•	(2.4)	•	•	•	(2.1)
Junior academic staff in universities 2007	2.8	2.1	2.7	2.6	2.4	2.1	2.8
(Junior academic staff in universities 1992)	(3.0)	•	(2.6)	•	•	•	(2.3)
Senior academics in other HEIs 2007	2.6	2.3	2.5	2.4	•	1.9	•
(Academics in other HEIs 1992)	(2.9)	•	(2.5)	•	•	•	•

Abbreviations of country and source: see Table 47.1

*On a scale from 1 = "Very satisfied" to 5 = "Very dissatisfied" in 2007; four-point scale in 1992

often, a development of a clear institutional "profile" is advocated, and popularity of rankings is based, in most cases, on the belief that the quality of individual academic work is strongly determined by the environment of the individual institution. Therefore, one could expect that, if this managerial policy is successful, the academics' commitment to their institution of higher education is growing.

Although there is a difference between the scales employed in the two surveys, Table 47.10 suggests a different direction of the development of the institutional affiliation in the three countries for which information is available at both points. On the one hand, German academics who have had the least feeling of institutional affiliation in 1992, feel somewhat more affiliated to their institution in the meantime. In the Netherlands, we note only a small move into the same direction. In the United Kingdom, however, where the institutional affiliation was relatively strong in 1992, it declined considerably over time.

The most recent data do not suggest any similarity across countries. For example, in reporting the findings in percentages (not in arithmetic means, as stated in Table 47.10), we note that 76% of university professors in Portugal feel strongly committed to their own university, but only 46% of their colleagues in Germany and Norway. Junior academics in universities and academics in other institutions express a similar extent of institutional affiliation to their institution, whereby the variation by country is, by no means, smaller.

47.2.7 Professional Satisfaction

Finally, the degree of variety among academics regarding their professional satisfaction will be shown again differentiated according to different countries, types of higher education institution and career status of the academics. Except for a single country, academics of the various countries are satisfied to a similar degree, as Table 47.11 shows. Or in percentages: between 5% and 10% of university professors express dissatisfaction with their overall professional situation in six of the countries addressed and 15% in the United Kingdom. Among the junior staff in universities,

Table 47.11 Overall professional satisfaction of academics in selected European countries 1992 and 2007 (arithmetic mean^a)

	DE	FI	NL	NO	IT	PT	UK
University professors 2007	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.6
(University professors 1992)	(2.4)	•	•	•	•	•	(2.5)
Junior academic staff in universities 2007	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.8
(Junior academic staff in universities 1992)	(3.1)	•	•	•	•	•	(2.8)
Senior academics in other HEIs 2007	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.3	•	2.4	•
(Academics in other HEIs 1992)	(2.7)	•	•	•	•	•	•

Abbreviations of country and source: see Table 47.1

^aOn a scale from 1 = “Very satisfied” to 5 = “Very dissatisfied”

the respective proportion is somewhat higher and ranges from 8% in Norway to 20% in the United Kingdom. The respective proportion among senior academics in other institutions of higher education ranges from 6% to 13%.

47.2.8 *Inter-individual Diversity*

The descriptions and analyses hitherto published on the results of the comparative survey “The Changing Academic Profession” have focused on the extent of variety according to country, type of higher education institution and career status of the respondents. The CAP survey data are not suitable to analyze intra-institutional diversity, but they can be employed to analyze the diversity between individuals within the same type of higher education and the same career status. This will be illustrated with a few examples as regards university professors.

Obviously, university professors are quite free to shape their academic role:

- Some of the university professors report that they work more than 60 h per week, while other – full-time employed – professors work even less than the customary working hours in their country.
- Most professors consider both teaching and research as important components of their work, but 17% of them (country mean) point out a clear preference for research and 4% for teaching.
- 18% express a very high job satisfaction, while 3% are highly dissatisfied.

The impact on individual options on academic work has been recently analyzed for university professors in Germany and the United Kingdom with the help of CAP data (Teichler 2010b). Obviously, academics are relatively free to take options as regards their notions and activities with respect to teaching and research:

- 59% of university professors in Germany share their time between teaching and research in a relatively balanced way, but 24% devote clearly more time for research and 17% more time for teaching. Similarly, 43% of university professors in the United Kingdom have a relatively balanced schedule, while 33% spend clearly more time on research and 24% on teaching.

- Strong preferences for research are expressed by 12% of the university professors in Germany and 26% in the United Kingdom. Respective strong preferences for teaching are only expressed by 2% and 5%.
- 33% of university professors in Germany and 39% in the United Kingdom consider themselves as strongly theory-oriented, 25% each as both theory and practice-oriented, 22% and 19% as strongly practice-oriented, and, finally, 20% and 17% as neither strongly theory nor practice-oriented.

The in-depth analysis suggests that neither preferences for teaching and research nor orientations towards theory and practice have a pervasive influence on the university professors' views and activities. However, the time allocation for teaching and research is closely linked to make aspects of the academics' role:

- 75% of professors in Germany spending much time on teaching are involved in curriculum development, but only 46% of them are spending much time on research. The respective figures are 95% and 66% in the United Kingdom.
- In both countries, those spending much time on research publish twice as much as those spending much time on teaching.
- Professors spending much time on teaching believe more often that research and teaching are hardly compatible than those spending much time on research (33% vs. 3% in Germany and 33% vs. 23% in the United Kingdom).
- Those investing much time into research more often perceive a good working environment in their institution than those putting much time into teaching (55% vs. 39% in Germany and 47% vs. 31% in the United Kingdom).
- Professors in Germany spending much time on research believe much more often that they have a strong influence on their university (34% vs. 13%), whereas no such difference can be observed in the United Kingdom (9% vs. 8%).
- Finally, those spending much time on research are clearly more highly satisfied with their job than those spending much time on teaching (84% vs. 45% in Germany and 62% vs. 37% in the United Kingdom).

This analysis, in sum, shows that academics have room for options in their academic role, and we note that many academics do chose so. For example, some of them might only spend 1 h on various teaching-related activities per teaching hour, while others might spend 3 h or more on such activities per teaching hour. According to the above-named analysis, time allocation for research and teaching seems to be a very important issue for many aspects of academic life, but this does not go so far that it shapes all activities strategically. Altogether, however, those spending much time in research consider themselves in a preferable situation and are more highly satisfied than those spending much time on teaching.

47.3 Conclusion

The debate on diversity in higher education suggests that the national systems of higher education are likely to become increasingly similar as a consequence of the efforts to create a convergent European Higher Education Area, of widespread

believe in the virtue of certain trends of “modernization” of higher education, and as a consequence of global competition for creating world-class universities according to global rankings. In some respects, comparative surveys on the academic profession confirm such trends, for example, in showing a spread of evaluation activities and in a growth of visible international activities.

However, a survey on the views and activities of university professors in seven European countries undertaken recently in the framework of the study “The Changing Academic Profession” indicates a substantial variety by country. Across the about 20 themes examined, one notes very few cases where differences between countries could be called extreme, and one also observes very few cases where almost common norms and practices prevail across Europe. In most instances, one can note a range of variety which might be called substantial. For example, the proportion of university professors reporting a practice-oriented approach in teaching varies by country between 31% and 75%. And emphasis on applied research – not as the dominant one, but as one of several emphases – ranges from 41% to 77%. Even pressures to be more visibly efficient have different consequences: in some countries, the university professors’ working time matches the routine of employees, whereas, somewhere else, 30% more working time is customary. In the respective European country on the top, the number of publications is twice as high as in the country on the bottom in this respect.

The junior staff in universities, first, differs from university professors in some respects which might be explained by the career stage: for example, a less secure employment, a lower number of publications and less research cooperation worldwide. Second, one notes that the research and teaching functions and respective preferences on the part of the respondents are more varied between countries than on the part of university professors. In some countries, their research and teaching tasks seem to be similarly distributed and this is the case for university professors, while, in other countries, they concentrate more strongly on research. Third, the junior staff holds views very similar to senior academics as regards the conditions and the tasks of academic work. There are no indications that a changing understanding of the tasks and functions of higher education discussed publicly and the change of the managerial climate or resources for academic work affect the newer generations more strongly than the elder generations of academics.

Academics in other institutions of higher education, as one should expect, are more strongly devoted to teaching, are less international and publish less than academics in universities. At first glance, the findings seem to confirm conventional wisdom. A closer look reveals that the differences are often smaller than one might expect. For example, senior academics in other higher education institutions spend on average across countries only 10% more of their time on teaching and teaching-related activities. But this cannot be interpreted as a sign of erosion of the divide between institutional types in Europe, for, in some European countries, senior academics in other institutions of higher education spend almost a similar proportion of their work on research as university professors while, in other countries, they spend less than half of the time on research. Again, there seems to be more variety of norms and practices for academic work in other institutions of higher education in Europe than for academic work of university professors.

The study “The Changing Academic Profession” does not provide any information about the extent of variety or similarity of the academic views and activities between institutions of the same institutional types. Therefore, we cannot examine the extent to which the institutional rankings and institutional profiles are mirrored in the academics’ views and activities. However, information is available on inter-individual variety. There are norms and practices affecting large numbers of academics, but, obviously, academics have an enormous freedom to shape their individual academic life. For example, more than a third of the university professors do not consider themselves to strike more or less a balance between teaching and research, but rather consider themselves clearly as researchers with some additional teaching tasks or as teachers with, possibly, some additional research tasks. Interestingly enough, those clearly opting for research see fewer problems of compatibility of teaching and research in universities and are more highly satisfied with their overall professional situation than those clearly opting for teaching.

One might draw the conclusion that the debate about the desirable and the actual extent of diversity – substantial or moderate, vertical or horizontal – is too strongly occupied with the shape and the size of the system and with policy and management approaches to higher education. The academic views and practices seem to be shaped to a lesser extent by supranational fashion and pressures than one might expect, and they seem to reflect national cultures of higher education more strongly than the visions of Europe or of global higher education suggest.

References

- Aarrevaara, T., & Pekkola, E. (2010). *Muuttuva Akateeminen Profession Suomessa – Maaraportti* [The changing academic profession in Finland – National report]. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1996). *The international academic profession: Portraits of fourteen countries*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation.
- Bentley, P., Kyvik, S., Vaboe, A., & Waagene, E. (2010). *Forskningsvilkår ved norske universiteter I et internasjonalt perspektiv* [Research conditions at Norwegian universities from a comparative perspective] (Rapport, 8/2010). Oslo: NIFU STEP.
- Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., & Whitelaw, M. J. (1994). *The academic profession: An international perspective*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation.
- CHEPS. (2008). *Mapping diversity: Developing a European classification of higher education institutions*. Enschede: COLOFON.
- Clark, B. R. (1996). Diversification in higher education, viability and change. In V. L. Meek, L. Goedegebuure, O. Kivinen, & R. Rinne (Eds.), *The mockers and mocked* (pp. 17–25). Oxford: Pergamon/IAU Press.
- Coates, H. B., Dobson, I., Edwards, D., Friedman, T., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, L. V. (2009). *The attractiveness of the Australian academic profession: A comparative analysis*. Melbourne: LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management, Educational Policy Institute/Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Diversification of higher education and the academic profession (special issue). (2010). *European Review*, 18 (Supplement 1).
- Enders, J., & Teichler, U. (1995). *Der Hochschullehrerberuf im internationalen Vergleich* [The academic profession in international comparison]. Bonn: Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie.

- Huisman, J. (1995). *Differentiation, diversity and dependency in higher education: A theoretical and empirical analysis*. Utrecht: Lemma.
- Huisman, J. (2009). The Bologna process towards 2020: Institutional diversification or convergence? In B. M. Kehm, J. Huisman, & B. Sensaker (Eds.), *The European Higher Education Area: Perspectives on a moving target* (pp. 245–262). Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Jacob, A. K., & Teichler, U. (2011). *Der Wandel des Hochschullehrerberufs im internationalen Vergleich: Ergebnisse einer Befragung in den Jahren 2007/08* [Change of the academic profession in international comparison: Results of the survey of the years 2007–08]. Bonn/Berlin: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung.
- Kehm, B. M., & Stensaker, B. (Eds.). (2009). *University rankings, diversity and the landscape of higher education*. Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Kogan, M. (Ed.). (2004). *Management and evaluation in higher education* (UNESCO Forum Occasional Paper Series, 7). Paris: UNESCO.
- Kogan, M. (2007). The academic profession and its interface with management. In M. Kogan & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession* (Werkstattberichte, Vol. 65, pp. 159–173). Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel.
- Kogan, M., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2007). *Key challenges to the academic profession* (Werkstattberichte, Vol. 65). Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel.
- Kyvik, S. (2009). *The dynamics of change in higher education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Locke, W., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2007). *The changing conditions for academic work and careers in select countries* (Werkstattberichte, Vol. 66). Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel.
- Locke, W., Cummings, W. K., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Changing governance and management in higher education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Meek, V. L., Goedegebuure, L., Kivinen, O., & Rinne, R. (1996). Conclusion. In V. L. Meek, L. Goedegebuure, O. Kivinen, & R. Rinne (Eds.), *The mockers and mocked* (pp. 207–236). Oxford: Pergamon/IAU Press.
- Musselin, C. (2007). Transformation of academic work: Facts and analysis. In M. Kogan & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession* (Werkstattberichte, Vol. 65, pp. 175–190). Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel.
- Neave, G. (1979). Academic drift: Views from Europe. *Studies in Higher Education*, 4(2), 143–159.
- Neave, G. (1989). Foundation or roof? The quantitative, structural and institutional dimensions in the study of higher education. *European Journal of Education*, 24(3), 211–222.
- Neave, G. (1996). Homogenization, integration and convergence: The Chesire cats of higher education. In V. L. Meek, L. Goedegebuure, O. Kivinen, & R. Rinne (Eds.), *The mockers and mocked* (pp. 26–41). Oxford: Pergamon/IAU Press.
- Neave, G. (2000). Diversity, differentiation and the market: The debate we never had but which we ought to have done. *Higher Education Policy*, 13(1), 7–22.
- OECD. (1991). *Alternatives to universities*. Paris: OECD.
- Reichert, S. (2009). *Institutional diversity in European higher education: Tensions and challenges for policy makers and institutional leaders*. Brussels: European University Association.
- Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University. (Ed.). (2008). *The changing academic profession in international comparative and quantitative perspectives* (RIHE International Seminar Reports, Vol. 12). Hiroshima: RIHE.
- Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University. (Ed.). (2009). *The changing academic profession Over 1992–2007: International, comparative and quantitative perspectives* (RIHE International Seminar Reports, Vol. 13). Hiroshima: RIHE.
- Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University. (Ed.). (2010). *The changing academic profession in international comparative and quantitative perspectives: A focus on teaching & research activities* (RIHE International Seminar Reports, Vol. 15). Hiroshima: RIHE.
- Sadlak, J., & Liu, N. C. (Eds.). (2007). *The world-class university and rankings: Aiming beyond status*. Bucharest/Cluj-Napoca: UNESCO-CEPES/Presă Universitară Clujeană.

- Scott, P. (1996). Unified and binary systems of higher education in Europe. In A. Burgen (Ed.), *Goals and purposes of higher education in the 21st century* (pp. 37–54). London/Bristol: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Scott, P. (2008). Structural differentiation in higher education. In Kehm, B. M. (Ed.), *Hochschule im Wandel* [Changing higher education] (pp. 169–180). Frankfurt/M. and New York: Campus Verlag.
- Shin, J. C., Toutkoushian, R. K., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2011). *University rankings: Theoretical basis, methodology and impacts on global higher education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Teichler, U. (1988). *Changing patterns of the higher education system: The experience of three decades*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Teichler, U. (1996). The conditions of the academic profession: An international comparative analysis of the academic profession in Western Europe, Japan and the USA. In P.A.M. Maassen, & F. van Vught (Eds.), *Inside Academia: New challenges for the academic profession* (pp. 15–65). Utrecht: Uitgeverij De Tijdstrom.
- Teichler, U. (2007). *Higher education systems: Conceptual frameworks, comparative perspectives, empirical findings*. Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Teichler, U. (2008). Diversification? Trends and explanations of the shape and size of higher education. *Higher Education*, 56(3), 349–379.
- Teichler, U. (2010a). Diversity in higher education. In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGaw (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education* (Vol. 4, pp. 347–353). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Teichler, U. (2010b). The diversifying academic profession? *European Review*, 18(1), 157–179.
- Teichler, U. (2011a). Germany: How changing governance and management affects the views and work of the academic profession. In W. Locke, W. K. Cummings, & D. Fisher (Eds.), *Changing governance and management in higher education* (pp. 223–241). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Teichler, U. (2011b). Social contexts and systemic consequences of university rankings: A meta-analysis of the ranking literature. In J. C. Shin, R. K. Toutkoushian, & U. Teichler (Eds.), *University rankings* (pp. 55–69). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Trow, M. (1974). Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education. In OECD (Ed.), *Policies for higher education* (pp. 51–101). Paris: OECD.
- Van Vught, F. (1996). Isomorphism in higher education. In V. L. Meek, L. Goedegebuure, O. Kivinen, & R. Rinne (Eds.), *The mockers and mocked* (pp. 42–58). Oxford: Pergamon/IAU Press.