Chapter 6
The Professoriate in International Perspective

Joseph C. Hermanowicz

6.1 Introduction

My aim in this chapter is to consolidate the growing literature on the international professoriate. This literature has burgeoned particularly over the past 15 years, which is a response to the transformations that national higher education systems, from the nascent to the most advanced, have experienced around the world. The proliferation of this literature, as shall be made apparent, is now such that an exhaustive cataloging is not practical. Instead my overall goal is to identify the major clusters of work that animate research on the international professoriate and to thereby reveal how important comparative work may proceed.

Any such endeavor requires some demarcation of boundaries, even as these boundaries must be sometimes crossed when thinking about and researching one part of a network of interconnected parts. I am here concerned with the *professoriate*, that is, with the social order of *people* who, in varieties of arrangements, teach, undertake research, and engage in scholarship in tertiary institutions of higher learning. As such, the focus may be differentiated from a concern for the social organization of *universities*, from national *systems* of higher education, or from the *institution* of education, each type of structure in turn associated with particular sets of prevailing issues.

Subsumed under the overall goal of the chapter are five concurrent aims: (1) to identify the most prominent and pressing topics and themes in the current research literature on the international professoriate; (2) to thereby codify and systematize recent research undertakings; (3) to bring together bodies of work that might otherwise escape the notice of those interested in specific sub-areas, or to scholars

J. C. Hermanowicz (✉)
Department of Sociology, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
e-mail: jch1@uga.edu

of particular countries, but which offer important bridges by which ground may be connected; (4) to explore both substantive pay-offs and challenges in comparative work, and; (5) to expose empirical and theoretic gaps in the work to-date which present opportunities for significant conceptual advancement.

These aims, while seeking to impart benefits on students and scholars of the international professoriate, prompt a prior question; namely, why study the international version of something? As many know, it is enough of a challenge to study smaller units of that something. Studying academics of France (e.g., Musselin, 2001), Great Britain (e.g., Halsey & Trow, 1971), the United States (e.g., Clark, 1987a), Japan (e.g., Arimoto, Cummings, Huang, & Shin, 2015), or any other country, is arduous work.

All studies and how they are executed, depend, of course, on the specific questions that motivate them. This methodological point notwithstanding, our understanding comes only by comparison with something else. We are able to understand and evaluate a professoriate of one country with reference to that of another. It is not the only way to go about comprehending the professoriate (we could compare it to other occupations and professions within nations, for example), but it is arguably a profitable one.

More to the point, higher education is increasingly a key feature of modern social organization throughout the world. Over 200 million students are enrolled in post-secondary institutions globally, which represents a doubling in just the first twelve years of the twenty-first century (Altbach, 2016). By 2030 it is estimated that student enrollment will again double to 400 million (Altbach, 2016). These students are taught by over six million post-secondary teachers, a number that in turn is likely to grow as enrollments rise (Altbach, 2016). To a significant degree, higher education around the world is institutionally set apart—conceptually and operationally—from education at the primary and secondary levels. To that end, the people who constitute the professoriate on which these workings rely merit researchers' attention, in ways akin to the family and kinship systems, the military, the economy, the polity, and other facets of modern social organization.

Higher education, and the professoriate on which it depends, has, especially in the last quarter-century, experienced globalization, often understood by an increased integration of a world economy (King, Marginson, & Naidoo, 2013). Science, technology, and scholarship are increasingly global in scope (Altbach, 2016). Knowledge, research, researchers, and students are increasingly mobile and transcend of national boundaries. Rankings of universities in which academics work are themselves now global, all of which speaks to a kind of common ground that sustains an increasingly institutional world-wide enterprise of endeavor (Altbach & Balan, 2007; Clotfelter, 2010; Shin & Kehm, 2013). By this accord, the professoriate warrants international, comparative investigation.

Finally, comparative inquiry may aid in identifying strengths and weaknesses in and between the systems in which members of the professoriate carry out their work. Here we are readily aware of the pretense that conventions and procedures found in one part of the world are seamlessly imported elsewhere. If, however, we understand through comparison, then even wide-ranging comparisons have the chance to

Chart 6.1 Organization of the chapter

I. Part 1: Theoretic Foundations

 A. Conceptual Frameworks

  1. Classic Contributions

  2. Contemporary Contributions

 B. Center and Periphery

 C. Theoretic Puzzles: Convergence & Differentiation

 D. Growth & Accretion

II. Part 2: Topical Forays

 A. Academic Freedom

 B. Contracts and Compensation

 C. Career Structures and Roles

 D. The "Changing Academic Profession" Project

III. Conclusion

deepen understanding and inform relevant policy interests by an expanded mindfulness of how things work under varied sets of conditions, whether close to, or far from, home. Despite a proliferation of international work on the academic profession, important calls for still more comparative work, covering a broad range of theoretic and policy-related higher education concerns, are voiced with advisories that much needed work lies ahead (Perna, 2016).

The chapter proceeds with two encompassing parts. By way of organizational clarity, I offer a visual map in Chart 6.1 of the terrain that the chapter will traverse. In part one, *theoretic foundations*, I discuss conceptual frameworks for understanding the professoriate comparatively, as well as the guiding ideas that inform a conceptualization of the professoriate internationally. I introduce the subject of *conceptual frameworks* and then proceed in turn to a consideration of *classic* and then *contemporary* contributions. In part two of the chapter, *topical forays*, I identify the main clusters of work, both analytic and empirical, that situate contemporary international study of the professoriate. The forays include (1) academic freedom; (2) contracts and compensation; (3) career structures and roles; and (4) an accounting of the "Changing Academic Profession" project. I conclude the chapter with three suggestions to enable future successful comparative work.

6.2   Part 1: Theoretic Foundations

A discussion of core theoretic concerns that inform the comparative study of the international professoriate is organized into four parts: an explication of major *conceptual frameworks* used to organize comparative inquiry and analysis, which includes both classic and contemporary formulations (dating from the 1970s and 1980s in the case of the former, and from the 2000s in the case of the latter); a consideration of a paramount metaphor, *center and periphery*, used in the comparative study of international higher education, including the professoriate; an identification of *theoretic puzzles* that have emerged from comparative work, chiefly involving the ideas of convergence and differentiation; and, finally, a recapitulation of *growth and accretion* as forces deemed causal antecedents to change and evolution in a global professoriate.

6.2.1   Conceptual Frameworks

While the benefits to be gained from international comparative work—whether on professors, state revolutions, or culinary cuisine—are potentially substantial, so are the challenges, and arguably not a single comparative higher education researcher has been remiss in noting this fact. The challenges center on *the point* in analytic thinking at which meaningful comparisons and contrasts can be drawn. The closer we get in comparison, the more the parts are apt to diverge. The further we back away from comparison, the more the parts blur into unmeaningful generality. Even the idea of an "academic profession" is riddled with problems. Neave and Rhoades (1987), for instance, have ventured to exclaim that academia of Western Europe, where academia has its oldest roots and most traditional customs, is not a profession, but an "estate," "whose power, privileges, and conditions of employment are protected by constitutional or administrative law" (Neave & Rhoades, 1987, p. 213). By this it is meant that the professoriate is tied to the state and that it is national in its basis and orientation, as opposed to a free standing, largely autonomous profession. By their argument, "academia in Western Europe does not lend itself to translation into terms equivalent to the Anglo-American concept of an academic profession," nor is academia understood there as one of the liberal professions such as medicine or law (Neave & Rhoades, 1987, p. 220; see also Musselin, 2001, p. 135, entry for "academic personnel"). Despite these assertions, the term "estate" has not been adopted into the vocabulary of contemporary work. Researchers more typically invoke the idea of a profession and carry out empirical inquiry into a "professoriate," while understanding its linkages to the state.

In the interests of taking a few steps forward, let us speak for our present purposes of a *professoriate* in all countries that is defined by a constellation of teaching, research, and service roles as part of their central occupation and socially understood as the core academic staff in a given nation's system of higher education—"the

'productive workforce' of higher education institutions and research institutes, the key organizations in society serving the generation, preservation and dissemination of systematic knowledge" (Cavalli & Teichler, 2010, p. S1). The constellation of roles varies, to be sure, at extremes in different countries. In many countries, including many in Africa, there is little or no research or scholarly role as part of the professoriate. In other countries, such as Germany, the research role dominates. In still other countries, such as the United States, service and teaching roles can substitute for research in many institutions, including in the U.S. "research university." But these are the most basic points. These roles constitute the most general similarity. When we dig further we quickly realize that the differences can be so great that bases of comparison become highly problematic and thus subject to litanies of qualification and caveat.

By simple analogy, we may observe fruit, but our exercise amounts to a comparison of apples and oranges and pears. Terms such as "profession," "professor," "teaching," and "career," among many others related to those who carry out tertiary higher education, are complicated by national comparative idiosyncrasies (Teichler, Arimoto, & Cummings, 2013). To take but one instance of the point, most higher education teachers, from a world view, do not even hold a Ph.D. (Altbach, 2016, p. 25, 300). (How can an individual without advanced training and certified credentials be part of a profession? Strictly speaking they may be understood as members of the academic occupation. The occupation may or may not be situated on a path of professionalization akin to the forms found in some other parts of the world.) Possession of a doctorate may be assumed for most academics in the United States, Germany, France, England, Japan, and other highly developed education systems. What is the German professoriate in comparison with that of Ethiopia? Clark (1993a, p. 263) has put the problem as follows: "Any theory of convergence that highlights a common drift...and similar forms...will need in time to shade into a theory of divergence that observes individualized national evolutions."

Nevertheless, some past and some recent work have confronted this difficult challenge and attempted to provide theoretic structures in which to see substantive similarities and differences that facilitate grounded, empirically robust comparative understanding of the professoriate. It is important to identify the most fully elaborated of these structures so that our awareness, renewed or newly made, is drawn to them, and that, in doing so, we may search for still more sophisticated ways to organize thought about and study of the international professoriate. The articulation of these structures, deliberately selective but representative nonetheless, also provide an important backdrop for the growing and scattered amount of empirical research that characterizes the most recent activity in research on the professoriate, a subject to which we shall return. These most recent empirical forays demand an order and systemization, of the kind theoretic structures can provide, such that their contributions may be more fully explained.

While the following structures for comparative theoretic understanding of the professoriate are arguably among the most fully elaborated, they will not be elaborated fully here. Readers can refer to the original texts for a complete coverage. Rather, the present aim is to identify points of differing emphasis, to highlight their

most salient features, and, to these ends, intimate how they—or contemporaneous adaptations of them—can bring aid to the state of affairs in which current scholarship on the international professoriate finds itself. The discussion proceeds to a consideration of classic and then to contemporary contributions to frameworks used to anchor comparative work conceptually.

6.2.1.1 Classic Contributions

In *Centers of Learning*, Ben-David (1977) laid a strong foundation for comparative higher education analysis. His purpose was "to view the principal systems of higher education in the Western world as historical entities, namely, to see in response to what needs they first emerged, how they developed their structures, and how they responded to changing needs and opportunities" (Ben-David, 1977, p. 3). The systems he selected were those of Britain, France, Germany, and the United States. The rationale was that these systems were dominant across the world landscape, and were so because "they developed a high degree of all-around scientific excellence and self-sufficiency over a long period of time" (Ben-David, 1977, p. 5).

Ben-David opts to go about comparative analysis by focusing on the chief *functions* of higher education, explaining how the functions evolved in different systems and how their evolution portended contemporary performance. For Ben-David, the chief functions are five: professional education; general education; research and training for research; social criticism; and social justice. The first three of these functions are traditional and legitimate; the last two, new and illegitimate that have been foisted upon higher education roughly at the start of the last third of the twentieth century. He asserted at the time that by institutionalizing criticism and justice as formal functions, higher education systems also formalized threats to academic freedom and the autonomy of higher learning. Criticism and justice were, by this view, manifestations of a politicization of, and thus a detriment to, the academy. Ben-David's serious concerns about the point can be seen to have borne fruit. The intersection of purpose (e.g., freedom of inquiry in teaching and research) and protection (i.e., constraint on speech, including, ironically, instances of criticism) in universities has become a topic of mounting interest in universities, perhaps especially in, but not limited to, the American context (Bilgrami & Cole, 2015; Fish, 2014; Gerstmann & Streb, 2006; Patai & Koertge, 2003; Slaughter, 2011).

In taking a functions-approach, the problem for Ben-David becomes one of integrating the functions, so that nations constitute a "well-functioning system" of higher education; these four dominant national systems went about this task differently. An ascendance in the importance in research, beginning in the eighteenth century but rising to a crescendo in the mid- and late-twentieth century (and thereafter), raised many problems for universities. For Ben-David there exists an inherent tension of "linking education (which is essentially the transmission of a tradition) with research (the transformation of a tradition)" (Ben-David, p. 97).

The German system, most committed to research, supported a relatively weak general education to students not seeking to pursue a research or scientific career. The French system made little effort to incorporate research into the universities, culminating decades later in what Musselin (2001) has described as the "long march of the French universities" that sought a corrective re-integration of research and, consequently, a heightened university influence in French politics, policy, intellectual and cultural life. The British system integrated research and teaching more successfully, with an acknowledgement that some areas of research could not be fashioned with the universities' educational functions. The result was the creation of institutes. Examples of such institutes include those covering areas of biotechnology, cancer research, and actuarial science. In the United States, to the extent there was a relatively harmonious balance, it was seriously jolted following World War II, when a tremendous influx of research and scientific funds aided an ascendance in the disciplines and the empowerment of the specialist-professor (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). Even at the time of Ben-David's writing, long after the War, the American system was grappling with readjustment and newly posed problems of a well-aligned research-teaching configuration in its national higher education system.

For all of his scholarly and personal association with the scientific role and the scholarly values that universities should espouse (Greenfeld, 2012), Ben-David claimed that it was crucial to attend to the education of the general student for, as Vogt (1978, p. 91) put it, "money is in the 'FTE's', not research." Universities must "settle down to a realistic rate of [scientific] growth" (Ben-David, 1977, p. 173). Interestingly, by his reasoning, the welfare of higher education systems throughout the world depend largely on how they direct resources to general education. Ben-David's work was prescient. Universities globally now confront the challenge of educating unprecedented numbers of undergraduate students, but they also attempt to integrate a global press for prestige garnered by scientific research (Shin, Toutkoushian, & Teichler, 2011; Yudkevich, Altbach, & Rumbley, 2016). Despite Ben-David's predictions in 1977, when he claimed the U.S. system best positioned to evolve in functionally beneficial ways, it is arguably unclear which type of national system is best arranged to accommodate the new proportions of these historic demands. Shin and Teichler (2014a), extrapolating from Ben-David a Humboltian model, a Napoleonic model, and an Oxbridge model of higher education, offer important insights into how contemporary conditions of global higher education may be understood in the context of prior theoretic formulations. This discussion is expanded in Teichler (2014a), but a theoretic resolution of the problems—given the contemporary magnitude and scope of teaching/research pressures on systems—remains to be worked-out. In addition, Arimoto (2014) adopts a language of the "teaching-research nexus," which in reformulated terms was so central to Ben-David's earlier theorizing, in order to outline an historical argument about how universities' vital functions have evolved over time. For still additional treatments of the research-teaching relationships, which reflect contemporary developments in a broad array of countries, see the 21 chapters in Shin, Arimoto, Cummings, and Teichler (2014).

Whereas Ben-David's mode of comparative entré consisted of higher education functions, which the professoriate was socially mandated to carry out, Clark (1983), in *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*, changes the comparative lens and instead focuses on concepts: the concepts of *knowledge*, *beliefs*, and *authority* which, he contended, constitute a normative structure, variegated across national systems, in which governance and decision-making in higher education may be understood. Whereas for Ben-David, the professoriate was the chief implicated actor, for Clark the professoriate explicitly competes (and often struggles) to accomplish educational objectives with multiple entities and political groups, chief among them the state and the market. While keenly aware of and sensitive to the importance of "function," Clark's rendition of comparative framing is, while well short of what popularizers might call "Marxist," considerably more conflictual.

Clark's purpose was to understand the variation in the national structure of academic systems, why such variation arose, and how such variation reflects organizational solutions to tensions in respective systems. In so doing, Clark also conveys how systems vary by virtue of different historical circumstances and cultural traditions as well as how systems, in light of their social evolution, treat political and demographic challenges. Clark's comparisons were based on the United States, the United Kingdom, Japan, East and West Germany, Sweden, France, Italy, Australia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Mexico, and Thailand, but these are frequently collapsed as Continental, British, American, and Japanese models. Further still, he understands the British, German, French, and American systems as models for the higher education systems found, or to be developed, in other countries. He did so by arguing that these systems were the most "mature" and thus having had developed a capacity of modeling. This modeling constitutes a large-scale instantiation of "academic drift" usually reserved to characterize the status aspirations of institutions *within* national systems. Here, system-level arrangements are selected and studied because nations with younger and developing systems seek to emulate them. Clark's 1995 work, *Places of Inquiry*, reprises a visit to the systems in the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain, France, the United States, and Japan (see also the edited collection of essays on the higher education systems of these countries, especially pertaining to graduate education and research [Clark, 1993b]).

As for Clark's original guiding concepts, they are deployed in *The Higher Education System* as research questions: How is academic work, organized around knowledge, arranged? How are beliefs, the symbolic side of institutional existence, maintained? How is authority distributed? And also, incorporating knowledge, belief, and authority as interacting parts, how does change take place? He finds his answers in the exchanges and contests among a multi-layered configuration of organizational entities: in disciplines (exemplifying professorial, collegial, and guild-like control); in enterprises—colleges and universities (exemplifying trustee and bureaucratic control); and in the larger system (exemplifying government, political interest group, and professorial-organization control). To understand the

operation of disciplines, enterprises, and systems is to understand the dynamics of power wielded by politicians, bureaucrats, and professors at the postulated levels of analysis.

On the Continent, for example, Clark argues that guild authority (authority vested in a group of artisans who control the terms of their craft) and state bureaucracy have led to weak enterprise authority. In Britain, collegial authority mixed with trustee authority have led to greater state influence. In the United States, trustees and administrators are strong, but are counter balanced by guild and bureaucratic authority of departments. For Clark, Japan constitutes a blend of American and Continental forms: faculty guilds of a small set of universities dominate the system by their capacity to work with a state bureaucracy and they co-exist with a larger set of less politically influential faculties and institutions (Herbst, 1985).

Clark introduced a major conceptual tool of continuing utility: a *triangle of coordination* in which national systems of higher education could be mapped according to the gravity that pulled them in the direction of, and by which they accordingly assumed a typifying structure, stated as: (1) state authority; (2) the market, or; (3) academic oligarchy (1983, p. 143), where academic oligarchy refers to "the imperialistic thrust of modes of authority...in the way that personal and collegial forms, rooted in the disciplinary bottom of a system, work their way upward to have an important effect on enterprise and then finally system levels" (Clark, 1983, p. 122). By "imperialistic," Clark means dominant and ascendant as a form. The crux of authority in the academic oligarchy is the professor by virtue of disciplinary expertise. (For a critique of the triangle of coordination construct, including overlooked nuances of authority constellations *within* academic oligarchies, see Brennan, 2010).

The location of national systems on the triangle of coordination are different, often dramatically, between what Clark saw in 1983 and what higher education researchers see today, a point which underscores, rather than negates, the triangle's conceptual utility. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy to observe both a changed *mapping* of systems onto the triangle, in which especially the market has assumed a principal coordinating influence on academe, and a changed *language* to characterize international higher education. "We have observed," Clark wrote in 1983, "...that national systems can legitimately be ruled by professors...Operating as the major professional group...they have had, in many systems of the world, privileged access to central councils and offices, and they have been the most important constituency to please for top bureaucrats and political officials" (Clark, 1983, p. 122). He also recognized distortions of analytic thinking: "It does not make much sense to evaluate business firms according to how much they act like universities...Neither does it make any sense to do the reverse" (Clark, 1983, p. 275).

Yet this appears to be precisely a direction in which higher education systems, and authorities of them in many parts of the world, have gravitated, especially the United States and Europe. Brennan (2010, p. 234) observes: "In the English-speaking world at least, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that many key actors, both inside and outside higher education, do in fact expect universities to behave like

businesses." Similarly, Hüther and Krücken (2016, p. 56) use Clark's foundational work for its juxtaposition with historical developments:

> ...[F]rom the 1980s onwards, traditional European university structures have been facing significant changes. The starting point was changes in the British university system (Leisyte, de Boer, & Enders, 2006; Risser, 2003) that quickly spread to the Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands (de Boer & Huisman, 1999; de Boer, Leisyte & Enders, 2006). Later we find reforms in France (Mignot Gerard, 2003; Musselin, 2014), Italy (Capano, 2008), Germany (Hüther & Krücken, 2013, 2016; Kehm & Lanzendorf, 2006), and Eastern European countries (Dobbins & Knill, 2009; Dobbins & Leisyte, 2014). In recent years, research has shown a move in nearly all European countries toward...NPM [New Public Management].

Further, whereas for Clark the beliefs of "liberty" and "loyalty" were central to academic organization (Clark, 1983, pp. 247–251), Brennan (among others) suggests that these values have been replaced by such ideals as "competitiveness" and "entrepreneurship" (Brennan, 2010, p. 234; also Marginson & Considine, 2000; Slaughter, 1993; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Even the value Clark sees assigned to "competence" (Clark, 1983, p. 245–247), seemingly so central to the order of higher education because of its alleged meritocratic premises, may be questioned in ways today as unlike previously (Hermanowicz, 2013). For instance, the world-wide enlargement of the professoriate to meet demands of rising student enrollment, as well as concomitant changes in appointment type, call faculty quality, training, and ability into question (Altbach, 2002, 2003; Enders & de Weert, 2009a). In Chart 6.2, I list the core ideas, discussed above, that are used with the illustrative figures associated with classical formulations of studying the professoriate comparatively.

6.2.1.2   Contemporary Contributions

Reflecting changes in system environments, Enders (2001a) has proposed a conceptual framework that reformulates Clark's original triangle of coordination. His contributions—along with those identified below—illustrate among the more recent ways to conceive comparative study of academics. We thus encounter a simultaneous shift from, and a building upon, earlier theorizing as seen illustratively in foundational works of Ben-David (1977) and Clark (1983).

Enders notes that control of higher education institutions has shifted away from academic oligarchy toward market and state control. But Enders contends that new actors have also emerged that constrain decision-making and degrade guild authority. These new actors, operating in conjunction with the state, the market, and the academic oligarchy, compose three sets: "stakeholders," who play roles in financing and governing institutions; "university management," which consists of growing echelons of administrators, and; "other university members," which include the voices and votes of staff as well as students in the conduct of university affairs. For a figure of this model, see Enders (2001a, p. 5).

"Stakeholders" have entered the stage via channels of intensified fundraising activities and industry partnerships. "University managers" have appeared as a result

Illustrative Figure	Core Ideas
Joseph Ben-David	Functions of Professoriate to Understand • Professional Education • General Education • Research & Training for Research • Social Criticism • Social Justice Centrality of general education
Burton Clark	Organizing Concepts to Study • Knowledge • Beliefs • Authority Centrality of "triangle of coordination" • State Authority • The Market • Academic Oligarchy

Chart 6.2 Key elements of the classic tradition in studying the professoriate comparatively

of accretion of university functions as well as an accountability movement that entails an "audit culture" and a regime of reporting activity within universities (Lucas, 2006; Power, 1997; Tuchman, 2009). "Other university members" emerged as actors in the management of universities (and encroachment on the professoriate) via gains in political power that were achieved in the 1970s and which have intensified subsequently. In this last case, the American system, for instance, witnessed a transformation in academic governance through senates of universities and corresponding nomenclature: once such entities were the province of "faculty governance." Now, in most public U.S. institutions, they are the vehicles of "university governance," with staff councils and student assemblies seated alongside professors and cadres of administrators to ratify institutional policy.

The model that Enders proposes builds directly upon Clark's (1983). It seeks to account for the historical developments in international systems of higher education, particularly in Europe, across the last quarter of the twentieth century, which have continued to intensify in the first quarter of the twenty-first century. By accounting for these historical changes, and in identifying the new sets of actors that re-make constellations of authority in universities and in higher education systems, the professoriate is de-centered in two senses. First, and most transparently, collegial control and guild power are diminished. The dynamics of which Clark (1983) spoke at the level of department and discipline (quite apart from the level of enterprise and system) are taken away, weakened, and/or overshadowed, by competing forces exogenous to units of faculty. Put differently, the process illustrates deprofessionalization. Second, it may be said that these specific changes in and transfers of authority leave in question precisely how the professoriate should be

studied and understood. In this sense, the professoriate is de-centered from analysis, in that the story, once of and about the academic staff, is increasingly a story of other things. The subject of professors begins to get co-opted by research concerns increasingly formulated as matters of management and governance. Department and discipline remain real entities, but interests in the state and the market have increasingly occluded them, both tangibly and intellectually.

Like Enders, Finkelstein (2015) seeks to develop a conceptual framework of international academe that is responsive to the most contemporary conditions. Finkelstein's approach is to posit five provisional models of the professoriate loosely tied to specific national contexts around the world. The models include: (1) the state-centered model; (2) the institutionally anchored model; (3) the part-time professional model; (4) the communitarian model, and; (5) the hybrid model.

The *state-centered model*, exemplified by nations such as Germany, France, and Italy, is distinguished by the terms of faculty employment. Faculty are government, not institutional, employees, and thus operationally faculty are hired, promoted, and rewarded by a central government. While state-centered, the model also entails measurable faculty control, because the central government does not dictate orders, and because institutional powers tend to be weak in light of de facto state-organizing authority. A consequence is a splintering of authority hierarchically, in which senior academic staff, or chairs, are markedly differentiated from junior academic staff (Finkelstein, 2015, pp. 321–322).

The *institutionally anchored model*, exemplified by nations such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada, is an opposite of the state-centered model. Individual universities operate as the units in which academic careers are pursued, regulated, and rewarded. In contrast to the state-centered model, careers are more predictable and paths to seniority clear. Disciplines are arranged horizontally into academic departments that emphasize collegial control over hierarchy, even in the presence of a system of academic ranks (Finkelstein, 2015, pp. 322–323).

The *part-time professional model*, exemplified especially by Latin American countries, is characterized by centralized government control, weak institutional administrations, and a largely part-time faculty. Throughout Latin America, faculty consist of groups of professionals who teach part-time in professional education programs that confer a first academic degree in fields such as business, engineering, law, and medicine. For the most part this has entailed an absence of a full-time university faculty, and academic appointments are understood as ancillary to professional careers outside of institutions. Generally, little concern thus exists about trajectories of academic careers, and faculty, owing to a weak institutional integration, play little role in university governance (Finkelstein, 2015, pp. 323–324).

The *communitarian model*, exemplified by China in particular, stresses the idea of community in which members both live and work. First academic appointments are often based on sponsorship by current members, who may also possess family or social ties to recruits. As Finkelstein (2015, p. 324) states, "The university is a place of residence, family and community life, leisure and commercial activity—as well as work." Careers in this context of community are predicated not only on academic obligations but also informal rules of communal life. Indeed, according to

Illustrative Figure	Core Ideas
Jurgen Enders	Reformulation of Clark's "triangle of coordination" to incorporate new actors
	Centrality of: • "stakeholders" • "university management" • "other university members"
Martin Finkelstein	Responsiveness to contemporary plurality of professoriate
	Centrality of Models of the Professoriate • State-centered model • Institutionally anchored model • Part-time professional model • Communitarian model • Hybrid model

Chart 6.3 Key elements of the contemporary tradition in studying the professoriate comparatively

Finkelstein, disciplinary responsibilities are secondary to community ones (Finkelstein, 2015, p. 324).

Finally, the *hybrid model*, exemplified most approximately by Japan, is argued to include at least one major element of the preceding four models. Japan's professoriate is significantly differentiated by the public versus the private sector. The public sector operates more akin to the state-centered model, while the private sector more akin to the institutionally anchored model. At Japan's national universities, faculty exert considerable authority even as budgets are allocated from a ministry. Budgets are in turn determined by precedent rather than by enrollment or research productivity. By contrast, in the private sector, the ministry sets enrollment targets, but individual institutions determine faculty appointments and working conditions (Finkelstein, 2015, p. 325).

In Chart 6.3 I list the core ideas, discussed above, that are used with the illustrative figures associated with contemporary formulations of studying the professoriate comparatively.

6.2.2   Center and Periphery

Many of the major analytic frameworks for understanding the international professoriate comparatively, whether articulated decades ago or more recently, make use of a metaphor, expressed both in the empirical bases of the frameworks and in their theoretic formulations. The metaphor consists of *center and periphery*. In its usage in higher education, "centers" refer to loci of the most important thought, great

intellectual energy, and the source from which transformative intellectual power flows. By turn, "peripheries" are places outside the center where intellectual activity can occur but on smaller scales. Their definition is set in terms of their relationship to a center. Centers are endowed with charismatic authority, peripheries not so. Sometimes the usage of the metaphor is explicit, as in the work of Ben-David (e.g., 1977) and Altbach (e.g., 2003), at other times implicit, as in Clark's work (e.g., 1983). Elsewhere, such as with Enders and Finkelstein, they are not specifically used. Empirically, the major comparative frameworks, such as those of Ben-David and Shils, as discussed in the preceding sections of the chapter, have been based on examinations of the most mature and/or most successful higher education systems, where arguably the oldest and/or most successful instantiations of the professoriate are found (i.e., Britain, France, Germany, and Continental systems writ large, and the United States). These are *centers*. What remains is the *periphery*, where specific cases of a national professoriate are proximal to the center in varying degrees (e.g., Japan's professoriate is closer to the idea of a center than that of South Africa's, even as South Africa's professoriate has developed significantly over time, and is thus closer to a center than it once was). Most of the major frameworks use this metaphor in turn to make comparative inferences about the professoriate, both in its instantiations at the center (explicitly the task of Ben-David's and Clark's master works) and in its instantiations on the periphery, vis-à-vis a far or near center (explicitly the task of Altbach's work [e.g., Altbach, 2003]). Clearly, though, in comparative work on the professoriate of the most theoretic sort, Britain, France, Germany, and the United States have been covered far more extensively than other countries, a point not lost on those of us who study academics (Musselin, 2011, pp. 423–424).

Forms of the professoriate and the issues affecting it, as found at the center, are mirrored on the periphery. Thus, by this orientation, despite cultural differences across national systems, and extending from affluent to middle-income and developing countries, forms and problems of the professoriate are finite. They are versions of something, having previously played-out in some way, somewhere else. As Altbach (2003) argues, a generalized evolution is explained by the fact that universities in industrialized countries set the patterns for all countries. Musselin has explained that "[d]eveloping countries are therefore in a world of 'peripherality' or, to put it more crudely, in a situation of dependence on resources, importation of knowledge, access to technologies, attractiveness, value setting, and the like. As a result, the academic profession in those countries is the same as the academic profession in industrialized countries writ large…" (Musselin, 2011, p. 427). Using African nations as a point of reference, Altbach elaborates that the French model was imposed by colonial power in many countries on the African continent, "but that even in Ethiopia, [and outside of Africa, in] Thailand, and Japan, where foreign academic patterns were not imposed, European models prevailed over existing indigenous academic traditions. Following independence, when developing countries had the chance to change the nature of the university, none chose to do so" (Altbach, 2003, pp. 3–4). Parallel points are made about many Asian nations and still other African nations with respect to the British model of higher education (Altbach & Umakoshi, 2004; Ashby, 1966).

In its usage in higher education, and for the study of the professoriate specifically, the center-periphery construct owes its formulation to the thinking of Shils (1961 [1975]). And we may note how a line of professional descent between Shils and Ben-David and between Shils and Altbach helps to account for the importance that this device has played in the oeuvre of these exceptionally creative and influential scholars. As Shils conceived it:

> The center, or central zone, is a phenomenon of the realm of values and beliefs. It is the center of the order of symbols, of values and beliefs, which govern the society. It is the center because it is the ultimate and irreducible...The central zone partakes of the nature of the sacred...The center is also a phenomenon of the realm of action. It is a structure of activities, of roles and persons, within the network of institutions. It is in these roles that the values and beliefs which are central are embodied and propounded...The section of the [world] population which does not share in the exercise of authority and which is differentiated in secondary properties from the exercisers of authority, is usually more intermittent it its 'possession' by the central value system. For one thing, the distribution of sensitivity to remote, central symbols is unequal...Furthermore, where there is more marginal participation in the central institutional system, attachment to the central value system is more attenuated (Shils, 1961 [1975] p. 3 &13).

Center and periphery concern fundamentally degrees of societal *integration* into an order of things, in this instance, an integration of formal learning, teaching, and discovery into a society and culture. Some higher education systems are highly developed, that is, highly integrated into the broader order and fabric of a national culture and society. This integration is both cause and consequence of a system's linkages to other systems around the globe. Other higher education systems are less integrated, and, once upon a time, still others had yet to be developed (e.g., Brazil's first university, the University of Rio de Janeiro, was created in 1920 and remained the country's only university for many years [Schwartzman, 2011]). By further example, the present higher education systems of Myanmar and North Korea are comparatively undeveloped and thus, by this conception, comparatively peripheral to the central zones of higher learning (Altbach, 2016, p. 244). Still, the cases of Myanmar and North Korea are now ones of only a handful of national higher education systems around the world that are this nascent.

This fact directs us to a larger point. Rise in post-secondary enrollments around the world exerts pressure on peripheries to develop. Development is modeled on other systems. The systems found in Central and Eastern Europe, for example, are directly patterned on the German model (Altbach, 2002); many systems in African nations are patterned on the University of Paris and increasingly on the American model (Altbach, 2003), and so on. Thus, "centers" multiply; some peripheral systems develop to become more central. New peripheries—emergent systems in countries, and new institutions in developing systems—are born to accommodate new demands for higher education, science, and technological training. This growth and mimicry results in an expanding institutionalization of finite forms and, also, of problems that arise in them (e.g., how to deal systemically and institutionally with continued growth; how to compensate a professoriate amidst competing demands on the State; how to recruit and, in effect, constitute a professoriate, and the like).

6.2.3 Theoretic Puzzles: Convergence & Differentiation

A present concern in the literature on the international professoriate encompasses the idea of *convergence*. The idea holds that, where once the professoriate was highly differentiated by country, it is increasingly isomorphic, insofar as its basic form and accompanying problems are concerned (Shin & Kehm, 2013; Teichler, 2014b). Convergence is an expression of institutional theory in the field of sociology (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; also Meyer, 1977; Meyer, Kamens, Benavot, & Cha, 1992; Meyer, Ramirez, & Soysal, 1992). Institutional theory is an explanation of change in educational systems, structures, and their content (Bentley & Kyvik, 2012).

> . . .institutional views stress the dependence of local social organization on wider environ-
> mental meanings, definitions, rules, and models. The dependence involved goes well beyond
> what is normally thought of as causal influence in the social sciences: in institutional
> thinking, environments constitute local situations—establishing and defining their core
> entities, purposes, and relations (Meyer, Ramirez, Frank, & Schofer, 2007, p. 188).

Meyer et al. (2007) argue that the form and meaning of higher education has been institutionalized throughout the world. This means that constructs such as "university" or "professor" or "student" or "course" "may be locally shaped in minor ways but at the same time have very substantial historical and global standing" (Meyer et al., 2007, p. 187). What is more, "universities and colleges, together with their disciplinary fields and academic roles, are defined, measured, and instantiated in essentially every country in explicitly global terms" (Meyer et al., 2007, p. 188). Institutional theory predicts isomorphic change in education organizations and in the professoriate in ways that mimic the practices found in the most successful (e.g., highly-ranked) universities and related national systems (Bentley & Kyvik, 2012). The university and its constitutive parts are, by this view, universalizing as part of a world society (Ramirez & Meyer, 2013).

This theoretic view, while itself institutionalized and influential, is contested. Cummings (2003), in a comparative study of six countries—Germany, France, England, the United States, Japan, and Russia—offers an historical comparative view of the evolution of educational systems. Cummings adopts a perspective that follows ideas of the sociologist Max Weber, in which national systems may be viewed as ideal societal types. Each type promulgates a "concept of the ideal person," which tend to be resistant to change. When change does occur, it tends not to involve dramatic, structural transformation, but refinement of preexisting patterns (Arnove, 2005).

This perspective harkens back to Clark (1983; 1993a), who specified that changes in higher education systems occur in contexts of local traditions, historical circumstances, and cultural contexts. In outlining distinct archetypes of education, Cummings averts a unilinear theory of modernization, as indicative of an institutional approach. He acknowledges a degree of convergence in which Western nation states have diffused educational templates internationally. But Cummings assigns greater importance to ongoing variations and the survival of distinct organizational forms

(Davies, 2004). Cummings' project is to demonstrate the cultural plurality of institutions of education. He thus rejects arguments of global isomorphic change.

Institutional theory and the idea of convergence are also marred by seeming contradictions in the research literature. On the one hand is the idea of growing sameness; on the other, an idea of intensifying difference. For example, Enders speaks of a "profession of professions." "Faculty are the heart and soul of higher education and research. But they are not one heart and one soul. . .the idea that there is a single academic profession becomes more and more contested" (Enders, 2011, p. 9). Separate disciplines and fields may, for example, be taken as distinct professions. Drawing on Clark (1987a), Enders (2006) identifies four important axes that differentiate the academic profession internationally: discipline or academic specialty, sector or institution, an internal ranking system, and national differences (also Clark, 1987b). Teichler (2010) and Altbach (2016), among others, explain how the contemporary international professoriate is marked by a growing *diversification* on a wide range of counts.

Further, seeming contradiction is evident in ideas of "community." Institutional theory, with its isomorphic claims, could be interpreted as possessing a power to lay a ground for a sense of "one-ness" or "we-ness" in an international professoriate. Yet scholars of the professoriate have made just the opposite claims. Much to the contrary, they instead speak repeatedly of a *fracturing* of the professoriate, in single nations let alone the world at large, into many segments, and to the decline of a sense of community (Altbach, 2002, p. 162, 2016, p. 286; Clark, 1987a; Hermanowicz, 2009).

What is interesting theoretically is that the *same* force is attributed as the causal driver of convergence on the one hand and differentiation on the other. This is, namely, the force of *massification*, which makes the conceptual contradictions more analytically fulsome. By turn, enrollment growth is said to drive systems and institutions to be more alike globally; at the same time it is attributed as a differentiating force on multiple levels—institution, national system, and international educational form. These apparent contradictions require analytic reconciliation. A possible course of such reconciliation is to suggest theoretically, and empirically verify, a convergence in *structure* of higher education *systems* globally, but a splintering in the *culture* of *institutions*—that is, in how academic work is experienced by academic staff. By this account, systems around the world are growing in size and consolidating in structure. But consolidation of structure does not shield (and may even facilitate) the effects of size on culture, and thus community. Such examples of theorizing require empirical treatment and focused analytic attention. The identification of massification as a carrier of such significant structural and cultural change for the professoriate is itself so notable a point that it merits its own attention. It is thus a subject to which we turn.

6.2.4   Growth and Accretion

Trow's classic 1974 essay was prescient, beginning with its first sentence:

> In every advanced society the problems of higher education are problems associated with growth...These problems arise in every part of higher education—in its finance; in its government and administration; in its recruitment and selection of students; in its curriculum and forms of instruction; in its recruitment, training, and socialization of staff; in the setting and maintenance of standards; in the forms of examinations and the nature of qualifications awarded; in student housing and job placement; in motivation and morale; in the relation of research to teaching; and in the relation of higher education to the secondary school system on the one hand, and to adult education on the other—growth has its impact on every form of activity and manifestation of higher education (Trow, 1974 [2010], pp. 88–89).

Trow's timelessly relevant contribution was to underscore a universalistic dynamic force in modern higher education systems. As Clark (1993b, p. 263) has put it: "The base similarity of modern systems of higher education is that they become more complex," and this similarity and complexity are at once adduced to be driven by expansion.

Customarily in the research literature, the subject of *growth*—explicit or implied—is student enrollment. But it is a mistake to believe that strictly student enrollment is growth's sole modifier. While Trow paid close attention to the profoundly altering force that enrollments exert on higher education systems, including the shape, form, and character of the professoriate, his concern for growth was not restricted to "numbers of students."

His concern, and those of select others, extended to "growth in what universities take on to do," which, one might say ironically, creates dysfunction. The growth extends from the addition of particular academic and/or professional schools (engineering, medicine, health, and law, for example) to the addition of particular offices (such as health clinics, career and placement centers, study abroad programs, student social and extracurricular programming). One might say this is ironic because universities assume greater responsibilities in the name of service: to serve more people and constituencies, and in so doing to serve them better. Yet much is often compromised by this growth: clarity of mission, and an ability to do all things well.

Smelser (2013) has offered a theory of accretion, in which higher education grows by adding functions, structures, and constituencies, but seldom sheds them, resulting in increasingly complex organizations. For Smelser, accretion embodies a theory of system- and institution-level change. In practice, accretion entails the very kinds of problems posed by rises in enrollments as indicated by Trow. A major theoretic point is not to restrict causal attributions of change in higher education, including growth in the global professoriate, to student numbers (Metzger, 1987). Instead it is more theoretically robust to understand expansion in terms that encompass both growth in enrollment and accretion in function. To date, however, far more attention has been paid to the former than to the latter.

The United States was the first country to create a mass higher education system. It has thus been also a system, but clearly by no means the only system, in which to see and study dramatic effects on, and structural and cultural consequences for, the

professoriate. Given its first brushes with massification, the United States has served as a model for other countries to examine as they opened access to higher education (Altbach & Forest, 2011). Mass access to higher education is now a reality in most of the world. Industrialized countries enroll approximately 30% of the relevant college-going age group, and developing countries will confront major enrollment growth in the next decades (Altbach & Forest, 2011, p. 2). Indeed China has already eclipsed the United States as the largest academic system in the world, even though it presently enrolls about twenty percent of its college-going age group (Altbach & Forest, 2011, p. 2). Dramatic growth has only just begun to occur in parts of the developing world such as sub-Saharan Africa and in the countries of Southeast Asia. Still, of the ten largest open-access universities in the world, nine are in developing countries (Altbach & Forest, 2011, p. 2). What is more, in response to demand, a private sector of higher education has grown significantly in many parts of the world, including in countries where once the public sector dominated, such as in several countries in Latin America (Altbach & Forest, 2011).

Finally, it is worth making explicit an additional set of patterns that have come to characterize the professoriate on an international scale, and which operate—again ironically—in correspondence with the patterns of growth and accretion. These corresponding patterns consist in *narratives of decline* (Enders & de Weert, 2009b, p. 251). Everywhere in the world, the professoriate is said to be "in decline." Perhaps the academic profession, wherever it has existed, has always been in decline, at least in perception. The perception has certainly existed for at least four decades, evident in *Academics in Retreat* (Deutsch & Fashings, 1971), *The New Depression in Higher Education* (Cheit, 1971), "The Crisis of the Professoriate" (Altbach, 1980), *The Decline of Donnish Dominion* (Halsey, 1992), *The Academic Profession: The Professoriate in Crisis* (Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997), *The Decline of the Guru* (Altbach, 2003), *Whatever Happened to the Faculty?* (Burgan, 2006), among numerous sources. The decline is seen as all-encompassing, affecting the whole of the academic enterprise. Still another critic summed it up as *The University in Ruins* (Readings, 1996).

If there is decline, then it must represent a fall from some high point. This point is often attributed, and attributed hagiographically, as the "golden age" of the years spanning roughly 1945 to 1970, particularly in the United States (Thelin, 2011). Still, the point in time, or an era, is not decidedly clear. Musselin (2011) argues that if we want to talk of decline from one point to another, we need to be able to measure change between any stated set of points. She thus calls for better, more systematic measurement of what is stable and what changes in the occupational conditions of the professoriate.

The "decline narratives" seemed to have assumed a greater potency especially in the early 1970s and thereafter. Today, the sound of alarm has achieved an apparently feverish pitch. This may be for valid reasons. Feller (2016), in his essay, "This Time It Really May be Different," argues that the historic resiliency of higher education may be unable to withstand the extent to which Federal and state government funding has eroded. It is precisely this erosion that accounts for the transformation in the very way the professoriate is constituted, exhaustively documented by

Schuster and Finkelstein (2006), through dramatic shifts in types of faculty appointment (also Finkelstein, Seal & Schuster, 1998). In aggregate, in the U.S. system, non-tenure line faculty now out-number traditional, full-time, tenure-line appointments (Schuster, 2011). This shift is in the midst of being witnessed internationally (Altbach, 2003; Altbach, Reisberg, Yudkevich, Androushchak, & Pacheco, 2012; Altbach, Androushchak, Kuzminov, Yudkevich, & Reisberg, 2013; Finkelstein, 2010). Finkelstein's part-time professional model is self-demonstrative of the pervasive trend.

The sense of decline corresponds with real growth. "Another inevitable result of massification has been a decline in the overall standards and quality of higher education" (Altbach & Forest, 2011, p. 2). Here again, much of the research literature treats rises in student enrollment as the major if not sole object of growth, but we know that growth extends to function (Smelser, 2013). Thus perceived decline may have ties not simply to massification but also to organizations whose accretion de-centers and alienates faculty. "Academics increasingly work in large organizations and are constrained by bureaucratic procedures" (Altbach, 2002, p. 162).

There are many other specified reasons for perceived decline, both in the United States and in the professoriate of societies throughout much of the world: the rise of state and market control, managerialism, neoliberalism, the corresponding degradation of collegial control, the diminished quality and altered type of faculty appointments, the preparedness, commitments, and motivations of students, and so on. But if we believe Trow (1974 [2010]), all of these problems have their source in *growth*. It is thus again ironic to recognize that amidst arguable fruition in systems (in global access to higher education and in the functions that higher education takes on) there is perceived, if not also measurable, demise in the professoriate. "Despite the fact that the academic profession is at the core of the university, the professoriate has suffered a decline in status and remuneration in many countries, at precisely the time when higher education has moved to the center of the global knowledge society" (Altbach et al., 2012, p. xi).

Recalling Chart 6.1, the foregoing sections of the chapter have identified and explained the key characteristics of the major *conceptual frameworks*, both classical and contemporary, to studying the international professoriate comparatively. Charts 6.2 and 6.3 summarize the core ideas associated with illustrative figures connected to the respective classical and contemporary formulations in studying the professoriate comparatively. The discussion has sought to encourage ways, either by emulation or adaptation, to organize contemporary empirical and theoretic inquiry into comparative analysis of the professoriate. The exercise exposed other significant theoretic issues as central to considering past as to future work on academics. These matters include a dominance of a guiding theoretic metaphor to account for variation (and, implicitly, change) in the international professoriate, *center and periphery*; theoretic puzzles in which the *convergence* of structure and form is said to occur at the same time *differentiation* is postulated; and the importance, historic yet intensifying, of *growth and accretion*—in enrollment of students and in the functions performed by institutions—as forces that alter the professoriate. Growth and accretion are

conjoined by widespread beliefs about decline in the professoriate around the world. Decline, and a multitude of other conditions of the professoriate—"real" and "perceived"—are, in principle, a prerogative of empirical examination. It is thus the subject of the most current empirical and analytic inquiry into the international professoriate to which we turn.

6.3   Part 2: Topical Forays

Referring again to Chart 6.1, part two of the chapter focuses on topical forays that are illustrative of current comparative work on the professoriate. Specifically, four major clusters of work animate prevailing inquiry into the international professoriate. At times these clusters of work are empirical. More often they are analytical and descriptive, an artifact of attempting to undertake comparative work, in which comparison can in many instances most profitably be made with broad heuristic approaches. A recent surge of specifically empirical work, conducted under the auspices of an international set of projects entitled "The Changing Academic Profession" is, to significant degrees, not truly comparative but rather engages in country by country reports. The topical clusters constitute a ground on which bona fide comparative work on the professoriate has been undertaken. There are many other topics as it were that pertain to professors, and as the bibliography contained herein implies, but they often are topics in a substantive isolation or which belie comparison. The clusters of topical forays here treated in turn include: *academic freedom*; *contracts and compensation*; *career structures and roles*; and an account of the "*Changing Academic Profession*" *project*.

6.3.1   Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is an idea so closely associated with the professoriate, at least in the West, that it assumes a defining characteristic of the professoriate. Within the West, academic freedom, both as a principle and as a practice, has become very strongly linked to the system of academic tenure as found in the United States, even though its origins lay elsewhere and date to a time that far precedes the development of American higher education (Hofstadter, 1955; Hofstadter & Metzger, 1955; Metzger, 1951, 1961). Yet for its centrality, it is understood, interpreted, and applied variously to instances where it is thought to be exercised or violated (Schrecker, 1983). Further still, academic freedom may also be taken to apply to students, administrators, and institutions. It was, in part, with an appreciation of students' academic freedom in Germany where an American preoccupation with it began in the nineteenth century (Cain, 2016; Metzger, 1967). Nevertheless, agents of its pluralistic understanding, interpretation, and application are often academics, particularly in systems of higher education where academic freedom is, ironically, the

most "well-developed." Few if any academics "take a course," or some part thereof, in their educational training on what academic freedom may or may not be; most of them also do not understand what a profession is and is not. Instead they mimic and manage to create a plentitude of tolerable or semi-tolerable ways to practice and behave in one (cf. Kennedy, 1997; Shils, 1983), and may invoke "academic freedom" when they perceive some aspect of a purported civic freedom has been violated. What is more, its centrality to dominant national systems of higher education in the West lends academic freedom to another of those ideas that is readily willed as a normative condition of the academic profession throughout the world. How can one have a professoriate without academic freedom? The answer, as it turns out, is locatable in many parts of the world.

A traditional understanding of academic freedom, construed in the Western world, has been advanced by Shils (1991), and it is worth quoting at length:

> Academic freedom is a situation in which individual academics may act without consequences that can do damage to their status, their tenure as members of academic institutions, or their civil condition. Academic freedom is a situation in which academics may choose what they will assert in their teaching, in their choice of subjects for research, and in their publications. Academic freedom is a situation in which the individual academic chooses a particular path or position of intellectual action. Academic freedom arises from a situation in which authority—be it the consensus of colleagues in the same department, the opinion of the head of the department, the dean, the president, the board of trustees, or the judgement of any authority outside the university, be it a civil servant or a politician, or a priest or a bishop, or a publicist or a military man—cannot prevent the academic from following the academic path that his intellectual interest and capacity proposes. Academic freedom is the freedom of individual academics to think and act within particular higher educational institutions, within the system of higher educational institutions, and within and between national societies (Shils, 1991, pp. 1–2).

This understanding, by turn, permits inference as to what academic freedom is not, again as thought about by Shils (1991):

> Academic freedom is not the freedom of academic individuals to do just anything, to follow any impulse or desire, or to say anything that occurs to them. It is the freedom to do academic things: to teach the truth as they see it on the basis of prolonged and intensive study, to discuss their ideas freely with their colleagues, to publish the truth as they have arrived at it by systematic methodical research and assiduous analyses. That is academic freedom proper (Shils, 1991, p. 3).

Still, the protection and enforcement of academic freedom, even in those systems where it is most valorized, such as the United States, is left essentially to an organizational ether. University administrations are understood as quasi guardians of academic freedom, yet they (or specific members of them) are often the objects of reported violations of professors' academic freedom. Faculty panels may be convened to assess specific cases that allege an infringement upon academic freedom, but such panels rarely possess statutory authority; the operationalization of their conclusions is thus organizationally problematical. Professional associations, including but by no means limited to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in the case of the U.S., may take stands in defense or support of academic freedom and seek to intervene on behalf of specific persons whose academic

freedom is believed to have been violated, but these associations have no administrative authority over universities, colleges, or institutes. Public admonishment, an inconsistent, non-binding, and financially costly mechanism, is an association's only corrective tool for social control. Even colleagues, however once trusted, close-by, trained in an area, informed about a case, or professionally acquainted with an individual or individuals, cannot be depended upon to uphold principles of academic freedom on which their very own livelihoods purportedly rely. "It should not be thought that academics always desire and strive for the academic freedom of their colleagues" (Shils, 1991, p. 14). Indeed the point connects to the observation in the literature discussed below that threats to academic freedom differ in their origins. In developing countries the threats are external to universities in the form of the state, other ruling bodies, or individuals. In the United States in particular the threats are often understood to come from within the university itself (Altbach, 2002, 2003). The latter should not be viewed as a luxury compared to the former.

The beginnings of academic freedom are themselves testimony to internationalism. European universities in the Middle Ages were self-governing to a degree (Rashdall [1895] 2010). But the church and/or the state controlled them in vicissitudes for centuries. As modern science emerged in seventeenth century England (Merton [1938] 2001) and as the partaking in research and scholarship began to spread in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries throughout Europe (Zuckerman & Merton, 1971), an interest in the protection of free inquiry intensified. Students who pursued advanced education did so in Europe, and especially Germany, where many of them became professors, and where, consequently, the idea of *Lehrfreiheit* emerged: "the right of the university professor to freedom of inquiry and to freedom of teaching, the right to study and to report on his findings in an atmosphere of consent" (Rudolph, 1962, p. 412).

Modern notions of academic freedom, even in Europe, began to coalesce in the nineteenth century and on into the early- and mid-twentieth century with the ascendance of the research role performed by academics and the increasingly research-minded institutions that employed them. Yet the point should not be lost that a broader interest in freedom of thought and teaching pre-dates these considerations. McLaughlin (1977) has explained how assertions of scholarly freedom in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries at the University of Paris constitute a legacy of protections in the pursuit of knowledge. Indeed, Cain (2016) notes that the term *scholastic freedom* is traceable to Pope Honorius III in the thirteenth century (see also Hoye, 1997). Owing to the length of life of the general idea across time and cultural contexts, it is unsurprising that understandings of academic freedom, in any one society, let alone many of them, have evolved (Russell, 1993), have consequently become plural (Brown, 2006; Fish, 2014; Metzger, 1988; Shiell, 2006), and are thereby also availed to misunderstanding and mis-application (Goldstein & Schaffer, 2015; Schrecker, 1983; Shils, 1991).

That there might or should be simply one way to construe academic freedom, as promulgated by Shils (1991) or Rudolph (1962) and many others, is something of a modern paradox. Academic freedom is often assumed by many to be a necessary condition for an authentic academic profession wherever professors are employed.

"Academic freedom is a core value of higher education everywhere. Without it, quality teaching and research are constrained…Academic freedom is so much a part of the lifeblood of the university that it is today taken for granted" (Altbach, 2004, p. 2). In reality, these three declarations are empirical matters. It is equally transparent that national systems of higher education vary in their cultural, social, and political settings, traditions, and histories. To say that the conceptions of academic freedom offered by Shils, Rudolph, and others are "normative" is accurate in a limited theoretic sense, but it nevertheless averts the socio-historic reality in which academics practice in many parts of the world. We will come to see in this chapter how it is challenging to offer a universal definition of a "professor," among many other elements that are theoretically constitutive of an academic profession. The same may be said of "academic freedom."

What are the conditions of academic freedom around other parts of the globe? In general terms, academic freedom as an ideal has, in the U.S., applied to the classroom, the laboratory, and the public sphere (Altbach, 2002; Shils, 1991). In Western Europe, the ideal is more restrictive; it applies to teaching and research within the university and is circumscribed by areas of expertise (Shils, 1991). Broadly speaking, the Western European tradition attempts to reflect the idea of *Lehrfreiheit*, as noted above, as well as that of *Lehrnfreiheit*, the freedom to learn, which highlights the historic instrumental role that students played in the formation of this tradition. Nevertheless, one can find permutations in how academic freedom is conceived even within Western Europe (Cavalli & Moscati, 2010), and certainly between it and Central and Eastern Europe, the Nordic countries, and Russia (Altbach, 2002; Rostan, 2010).

Based on a comparative analysis of Western and Sinic (or post-Confucian) higher education systems, Marginson (2014) argues that differences in enactments of academic freedom reflect variations in state traditions and political cultures.

> The Western and English-speaking traditions speak especially to the power of individualism, to knowledge as an end in itself (though this is contested by government) and state-society relations and the contribution of universities to the broader public sphere, civil discussion and democracy. The Sinic tradition speaks to the good of the collective and individual aware of the collective, to the applications and uses of knowledge for ultimately practical ends (here there is more agreement in the East, than in the West, between university and state) to pluralism within the state and the securing of state responsibility and good government, and to the social leadership role of universities (Marginson, 2014, pp. 39–40).

Zha (2011 p. 464) casts further light on distinctions between West and East, China specifically: "Westerners focus on restrictions to freedom of choice, whereas Chinese scholars looking at the same situation focus on responsibility of the person in authority to use their power wisely in the collective interest" (quoted in Marginson [2014, p. 36]; see also Yan, 2010). Yet also consider views that beg to differ, as in: "Chinese academics routinely censor themselves. Criticism, loss of jobs, or even imprisonment, they understand, can result from publishing research or opinions that contradict the views of the government" (Altbach, 2007, p. 49).

These types of distinctions have been thought about in terms of "negative" and "positive" freedoms. "Negative freedom" consists of a *freedom from constraint*.

People shall *not* be physically or intellectually barred from activities. By contrast, "positive freedom" consists of the active *capacity to do good things.* People *shall* be able to do what they want to do, which lead to constructive ends (Berlin, 1969).

As Marginson argues, both set-ups for academic freedom—paradigmatically East and West, positive and negative—contribute to intellectual life. They do so, however, in distinctive ways, and both are compatible with a free exercise of academic roles, though the substantive content of faculty members' work and aims of their roles are different in the Western and Eastern contexts concerned (Marginson, 2014).

Marginson emphasizes the additional point that even in the West, academics rarely have the opportunity to engage in "blue-sky inquiry." Many of them are required to raise money and to tailor their research and teaching to the needs and interests of clients, sponsors, and governing authorities (Marginson, 2014). If, for example, professors' are compromised in their ability to assign grades independently or to produce research and scholarship as they see fit, they become "managed professionals" (Rhoades, 1998).

Furthermore, differing freedoms may apply to academic disciplines and professional fields of work. Fields vary in how much they tolerate plurality—in assumptions, premises, theory, methods, and other conventions. Marginson suggests that mainstream economics, for example, is less tolerant of dissent than social theory (Marginson, 2014). For these reasons, according to Marginson, the idea of a "universal" academic freedom lacks validity. Academic freedom is not for Marginson a concept divorced from time and place—as if locked in a state of "paradisiacal being"—but is, rather, "a set of relational human practices that are irretrievably lodged in history and changing in time and place" (Marginson, 2014, p. 26).

He thus calls for the conceptualization and study of academic freedom in ways that balance universal qualities with local, contextualized enactments of it. Academic freedom is imputed normatively, but also exists in empirical categories (Marginson, 2014). We can thus imagine many versions of academic freedom that reflect their cultural nestling.

Tierney and Lankford (2014) rebut such an argument as historically deterministic: "current actions are inevitably [interpreted as] the result of a country's particular traditions" (Tierney & Lankford, p. 19). They argue on behalf of academic freedom as an international imperative. By their account, the forces and realities of *globalization* authorize a *willing* of academic freedom, as understood historically in the West, upon academics everywhere. "Academic freedom, as a transcendent value, needs to be protected regardless of location…a threat to academic freedom in a faraway land, regardless of geography, is a threat to academic freedom everywhere" (Tierney & Lankford, 2014, p. 20).

Rostan (2010) similarly argues that globalization, short of serving as only an economic term, changes the purpose and function of academic work throughout the world. By this reasoning, academics can be viewed increasingly as workers employed to advance the economic interests of their home country, independent of (or stripped from) cultural tradition (Tierney & Lankford, 2014). Based on data from academics in Finland, Germany, Italy, Norway, and the United Kingdom, Rostan

(2010) examines the extent to which academics perceive a government demand for "relevance" to intrude into the academic profession. Rostan finds support to the idea that specifically teaching evaluation, research funding, and ties to economic sectors link academics to external actors. These linkages operate as mechanisms by which expectations of social and economic relevance intrude into the professoriate and constrain academic freedom. Aarrevaara (2010), focusing on Finland as a case, and using the same base of data, makes closely similar assertions that tie demands for relevance to constraint in the practice of academic work and teaching.

As with "relevance," academic freedom gets tied-up in the political movement of "accountability," which is itself found in an increasing number of national contexts throughout the world. Enders (2006, p. 11) underscores these points further still: "...more and more faculty around the globe realize that academic freedom does not necessarily include a protection from social and economic trends affecting the rest of society. Growing interests in strengthening the accountability and responsiveness of higher education to society form part and parcel of the realities of twenty-first century academe everywhere." Consequently, we may observe how higher education scholars posit a demand for a universal academic freedom, while at the same time many such scholars note increasingly global ways in which it is compromised. Altbach (2007, p. 49) has offered the additional paradox by seeing that "academic freedom is far from secure in many parts of the world," yet "also more widespread in the early 21st century"—a phenomenon attributable to the growth and development of academic systems around the world, as discussed in the previous section of this chapter.

Academic freedom in a limited number of national systems, particularly the United States, is strongly associated with tenure. But globally, most systems of higher education do not have tenure. This fact begs the obvious question of how academic freedom, however construed, can exist in an absence of tenure protections. Answers to the question are not straightforward, but are rather, again, seen by many as conditioned by histories and traditions, long or limited, that situate professors' work in a relationship between the state and higher education (Altbach, 2003). The issue is encumbered by the additional fact that a very large and increasing number of academic staff throughout the world are employed in part-time positions or in other types of positions with fixed contracts (Altbach et al., 2012). This, too, is a consequence of global growth and accretion in higher education (Altbach, 2016; Shin & Teichler, 2014a).

The reality that academic freedom is understood differently in different parts of world makes comparison difficult—a recurrent theme of the present chapter (Altbach, 2002). This very likely accounts for the relative paucity of explicitly empirical treatment of academic freedom in international comparative focus. We do not even know, for example, but only infer through a Western lens, that academic staff outside the West take academic freedom as importantly as those in the West, most especially the United States. They may in various ways, but they still work without it, strictly speaking.

Those who have ventured to make comparative assertions about the actual operation of academic freedom do so by implying an empiricism but are in actuality

writing in general, observational terms. This has value, because it is all that we have with which to understand academic freedom in several systems throughout the world. The degree of generality and absence of empirical elaboration place limits, however, on our current means to analyze academic freedom comparatively.

Altbach (2002) notes that academic freedom is now more robust in central and eastern Europe, as well as in Russia, than it was in the former Soviet period. The idea that professors ought to have freedom in research, teaching, and expression is reportedly gaining greater acceptance in the political and social spheres. In Latin America, full-time permanent staff are a small proportion of the academic labor force, but even full-time academics have little job protection. There is not tenure, but there is de facto security; rarely are they let go (Altbach, 2003). Many universities in developing countries, including in Latin America, operate as centers for activism and incubators of social movements (Altbach, 2003). In addition, especially in developing countries, the history of higher education is an expression of state control (Altbach, 2003). This combination of forces places limitations on academic freedom in these substantial parts of the world.

Philip Altbach, who has been a long observer of, and has written about the global conditions of academic freedom, perhaps more than anyone else, has suggested the creation of a "world academic freedom barometer," akin to global measures of human rights. The idea places on a differentiated scale efforts that are an impetus behind groups such as the former Network for Education and Academic Rights (NEAR), sponsored by UNESCO (Akker, 2006), the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), as well as the *Scholars At Risk Network*, whose mission is to protect scholars and promote academic freedom (see: https://www.scholarsatrisk.org/). Definitional difficulties notwithstanding, Altbach proposes six qualitatively-based categories into which academic systems might be placed (Altbach, 2001, pp. 210–217):

1. Severe restrictions—systems where academic freedom is non-existent, such as those of Myanmar, Iran, North Korea, and Syria.
2. Significant limitations and periodic crisis—systems where academic freedom may exist in small degrees but accompanied by significant restrictions, as in the systems of China, Viet Nam, and Cuba.
3. Tension in the context of limited academic freedom—systems that have general academic freedom but only where classroom and research activities are not considered sensitive by the state, characteristic of many countries in Africa and Asia.
4. Academic freedom with limits—systems that impose formal restrictions on topics of research and forms of public expression, such as those of Singapore and Malaysia.
5. Re-emergence of academic freedom—systems where academic freedom is gaining strength, such as those of Latin America, Eastern and Central Europe, and Russia.
6. Industrialized countries—systems where academic freedom is most strongly established, such as the United States and modern Japan and Germany.

Finally, *academic freedom* and *autonomy* have come to be terms used interchangeably and confusedly. Let us remind ourselves that they are distinct. Academic freedom, in whatever society and culture it may exist, personifies individuals—teachers, scholars, researchers, students, and administrators. No human individuals of any time or place are autonomous; many universities in the world strive to be, but even in those countries where their autonomy is most complete, they are not fully autonomous. No university has been or could be completely autonomous (unless it were a strictly private commercial enterprise). University autonomy is:

> the freedom of the university as a corporate body from interference by the state or by the church or by the power of any other corporate body, private or public, or by any individual such as a ruler, a politician, government official, publicist, or businessman. It is the freedom for members of the university, acting in a representative capacity and not as individuals, to make decisions about the affairs of their university (Shils, 1991, pp. 5–6).

In the case of institutional degrees, for example, the right to award them has historically been a privilege conferred through a charter granted by a state or church (Shils, 1991). "Those who acknowledge the degree believe that it has been authorized by the highest authority in the society, be that authority the church or the state" (Shils, 1991, p. 6). As another example, the case of academic appointments represents an occasion in which university autonomy is constrained by a process wherein ministry officials decide on the acceptable candidate, as found in the German system, or where the decision is made by a national appointed body other than the state, such as a group of academic representatives from many universities, as found in the French and Italian systems (Shils, 1991).

The financial dependence of universities on outside bodies creates a condition for infringement on the autonomy of institutions (Shils, 1991), and sometimes also on the academic freedom of persons working and studying in institutions. This has been understood for a very long time. Further, the degree of autonomy that institutions enjoy can affect the conditions in which professors work, including the extent of their academic freedom, as illustrated in discussion above concerning especially parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is also true that infringements upon institutional autonomy can affect academics' perceptions of, as opposed to their actual, academic freedom. In this sense the conditions of autonomy affect the satisfactions academics possess about their professional lives. But this may have nothing to do with academic freedom as such.

Academic freedom and autonomy are analytically and empirically separate; neither are they necessarily proportional to each other. The universities of the Middle Ages, for example, had from time to time arguably much autonomy, but staff had little academic freedom (Rashdall ([1895] 2010; Shils, 1991). In the contemporary United States institutional autonomy may be said to have eroded, especially in the public sector (Rhoades, 1998). But the freedom enjoyed by academics there is substantial. As autonomy is a property of institutions, not the professoriate, I thus leave the full subject of autonomy to reviews about institutions.

In summary, academic freedom is often viewed as a core element of the academic profession. But academic freedom does not exist formally in most colleges,

universities, and institutes around the world. Its close ties to the tenure systems in the United States makes it serve as a model that is dominant in the West. And yet even where it is most institutionalized, as in the U.S., it is enshrouded with difficulties in its definition, application, and defense. Whereas threats to academic freedom in most parts of the world are external (i.e., having their sources in the State or other ruling bodies), in the West threats are more often internal, that is, having their origins within institutions themselves. Understandings of academic freedom are not fixed. Rather they have evolved and become plural. Like other elements of the professoriate, the plurality of academic freedom renders it difficult to make country by country comparisons. Still, because it is vital to academic work in all places where teaching and research are undertaken, empirical comparative research on academic freedom awaits.

6.3.2 Contracts and Compensation

The global institutionalization of higher education, along with the effects that massification is bringing about around the world, corresponds to a relatively new concern for how academic labor is contracted and paid for. Research on contracts and compensation of the international professoriate, now having begun, essentially did not exist prior to a dozen or so years ago. Moreover, contracts and compensation of academic labor pertain of course to academics throughout the world, but this corner of the literature on the professoriate is dominated by U.S. researchers. This may owe itself to the fact that the U.S. system was the first to massify and consequently the first to employ on a large-scale non-regular faculty as a departure from a norm. Given that European, Asian, and Australian researchers are highly engaged with the topics of massification and managerialism (e.g., Altbach & Umakoshi, 2004; Arimoto, 2010; Azman, Jantan, & Sirat, 2009; Enders, 2001a; Kwiek, 2012; Locke, Cummings, & Fisher, 2011; Marginson & Considine, 2000; Maassen & van Vught, 1996; Shin & Teichler, 2014b), and because of the intensifying centrality of higher education to most countries, and because of perceived world-wide worry about the decline of the professoriate as discussed earlier, it is quite likely that the subject of contracts and compensation will see a spread of research work around the globe. It is not today a theoretically exciting subject, and one can have doubts about it ever being so. Scholars could theorize compensation in an account of academic labor, or study contracts toward a theory of stratification, but there is practically no current evidence of such endeavor. Such work is on hand through alternative lenses of career structures, to be discussed in the next section of this chapter. Like purely demographic profiles, contracts and compensation are a timely subject that will likely sustain crude-level empirical interest and possess a kind of value. It is also important to note that some of the work described below includes systematic measurement of compensation and thus—unlike a substantial sweep of inquiry into other subjects pertaining to the international professoriate—provides a strong basis on which to examine change over time.

The most comprehensive treatment, Altbach et al.s' (2012) work, is based on a study of 28 countries across six continents. Altbach et al.s' (2013) work is a complement to the prior study that retains a concern for contracts and compensation while focusing on the "BRIC" countries—Brazil, Russia, India, and China, in addition to the United States. In general, tenure systems entail well-defined parameters of contracts and compensation, but, as previously noted, most national higher education systems lack formal tenure policies. Where they exist, tenure systems are highly evaluative in their operation; contracts and compensation are thus outcomes of intensive peer review. The professoriate in other countries, such as Brazil, Germany, and Saudi Arabia, is part of the civil service, and thus terms of employment and pay are determined by the civil service. Employment terms and compensation are customarily structured by length of service and rank, rather than by evaluation (Altbach et al., 2012).

In many systems without formal tenure (and also without explicit academic freedom), even those that rely preponderantly on part-time teachers, as in Latin America, academic staff are understood to be rarely dismissed (Altbach et al., 2012, p. 7). Thus, world-wide, comparatively few academics work in systems offering formal tenure, but most academics allegedly work with virtual tenure. "There is...a certain degree of inertia in the academic culture of many systems, leading to nearly automatic contract renewal except in cases of gross negligence" (Altbach et al., p. 15).

Formal and "virtual" tenure are not, however, to be mistaken for each other. In Great Britain, for example, formal tenure was eliminated as part of the restructuring of its higher education system in the 1980s. Lord Jenkins, the chancellor of the University of Oxford, created a coalition involving Tory and Labour leaders to include in the major Higher Education Bill of 1988 the provision that academic staff "have the freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom, and to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges" (Crequer, 1989, p. 11). Shattock (2001) explains that while academic staff in Great Britain receive the protection of the Jenkins amendment, institutions are able to terminate their contracts with three months' notice subject to "redundancy" provisions. This authority has been used to accommodate enrollment declines in specific departments and financial shortfalls in specific institutions (Shattock, 2001, p. 38).

In order for international compensatory comparisons to be made, researchers speak not of salaries but of remuneration, since it is a convention in many parts of the world, especially in developing countries, to pay academic staff not only by basic salary but also by supplements, bonuses, allowances, and subsidies (Altbach et al., 2012). What is more, in most of the countries studied by Altbach et al., academics earn additional money through employment in varieties of academic and non-academic work (Altbach et al., 2012). The capacity to maintain a standard of living by one's main academic position applies to a minority of national higher education systems in the most developed countries of the world where, too, in the course of their own beginnings, this was not possible to accomplish (Geiger, 1999; Rashdall [1895] 2010). In the most developed higher education systems of the world

it took time measured in centuries for academe to develop into a full-time occupation that enabled financial self-sufficiency.

Currency conversions alone are an inadequate means by which to compare compensation. Recent work has used the purchasing power parity (PPP) index, which takes into account variation in the cost of living across countries (Altbach et al., 2012). The index is based on an item or set of items (a basket of goods) whose prices are compared to the equivalents in a reference country. Remuneration is in turn adjusted using the index, in conjunctions with the Penn World Tables (Heston, Summers, & Aten, 2011), in order to arrive at more meaningful compensation comparisons.

Altbach et al. (2012) report base academic salary ranges for regular academic staff at public institutions in the countries represented; the salary ranges include three points of data—entry-level, average, and top. The highest academic salaries are found in Canada and South Africa, the lowest in Armenia, Russia, and China. At middle levels are Japan, France, and Norway (Altbach et al., 2012, table 1.1., p. 11). Academic staff are able to sustain a comfortable living standard on their base academic salary alone in less than half of the countries studied (Altbach et al., 2012). For a listing of the importance that academics assign to specific alternative sources of income, by country, see Altbach et al. (2012) table A.5. The authors contend that major systems—in Japan, Germany, Israel, and the United States, among others—will find it difficult to recruit young talent to academia if salaries do not improve in these countries. The authors also recognize that by aggregating data from institutions in the public sector, the results exclude a rapidly growing private sector of higher education in several countries, China foremost among them, and mask significant differences across institutional types within the public sector in various countries (Altbach et al. p. 9 & 16).

Enders and Musselin (2008) call attention to several trends in academic salaries (excluding other types of remuneration) in European countries. First, they argue that the relationship between academic and non-academic salaries within a country are influenced by the degree of massification in higher education, which by turn affects the size of a cadre of academic staff. As the rate of student access to higher education increases, salaries become less attractive, and a gap widens between academics and Ph.D.-holders who opt to work in non-academic sectors.

Second, they contend that salary variations among academics within countries increase as more assessment and performance measurement is used. This effect is moderated by societal context, wherein academics employed as civil servants are firstly compensated according to civil service pay scales. But in countries with less standardized salary schedules, the effects of differentiation apply to academics, as to members of other labor forces who have also been subject to commensurative performance evaluation (Espeland & Stevens, 1998).

Third, Enders and Musselin (2008) argue that salary differences among countries have intensified. This is accounted for by variations in economic development, but also by a pattern, noted above, wherein when non-academic salaries are more differentiated, so are academic salaries. Consequently, a gap grows between countries where overall economic growth has been relatively weak and/or where

differentiation has also been moderate from those countries exhibiting stronger growth and greater salary differentiation. Countries where academic salaries are comparatively low are more likely to turn to other components to supplement income, including housing subsidies, stipends, and special loan provisions. These complements to salary can operate as comparative advantage, even at times against some countries whose higher education systems are highly developed but whose prevailing economic performance has been damp.

Finally, Enders and Musselin (2008) state that multi-affiliation develops when regular employment does not provide adequate income to academics, a point elaborated upon by Altbach et al. (2012), as detailed above. Enders and Musselin (2008) draw attention not only to Latin America, where this phenomenon is long-running, but also to countries of the former Eastern Block, as well as Poland and Russia, where academic salaries are frequently complemented by additional work in and/or outside of academia (see also Kwiek, 2003; Slantcheva, 2003; Smolentseva, 2003).

A notable strength of Enders and Musselin's work is found in the undercurrent of comparison to non-academic labor markets (see also Enders & de Weert, 2009b). A contemporary and heretofore inadequately addressed question—will academic work become less attractive?—is situated among employment options. Enders and Musselin (2008) contend that many of the changes in academia (expressed variously as concerns about salary decompression, managerialism, transformations in loci of control over the terms of work, and the like) are found in non-academic labor arrangements throughout Europe if not also many other parts of the world (Chandler & Daems, 1980; Edwards, 1979; Hodson, 2001; Kalleberg, 2011; see also Musselin, 2009). Where academic work can be seen as less attractive than it once was, so can many other types of work in historical comparison. The core issue for Enders and Musselin (2008) is the *relative* attractiveness between academic and non-academic types of employment.

International mobility is often construed as a related pattern of globalization. This is true, for example, among many undergraduate students and "study abroad" programs, as well as in graduate and professional education where students leave (and sometimes do not return to) their home countries in order to obtain training in better institutions located elsewhere. "Brain drain," "brain gain" are the colloquialisms used to acknowledge some degree of increased frequency of these behaviors. A greater occurrence of international collaboration among scholars and scientists is also testimony of globalism (Altbach, 2016, p. 10; Huang, 2009).

But when it comes to academic staff, those who are appointed at a university in a given country are not only very likely to remain in that country but also to never move from their initial place of faculty employment. This pattern holds across the world (Altbach et al., 2012). It is true even in the most developed higher education systems—in Germany, France, Britain, Italy, Japan, the United States, to name only a few (Altbach et al., 2012), which reflects both the constraints of structure in hiring and advancement in careers of specific systems (e.g., Germany, France, Italy) and constraints on institutions to hire regular, full-time academic staff at both junior, but most especially senior, levels. There are exceptions to the patterns—some

individuals do of course move among institutions and between countries—and where they are found, they concentrate in the most developed systems and typically display exceptional achievement, but they nevertheless remain exceptions that demonstrate the more general pattern (Altbach et al., 2012; Musselin, 2005a, 2005b). The United States is arguably the most fluid system for specifically inter-institutional mobility among faculty, but still about one-third of academics remain at their first institution of academic employment, and another third move only once over the entirety of their academic career (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 208).

Research on contracts and compensation has to-date generally excluded part-time academic staff. This is a significant omission, since the use of such staffing, largely interpreted as a consequence of massification, has become normalized in universities throughout the world. Musselin (2011, p. 429) has noted a need to study and better understand "casual staff" who comprise an "invisible" or "shadow" workforce. This need applies to the contracts and compensation of part-time academic staff, as much as to other facets of their work, including their educational backgrounds, training, and career characteristics, professional trajectories, and employment conditions. To act on any such need, however, under the rubric of the international academic profession or of a professoriate commits the observer to including such types of staff as constitutive parts of these bodies. This presents a conceptual juggernaut whose resolution is evaded, not confronted, by a prevailing fashion of speaking about a profession or professoriate in the honorific sense as a plural noun.

It is unlikely that part-time or itinerant academic staff anywhere self-identify as members of "the academic profession," because they understand that they are not members of a profession in the proper sense (see Hermanowicz, 2009, note 11, pp. 295–296). Electricians, though in many countries possess a license which makes their work critical, typically do not say that they are members of the electrical profession. Even in Latin America, where academic staff consist centrally of a part-time labor force, it is unclear whether they understand themselves as members of an academic profession, or rather as members of legal, medical, and other professions, semi-professions, and occupations who in turn teach at universities on a part-time basis. Part-time and temporary academic staff in perhaps all parts of the world are more likely to answer affirmatively that they teach or work at such and such college, school, or university. To study them is indeed important, for they perform much work on behalf of universities and in the name of the academic profession. This is not the same as saying they are the academic profession in any given place.

6.3.3 Career Structures and Roles

The widespread existence of ranks for faculty personnel across national systems is suggestive of the idea of *career*, even amidst permutations among systems in nomenclature, phase duration, sequencing, and role expectations. For illustration, a consolidated listing of ranks as operating in 28 national systems of higher education

can be found in Altbach (2012, appendix A1). In the case of academic staff, we may understand a career "to be the set of hierarchically ordered and professionally relevant positions within a field or discipline in which entrance and progression are regulated by peers" (Lawrence, 1998) *and/or* external bodies, such as a government ministry, national assembly, or the state.

Enders (2006) posits two dominant career structures for academic staff: the *chair-model* and the *department-college model*. The chair model is marked by a deep separation between a professional core who hold tenured positions (often as part of the civil service) as chairholders and a largely untenured class of junior academics who aspire to senior positions as they pass through two or three career stages of relatively long duration (Enders, 2006, p. 13). In Germany, the start of an academic career actually pre-dates the conferral of the Ph.D. Staff are employed on contracts for approximately six years, and then for up to another six years upon receipt of their degree as part of a second formal qualification phase (Kehm, 2006). Incumbency in a junior position is not understood as an inevitable path to promotion. Appointment to senior professorships is made only after a national search (Altbach, 2002).

Chairs possess considerable independence and power, junior staff comparatively little. Junior academic staff are often employed at the will of a doctoral supervisor or chair-holder (Kehm, 2006). Chair-holders are also often affiliated with and directors of institutes which accentuates their authority and deepens their independence from university controls (Neave & Rhoades, 1987). Similar disciple-apprentice relationships and controls are predominant in the career structures found in France (Musselin, 2006). The structure is expressly hierarchical and indeed premised on the idea of patronage in which aspirants to full-fledged professorships are highly dependent on individual chair-holders both for admission into academia and for subsequent career advancement (Neave & Rhoades, 1987, pp. 211–212). A version of the chair-model is found in Japan where the arrangement permits just one powerful senior professor in each department (Altbach, 2001, p. 167). For an extended description of the chair-model and career processes as paradigmatically found in Germany, see Enders (2001b).

By contrast, a department-college model is both more collegial and egalitarian, even as it displays divisions by rank and corresponding authority. Academic staff in lower ranks up to full professor generally carry-out the same basic functions; status in all ranks, not only the most senior, is more greatly dependent on achievement, rooted in demonstrated expertise, and conveyed by recognition garnered from the academic community (Enders, 2006, p. 13). In this model, probationary periods are shorter, promotion into tenured positions comes earlier, and intermediate career phases are more regularly organized (Enders, 2006, p. 13). Junior academics understand themselves as incumbents on a career path of promotion to one or more advanced ranks; such advancement does not entail an open search. There is thus greater predictability and continuity about the career structure.

Groupings of academics are organized into departments overseen by a head. The headship rotates among members of the senior faculty, a further dispersion of authority. Desire to hold a headship is typically inversely related to the prestige of the department or institution (Blau, 1973). Among active scholars, individual

professors in a well-reputed department understand how authentic status is won—through scholarly, not administrative, achievement; in such departments, consequently, very few people actually desire to be head. Less reputed departments and institutions exhibit more bureaucratic forms of organizational control. In such settings, bases of status are pluralized, and they include administrative roles. Consequently, some professors actually aspire to headships and other administrative posts; this variation in structure is more hierarchical than its purest counterpart just articulated, but nevertheless more egalitarian than the chair-model. The tenure-track system in the U.S. is indicative of the department-college model (Enders, 2006, p. 13).

Neave and Rhoades (1987) argue that the British system stands midway between the structures of Western Europe and the U.S., even as the early U.S. system was inspired in an organizational way by the clusters of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge. In Britain a departmental structure is linked to a version of the chair system. Chair- and department-college models thus run in parallel, with greater drift to the latter. Faculty stand above departments but without a hierarchy of vertical control (Neave & Rhoades, 1987, p. 217). They function as intermediaries and advisors and respond to initiatives coming from other professors and from deans (Neave & Rhoades, 1987, p. 217). Departments have power over chairs and all professors, and they thereby constrain autocratic behavior exercised by chairs over junior staff (Neave & Rhoades, 1987, p. 217).

Enders and Musselin (2008) offer a variation on the above patterns while maintaining most of the main elements indicative of the chair- and department-college models set forth in other works (Enders, 2006; Neave & Rhoades, 1987). They argue that everywhere, careers have been based on a two-stage process: the first stage is characterized by apprenticeship, selection, and time-limited positions; the second stage by permanent position (Enders & Musselin, 2008, p. 4). But massification has differentiated career structures into three predominant models in which a greater variety of career patterns are evident, including a prevalent use of part-time academic staff discussed in this chapter's prior section (see also Finkelstein, 2010). These models include: the tenure model, the "survivor" model, and the "protective pyramid."

The tenure model, corresponding most directly to the U.S., selects some Ph.D.s for tenure-track positions of a specifically limited duration, which leads to the tenure procedure—the complex review of a candidate to make his or her existing position permanent. While this model has been described as an "up or out" process, in actuality very few faculty members are "pushed out" of the professoriate altogether. They are rather pushed out of specific institutions. Junior academics who are not awarded tenure at their institution are more apt to take tenure-line positions at other universities. Depending on the conditions of the position, which reflect the constraints of specific institutions, these new posts either require the individual to work toward a second tenure review, or the individual is appointed with tenure in light of demonstrated achievement.

The survivor model, most indicative of the chair-system as it has operated in Germany, puts candidates, after having received a Ph.D., through trials that are

meant to provide evidence of talent and in a wait for a permanent position. Only those who survive these long periods and open competitions involving many candidates become the individuals selected for a limited number of senior professorships (Enders & Musselin, 2008).

The "protective pyramid" depicts the public systems of Italy, Spain, and France. Access to a permanent position occurs relatively early after a highly selective tournament, in which a panel of senior academics assesses and ranks the merits and prospects of a set of candidates. The panel may include a candidate's doctoral supervisor—a nod to the chair system and customs of patronage. Once chosen, different categories of positions are organized hierarchically with procedures that lay out promotion of some from one category to another. But the career structure does not assure promotion. A rise within the pyramid is contingent on the growth rate of the overall pyramid and the age/seniority of those at the top (Enders & Musselin, 2008, pp. 3–4). For in-depth treatments of career structures and advancement processes where this model is found, see Chevaillier (2001) in the case of France, Moscati (2001) in the case of Italy, and Mora (2001) in the case of Spain. The Dutch system presents a melding of forms as it has sought to remove appointive authority from the Crown and retain the civil service linkage to the professoriate while attempting to grant more power to departments and universities (de Weert, 2001).

These models and their distinctions notwithstanding, we may additionally observe the introduction of a multitude of means by which to evaluate academics—regardless of a historically situated career structure and regardless of the power that any given structure endows or fails to endow individual academics. What is more, the ascendance of evaluation applies to a broad array of roles that academics perform. The proliferation is not confined to research performance, even though research activity and publication productivity arguably have been made the most commensurate of the academic roles, but extends increasingly to teaching and service roles, where varieties of examples of peer review and/or administrative oversight, both internal and external to institutions, are evidenced in the control of academic work. The Research Assessment Exercises in Britain are an extreme illustration of this pattern (Lucas, 2006); the idea of an analogue in the form of teaching assessment exercises is an equally extreme illustration. Other illustrations, representing both formal and informal mechanisms of control, are readily at hand in the supervision of expenses, travel, and even speech and behavior (Bilgrami & Cole, 2015; Enders & Musselin).

Throughout the world the professoriate has entered an era of hyper-monitoring. It is easy to interpolate how such controls affect academic freedom (where traditions of academic freedom exist). But we await explicit study of the contests between the *control* of academic work on the one hand, and *freedom* in academic work on the other. Fundamental to this tension is the idea of *trust* (Cook, 2001; Kramer & Cook, 2004). Trust is in turn key to professional occupations (Parsons, 1949). An interactive matrix of control, freedom, and trust constitutes a topic possessing crucial theoretic and practical significance.

How do academics get jobs, and enter one of these prototypical career structures? To the extent that comparative work on academic labor markets and hiring processes

is available, the answer is that conventions are entrenched in national traditions. There is arguably greater plurality in the norms that govern recruitment and hiring than in the structures that organize careers once academics are on the inside. Career structures avail themselves to greater analytic consolidation; recruitment practices are more idiosyncratic.

Nevertheless, Musselin (2010) has produced a theoretically robust study that compares the hiring practices for academics at research universities in France, Germany, and the United States. Universities are characteristically understood to operate according to principles of meritocracy (Hermanowicz, 2013). But Musselin's work goes to show that in practice this is often far from the case. In her terms, the processes of academic labor markets are based less on considered judgment than on price. Markets interact with procedures internal to universities and departments.

For Musselin (2010), hiring processes are composed of three components: "the construction of job supply" (deciding that there is a job to be filled); "the judgment phase" (evaluation of candidates' scholarship, teaching, and other activities); and "pricing" (the determination of work conditions, duties, and salary for the successful candidate). These tasks are performed by different sets of people in different national systems. With respect to "the construction of job supply," research ministers in Germany determine which positions to fill. In France, national authorities authorize positions. In the United States, a university provost controls all academic positions, allocates them to deans of colleges and schools within an institution, and then deans in turn allocate them to heads of departments.

Importantly, Musselin sees merit playing an understated role in the "judgment phase" in processes found across the three systems. Hiring committees actively and explicitly work against a clock; they seek to secure candidates for further scrutiny before they are lost to other universities, and before the position is revoked. It is clear that in the United States, at least, that these conditions do indeed work against meritorious hiring. Faculties of departments are extremely reluctant not to fill a line for fear of not getting the line back from the dean the following year. It is at this very point where all kinds of compromises and rationalizations—antitheses of merit—are made by department faculties who are about to hire. The decisions entail effects for departments for decades; at most U.S. universities, especially in the public sector, hiring decisions are now effectively tenure decisions, owing to deeply-rooted departmental concerns that faculty will not easily get a replacement line, and almost certainly not at an equivalent level of seniority, should they let someone go. These behaviors, at these specific junctures in hiring processes, are very likely among the most powerful in lessening, even destroying, the long-term quality of departments and programs in higher education. It is a strike against rational decision-making for a department to believe it is better-off with having hired someone sub-par than going without having hired anyone at all. Musselin implies that such compromises and rationalizations—a consequence of clock-work combined with imputed fears about how hiring systems operate—also infect the French and German systems, although these systems may possess greater capacity to let go or not promote incumbents.

Musselin (2010) observes in all three systems during the judgment phase that very little actual reading of work produced by candidates is done by screening committees. This is yet another blow to meritocracy. The lack of reading candidates' work by most people in any way connected to the hiring weakens meritocratic operation in multiplicative fashion. It may be said that many academics obtain their positions without academic colleagues (and administrators) having read much if any of their work. And this likely holds for both junior- and senior-level hiring. Instead, listings of work (in the form of a vita), and campus visits in the the case of the U.S. and *auditions* in the case of France, operate as principal sorting mechanisms (Musselin, 2010).

What is more, in all three systems Musselin finds that "personality" figures prominently in hiring (Musselin, 2010). "Personality" is thought about by faculties both for how they imagine a candidate getting along with colleagues and for how well they would be able to teach. We can add that "personality" may also be used as a proxy of future voting behavior, in those systems where the person filling the position has voting privileges. Hiring is thus a process by which current academics protect themselves, which can have little if anything to do with "merit."

Finally, according to Musselin (2010), in the third phase—hiring—emphasis is not on the candidate, but on price. In France, the price is fixed by a national index of the civil service. In the United States, department heads negotiate with deans about the market price, which now varies by field; heads weigh-in on what departments of comparable quality are paying; and heads assess a candidate's competing offers, the quality of the candidate next in the queue, and the salaries of current faculty members (Musselin, 2010; Tuchman, 2010). For non-comparative, country-specific views of hiring practices and job conditions of beginning faculty members, see Yudkevich, Altbach, and Rubley (2015a). For still additional work on early career paths and employment conditions in seventeen countries, see Bennion and Locke (2010). For other work on the broad issues of academic recruitment and career paths, see Galaz-Fontes, Arimoto, Teichler, and Brennan (2016) and Teichler and Cummings (2015).

By these varied observations on academic hiring, Musselin challenges traditional conceptions of reward systems and how they function (Merton ([1942] 1973a))—that is, academic life as meritocratically oriented. The principal foil is work of the late sociologist of science, Robert K. Merton, one of the great theorists of modern social science (Calhoun, 2010; Merton, 1957, 1996; Zuckerman, 1988). His work inspired many other scholars who wrote in an institutional tradition of understanding scientific and/or academic work and occupational settings, to which Musselin's efforts may be viewed as a complement (for a review of this work, see Hermanowicz, 2012).

Other research has found that inbreeding—the practice of a faculty hiring its own graduates without the graduates' having first established their professional careers at other institutions—is common in many parts of the world (Yudkevich, Altbach, & Rumbley, 2015b). The most recent comprehensive examination of these hiring practices covers eight countries consisting of Argentina, China, Japan, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, South Africa, and Ukraine (Yukevich, Altbach, & Rubley,

2015b) In many different parts of the world, inbreeding is not considered unusual or problematic. As a general phenomenon the practice has been in place for centuries, and is in many systems considered a point of pride, tied to an idea that institutions display a scarce charismatic authority by their capacity to retain the best candidates (Yudkevich et al., 2015b).

Counter perspectives hold that inbreeding, both as isolated occurrences as found throughout the world and as a systemic procedure found in many national systems as illustrated above, constrains meritocracy. Hiring is not viewed as open to the best available candidates. What is more, inbreeding is argued to institutionalize other counterproductive practices among faculties and make organizational reform more difficult (Yudkevich et al., 2015b). It may also hamper broad institutional goals of science and scholarship—to advance certified knowledge (Merton ([1942] 1973a, [1957] 1973b). Inbred faculty collectives are thought of as less open to new ideas and to ideas that challenge prevailing group "ways of knowing" and decision-making. Inbreeding is also associated with local, as opposed to cosmopolitan, work orientations (Gouldner, 1957–58). Consequently, such faculty tend to demonstrate greater loyalties to their employing institutions, rather than to their profession, field or discipline. In these ways, the scholarly ambitions and publication productivity of inbred faculty are weakened (McGee, 1960).

What roles do academics perform within a given way in which their career and work are structured? To many, the question may seem trite. In the most developed systems, the answer is the customary role-triumvirate of teaching, research and/or scholarship, and institutional/professional service roles—though even within these systems the distribution of time among these roles is highly variable for academics (Hermanowicz, 1998, 2009). From a global point of view, however, the professoriate is mainly a teaching occupation (Altbach, 2003; Enders, 2006). Massification intensifies this dominance, but even in the absence of massification this pattern would still hold true. As noted earlier, globally, many of those who teach in universities hold only a first academic degree, not an advanced degree or doctorate. This pattern is antithetical to research and scholarship. It also makes apparent that advanced professional qualifications are an instance of structural lag with massification (Riley, Johnson, & Foner, 1972).

Arimoto and Ehara (1996) have proposed a classification of work orientations that encompass national systems: a type with a strong research orientation, such as Germany; a type with an allegedly balanced emphasis on research and teaching, such as the United States; and a type with a strong teaching orientation, such as the countries of Latin America. This classification has utility, but at the same time it understates internal variation within types and understates the global pattern of teaching dominance. A model of work orientations that I have proposed to capture variation in career patterns of academics *within* one system—the U.S.—can be applied with requisite adaptations across national systems (Hermanowicz, 1998, 2005). A critical goal of such a model is to capture variation and simultaneously modalities in work patterns.

As for teaching, Altbach reports that in many parts of the developing world few classrooms contain anything more than the very basics of chairs and desks (Altbach,

2003, p. 17). Classes are large by international standards; the mode of instruction is consequently the lecture; teaching loads are comparatively high (Altbach, 2003, p. 17). In not too few places academics do not have a private office or even their own desk, let alone a computer or private email account (Altbach, 2003, p. 9). In developing countries of Africa and Asia, access to the internet remains mixed and, where available, with sporadic connection (Altbach, 2003, p. 9). Nevertheless, the internet remains a growing and crucial resource in these countries, and has been utilized to conduct distance education. Indeed, developing countries comprise seven of the ten largest distance education providers in the world (Altbach, 2003, p. 10). In general, academics in developing countries who hold doctorates are a minority, have earned them abroad, and introduce in their home countries a status hierarchy in which more favorable work conditions and responsibilities are leveraged (Altbach, 2003).

In a comparison of developed higher education systems across nineteen countries, Teichler et al., (2013) find variation in academics' preferences for teaching and research, but a tilt is generally observed toward research in most of the countries for both junior and senior academics (Teichler et al., 2013, see tables 5.1 and 5.2). Aggregating survey respondents of junior and senior career stages and fields, some differences are evident in publication productivity among these countries. The three top producers of articles are stated to be South Korea, Italy, and Japan (at an average of 11.3, 9.1, and 8.9 articles, respectively, per individual over the past three years); the overall average among the thirteen *most advanced* systems included is 6.7 articles (Teichler et al., 2013, see table 5.8 and p. 76 for explanation of division by country-type). The averages suggest a relatively high-level of publication output in the professoriate across many countries, which is a pattern that coincides with contemporary developments of managerialism and accountability (Enders, 2001a; Lucas, 2006), commensuration (Espeland & Stevens, 1998, 2009; Power, 1997), and organizational status competition as reflected in global rankings of higher education institutions (Shin et al., 2011; Yudkevish, Altbach, & Rumbley, 2016).

Related work finds differing results. Bentley and Kyvik (2012), for example, contend that working-time patterns vary significantly among academics even for those located in the comparatively advanced national systems of Europe, and that role preferences evince sharp divides between junior and senior academic staff. What is more, faculty members holding the highest professorial rank tend to demonstrate greater commonality and greater identification with the research role (Bentley & Kyvik, 2012). Cavalli and Moscati (2010), researching Finland, Germany, Italy, Norway, and the United Kingdom, similarly stress dissimilarity over similarity in work orientations. Studying academics in eleven European countries, Kwiek (2015, 2016) draws the significant conclusion that the top ten percent of highly productive faculty members produce an average of almost half of the research output. This was a condition that characterized the acceleration of the research university as an institutional form in the United States in the mid-twentieth century; a minority of researchers produced the bulk of publication (Cole & Cole, 1973). In the United States, this pattern no longer holds (Hermanowicz, 2016). Research has

become standardized with academic careers, even in a system noted for its range of institutional differentiation.

6.3.4   The CAP Project: Antecedents, Aims, Outcomes

Readers' attention is called to the flurry of work produced under the auspices of the *Changing Academic Profession* (CAP) project. The CAP involved a survey study of the professoriate in eighteen countries around the world plus the special administrative province of Hong Kong during the period 2004 to 2012. A team of over 100 researchers were involved in the planning, design, and fielding of the survey. In undertaking a project of this kind, leaders of the project readily acknowledged the many challenges in studying the professoriate in the prolific variety of socio-cultural contexts. The very terminology used in the project speaks of this complexity; terms such as "academic", "professor", "profession", "university" are neither universally applicable nor possess identical meanings across countries. Nevertheless, a generalized survey instrument was used in the project; the survey contained both identical and/or roughly similar questions for respondents in all countries, as well as questions directed more specifically to respondents in particular countries. The survey contained 53 questions, mostly closed-ended, that produced approximately 400 variables to be analyzed. For an elaborated discussion of the background, aims, and execution of the CAP project, see Teichler et al. (2013, pp. 1–35).

The CAP project was situated via three contemporary macro-level phenomena in order to contextualize how the professoriate is changing and in what ways it is responding to its environment in the given national systems examined. These phenomena included: *relevance*, that is, the nature of the linkages between the academy and external constituencies; *internationalization*, which involves the effects of globalization, and; *management*, the ways in which the professoriate is monitored, controlled, and regulated (Teichler et al., 2013, pp. 16–17).

Two additional major projects were launched from the CAP project. The first consisted of "The Academic Profession in Europe: Responses to Societal Change" (EUROAC). For EUROAC, six additional European countries were added to those European countries original to the CAP project—netting a total of 12. An almost identical survey instrument was used between the projects, enabling a merging of data. The second project consisted of an examination of the professoriate in Asia, led by researchers from Japan (Teichler et al., 2013, p. 19).

The CAP project and its two major off-shoots has yielded nothing short of an industry of publication on the professoriate as well as many related topics, flagged in the introduction of this chapter, that are connected to and/or bear on the professoriate. What may be fairly characterized as the core work emanating from the CAP, EUROAC, and Asia projects consists of 16 edited volumes, as part of a series entitled "The Changing Academy—The Changing Academic Profession in International Comparative Perspective," published by Springer between the years 2011 and

2016. For consolidated reference, and to stimulate use by other researchers, the volumes are listed below.

1. *The changing academic profession: Major findings of a comparative survey*. (2013). U. Teichler, A. Arimoto, and W.K. Cummings (eds.).
2. *Changing governance and management in higher education*. (2011). W. Locke, W.K. Cummings, and D. Fisher (eds.).
3. *University rankings: Theoretical basis, Methodology and impacts on global higher education*. (2011). J.C. Shin, R.K. Toutkoushian, and U. Teichler (eds.).
4. *Scholars in the changing American academy*. (2012). W.K. Cummings and M.J. Finkelstein (eds.).
5. *The academic profession in Europe: New tasks and new challenges*. (2013). B.M. Kehm and U. Teichler (eds.).
6. *Institutionalization of world-class university in global competition*. (2013). J.C. Shin and B.M. Kehm (eds.).
7. *Job satisfaction around the academic world*. (2013). P.J. Bentley, H. Coates, I.R. Dobson, L. Goedegebuure, and V.L. Meek (eds.).
8. *The work situation of the academic profession in Europe: Findings of a survey in twelve countries*. (2013). U. Teichler and E.A. Höhle (eds.).
9. *Teaching and research in contemporary higher education*. (2014). J.C. Shin, A. Akimoto, W.K. Cummings, and U. Teichler (eds.).
10. *The internationalization of the academy*. (2014). F. Huang, M. Finkelstein, M. Rostan (eds.).
11. *The changing academic profession in Japan*. (2015). A. Akimoto, W.K. Cummings, F. Huang, and J.C. Shin (eds.).
12. *Academic work and careers in Europe: Trends, challenges, perspectives*. (2015). T. Fumasoli, G. Goastellec, and B.M. Kehm (eds.).
13. *The relevance of academic work in comparative perspective*. (2015). W.K. Cummings and U. Teichler (eds.).
14. *Forming, recruiting and managing the academic profession*. (2015). U. Teichler and W.K. Cummings (eds.).
15. *Re-becoming universities? Higher education institutions in networked knowledge societies*. (2016). D.M. Hoffman and J. Välimaa (eds.).
16. *Biographies and careers throughout academic life*. (2016). J.F. Galaz-Fontes, A. Akimoto, U. Teichler, and J. Brennan (eds.).

In addition to these books, hundreds of articles have been published using data from the CAP, EUROAC, and Asia projects. A bibliography of these works, running 51 pages, may be found in the appendix to volume 16 (Höhle & Teichler, 2016). Selections of these books and articles have been incorporated into the present review when relevant to the discussion. Another round of the CAP project is underway at this writing.

The CAP project as a whole represented the second foray into studying the professoriate internationally by way of a survey. Its antecedent was, as customarily called, the "Carnegie Survey of the Academic Profession." The Carnegie project, conducted in the early 1990s, was initiated by Ernest Boyer and was carried-out in

14 countries plus Hong Kong. A short summary of results from the Carnegie project was initially published in 1994 (Boyer, Altbach, & Whitelaw, 1994). A more elaborate analysis was published in 1996 and included country reports (Altbach, 1996). A European analog, focusing on the attractiveness of the academic work-place, and also including a format of 19 individual country reports, was produced in 2004 (Enders & de Weert, 2004).

Cross-national work conducted with surveys, with all of its ambitions, and all the greater as more countries are added to the mix, provides researchers with industrial levels of activity. Some of this activity has been worthwhile. To what extent has the most recent storm of work pushed further our understanding of the professoriate? Finkelstein has commented that, "The new availability of vast reservoirs of data for comparison thus forces us to confront the question: how do we allow for salient features of national context to enter into our data analysis in ways that ensure that we provide appropriate nuance to our juxtaposition of the numbers?" (Finkelstein, 2015, p. 318). Indeed, in much of the latest work, as in parts of the past, the question is dodged: the work is "international" but in actuality not comparative (Altbach, 1977). Various topics of the professoriate are treated in one country alone, a point echoed by Musselin (2011, pp. 423–424). Teichler is candid:

> The relevance of [how academics are socially arranged and organized]…is by no means trivial for a comparative study. In some countries, the average number of publications produced by a person defined in this project as belonging to the academic profession might be considered to be an interesting piece of information. In other countries, this information might be considered as irrelevant as the average temperature across days and night across the whole year…(Teichler, 2013, p. 10).

How would Ben-David or Clark, discussed in this first section of this chapter, make sense of the enormity of empirical results produced by the survey studies of late? For all the emphasis on comparison in the CAP and related projects, *we do not have sufficient tools to actually compare*. We lack a compelling framework by which to properly account for both similarity and difference in a phenomenon found, now, globally: a global professoriate. 'Here is a pile of x. Here is a pile of y. There is a pile of z.' But how can we meaningfully make sense of their likenesses and non-likenesses? This is our chief theoretic task to enable advancement in the field. We must develop a structure by which to study the professoriate in order to speak meaningfully of categories and their relationship to each other.

The foregoing discussion has identified key topical forays of scholarship and research on the international professoriate by way of four major clusters of both strongly analytic and explicitly empirical work. These clusters have included the topic of *academic freedom*, most often examined with richly analytic lenses; *contracts and compensation*, a subject of practical though under-theorized significance that nevertheless lends itself readily to continued inquiry; *the career structures and roles* that organize the professoriate in many parts of the world; and, finally, an identification and circumscribed commentary on the *"Changing Academic Profession" project* and its related spin-offs that present a recent surge of empirical work on the professoriate.

6.4   Conclusion

I have addressed the subject of the international professoriate first by way of the theoretic foundations that have undergirded its comparative study and, second, by way of the topical forays that characterize the current broad clusters of analytic and empirical work. The narrative is depicted in Chart 6.1, which provides an organizational map of the chapter. I conclude with observations that concern future comparative scholarship on academics.

To recommend work to be undertaken on various topics is the standard summative procedure. I shall not do that. It is not especially the case that there are specific topics left uncovered by work on the professoriate. It would be foolish under the present circumstances of extant work to say that the subject of x, y, or z has yet to be studied or that the subjects of a, b, and c need to be examined. Something always needs to be studied; that is our business; but that is not where our most pressing challenges lie when it comes to comparative work on the professoriate.

To move forward, we need to take a long look and consider what researchers are, and have been, doing. The problem for future comparative scholarship on the professoriate—for it indeed to be scholarly, lies in *conceptualization*. Ben-David and Clark, for example, were excellent at conceptualization. So have been the likes of Teichler, Enders, Altbach, Arimoto, and Musselin. We need more of these kinds of minds—those who cultivate a scholarly reach and ambition to attempt serious work, in new, authentically comparative undertakings. Charts 6.2 and 6.3 provide ideas on which future formulations may be made.

Most current topics of study on the international professoriate are undertheorized or atheoretical. A broad sweep of prevailing empirical work is wholly descriptive and, in many instances, executed with but banal goals. This type of literature has been built so high it has begun to collapse upon itself. We could question how much would be lost if we were to dispose of the current survey work on the international professoriate and begin anew with a clearer vision for comparative work.

If we consider the most successful comparative work on academics, and there are many examples used deliberately throughout this review, it is possible to discern three essential qualities that distinguish it as a league of its own. The most successful comparative work on the professoriate is undertaken with a *theoretic* objective. The work seeks to explain, not only to describe. Ben-David and Clark sought to explain the social organization of academics in paradigmatic systems of higher education. Comparative thinkers might envision, for example, how to go about analogous studies that make demonstrative inroads into the East, and into the developing world, where actually quite little comparative work on the professoriate exists. Another strategy would be to overlay, in rigorous and elaborated fashion, the center and periphery idea on bodies of empirical work on the professoriate in many parts of the world. As explained in the prior section of this chapter, we are desperately in need of structure—of an organizing framework—by which to make global, and even partly-global, sense of similar and dissimilar patterns.

In addition to theory, the most successful comparative work on the professoriate roots itself in analytic *concepts*. The concepts work in conjunction with theory. Clark's theory of the social organization of academics put to work the concepts of authority, market, and oligarchy. He identified, for his purposes, why these concepts were central, and used them as central elements to formulate a theory. Ben-David, in his theory of academic social organization, focused on the concept of function wherein the burden for his work was to explain how organization arose from how systems of academics differently managed core functions. These are, to be certain, not the only concepts available. But good work needs conceptual rooting of some kind. It is noteworthy that in these two illustrations, the scholars were conceptually rooted in disciplines. They were not adrift in a boundaryless sea of a higher education arena. They could have been, for higher education was absolutely their domain, but they chose not to be. Sociology was their base. Clark brushed, if remotely, with economics. And they both had an abiding capacity for a third field—history—which is the third element of excellent comparative work on academics.

The most successful comparative work, on the professoriate, as undoubtedly on many subjects, is made possible by a deep understanding of *history*. One must develop, as these scholars did, and put to use, a working history of the subject that one goes about studying. There is tremendous historical depth to their work, and to other outstanding work on the professoriate. These two scholars, at least, were also consummate readers. Shils also read, widely and voraciously, to a nearly incredulous degree. They produced excellent work, but they also read *a lot*. This is very likely a root problem of the most recent attempts at work on the international professoriate. It is very likely a root problem now in all academic work. Students have stopped reading; their teachers have, too. In the United States, if not elsewhere, most professors do not as much anymore read the work of their own colleagues, while at the same time they impose more and more strenuous demands upon each other to produce this work. And yet I am talking about further reading beyond the work of one's immediate colleagues, beyond even one's own field, and beyond that of academic work. Reading hooks people up with ideas. Reading is not innate; it is a matter that pertains to the allocation of time. Academics' ability to allocate time for reading may *itself* exist an an obliterating object of neoliberalist forces (Berg & Seeber, 2016; Vostal, 2016; Wajcman, 2015). Academics must do better in their allocation of time for reading for the sake of a higher learning.

Ben-David, I will add, was also a keen listener. He wanted to "find-out." There is little doubt that this characterizes the habits of others' who create excellent work. Wherever in the world he travelled, Ben-David was more intent on asking questions and listening to people about higher education in their countries than he was on

speaking about it, even as he had much he could say.[1] It remains lamentable—it always will be so—that he indeed had more in store to give us. Short of formal training in history, listening to others, but especially reading, are the best tools by which to acquire history, and with which to create imagination that links the past to an understanding of the present.

It is obviously true that theory, concepts, and history are not all it takes. But they together constitute a great share of remarkable comparative work. If we are more deliberate in directing our attention to *theory*, *concepts*, and *history*, there is a chance of our producing in the future comparative scholarship on the professoriate that is, like some of its progenitors, outstanding.

References

Aarrevaara, T. (2010). Academic freedom in a changing academic world. *European Review*, *18*(1), S55–S69.

Akker, J. (2006). Academic freedom in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia: Looking toward the NEAR future. In E. Gerstmann & M. J. Streb (Eds.), *Academic freedom at the dawn of a new century* (pp. 99–114). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1977). *Comparative perspectives on the academic profession*. New York: Praeger.

Altbach, P. G. (1980). The crisis of the professoriate. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 448*, 1–14.

Altbach, P. G. (1996). *The international academic profession: Portraits of fourteen countries*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Altbach, P. G. (2001). Academic freedom: International realities and challenges. *Higher Education, 41*(1/2), 205–219.

Altbach, P.G. (2002). How are faculty faring in other countries? In R. P. Chait (Ed.), *The Questions of Tenure* (pp. 160-181). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (2003). *The decline of the guru: The academic profession in developing and middle-income countries*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Altbach, P. G. (2004). Academic freedom: International warning signs. *International Higher Education, 24*, 2–3.

Altbach, P. G. (2007). Academic freedom in a global context: 21st century challenges. *The NEA 2007 Almanac of Higher Education* (pp. 49–56).

Altbach, P. G. (2016). *Global perspectives on higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

---

[1]Professor Ben-David died at the age of sixty-five in 1985, before I had the opportunity to meet him upon my arrival as a student at the University of Chicago in 1987. I know about him through his work and through others' direct contact with him. I credit especially personal communication with Ulrich Teichler in 2013 and 2015 at the annual meeting of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers in Lausanne and Lisbon, with Teresa Sullivan in 2013 at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in New York, and with Charles Bidwell, Terry Clark, and Edward Shils over the course of many years between 1989 and 1999 in Chicago, in informing my remarks.

Altbach, P. G., Androushchak, G., Kuzminov, Y., Yudkevich, M., & Reisberg, L. (Eds.). (2013). *The global future of higher education and the academic profession: The BRICs and the United States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Altbach, P. G., & Balan, J. (2007). *World class worldwide: Transforming research universities in Asia and Latin America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Altbach, P. G., & Finkelstein, M. J. (1997). *The academic profession: The professoriate in crisis*. New York: Garland.

Altback, P. G., & Forest, J. J. F. (2011). Introduction. In Forest, J. J. F. & Altbach, P. (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education, part 1* (pp. 1–4). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., Yudkevich, M., Androushchak, G., & Pacheco, I. F. (Eds.). (2012). *Paying the professoriate: A global comparison of compensation and contracts*. New York: Routledge.

Altbach, P. G., & Umakoshi, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Asian universities: Historical perspectives and contemporary challenges*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Arimoto, A. (2010). The academic profession and the managerial university: An international comparative study from Japan. *European Review, 18*(S1), S117–S139.

Arimoto, A.. (2014). The teaching and research nexus in the third wave age. In J. C. Shin, A. Arimoto, W. K. Cummings, & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Teaching and research in contemporary higher education* (pp. 15–33). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Arimoto, A., Cummings, W. K., Huang, F., & Shin, J. C. (Eds.). (2015). *The changing academic profession in Japan*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Arimoto, A., & Ehara, T. (Eds.). (1996). *Daigaku kyôshoku no kokusai hikaku* [International comparison of academic profession]. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

Arnove, R. F. (2005, May). Review of *The institutions of education: A comparative study of educational development in the six core nations*. *Comparative Education Review* (pp. 287–289).

Ashby, E. (1966). *Universities: British, Indian, African: A study in the ecology of higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Azman, N., Jantan, M., & Sirat, M. (2009). The transformation of the academic profession in Malaysia: Trends and issues on institutional governance and management. *Journal of the World Universities Forum, 2*(5), 123–138.

Ben-David, J. (1977). *Centers of learning: Britain, France, Germany, United States*. Berkeley, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bennion, A., & Locke, W. (2010). The early career paths and employment conditions of the academic profession in 17 countries. *European Review, 18*(S1), S7–S33.

Bentley, P. J., Coates, H., Dobson, I. R., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, V. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Job satisfaction around the world*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Bentley, P. J., & Kyvik, S. (2012). Academic work from a comparative perspective: A survey of faculty working time across 13 countries. *Higher Education, 63*, 529–547.

Berg, M., & Seeber, B. K. (2016). *The slow professor: Challenging the culture of speed in the academy*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Berlin, I. (1969). Two concepts of liberty. In I. Berlin (Ed.), *Four essays on liberty* (pp. 118–172). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Bilgrami, A., & Cole, J. R. (Eds.). (2015). *Who's afraid of academic freedom?* New York: Columbia University Press.

Blau, P. M. (1973). *The organization of academic work*. New York: John Wiley.

Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., & Whitelaw, M. J. (1994). *The academic profession: An international perspective*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brennan, J. (2010). Burton Clark's *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. *London Review of Education, 8*(3), 229–237.

Brown, A. (2006). Academic freedom in Western Europe: Right or privilege? In E. Gerstmann & M. J. Streb (Eds.), *Academic Freedom at the Dawn of a New Century* (pp. 115–129). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Burgan, M. (2006). *What ever happened to the faculty? Drift and decision in higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cain, T. R. (2016). A historiography of academic freedom for American faculty, 1865–1941. In M. B. Paulsen (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 157–215). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Calhoun, C. (Ed.). (2010). *Robert K. Merton: Sociology of science and sociology as science*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Capano, G. (2008). Looking for serendipity: The problematical reform of government within Italy's universities. *Higher Education, 55*(4), 491–504.

Cavalli, A., & Moscati, R. (2010). Academic systems and professional conditions in five European countries. *European Review, 18*(S1), S35–S53.

Cavalli, A., & Teichler, U. (2010). The academic profession: A common core, a diversified group or an outdated idea? *European Review, 18*(S1), S1–S5.

Chandler, A. D., & Daems, H. (Eds.). (1980). *Managerial hierarchies: Comparative perspectives on the rise of the modern industrial enterprise*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cheit, E. F. (1971). *The new depression in higher education: A study of financial conditions at 41 colleges and universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chevaillier, T. (2001). French academics: Between the professions and the civil service. *Higher Education, 41*(1-2), 49–75.

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R. (1987a). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R. (Ed.). (1987b). *The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional settings*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R. (1993a). The problem of complexity in modern higher education. In S. Rothblatt & B. Wittrock (Eds.), *The European and American University since 1800* (pp. 263–279). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, B. R. (Ed.). (1993b). *The research foundations of graduate education: Germany, Britain, France, United States, Japan*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R. (1995). *Places of inquiry: Research and advanced education in modern universities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clotfelter, C. T. (Ed.). (2010). *American universities in a global market*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cole, J. R., & Cole, S. (1973). *Social stratification in science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cook, K. S. (Ed.). (2001). *Trust in society*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Crequer, N. (1989). The passing of the education reform act. *Higher Education Quarterly, 43*(1), 11.

Cummings, W. K. (2003). *The institutions of education: A comparative study of educational development in the six core nations*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.

Cummings, W. K., & Finkelstein, M. J. (Eds.). (2012). *Scholars in the changing American academy*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Cummings, W. K., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2015). *The relevance of academic work in comparative perspective*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Davies, S. (2004, May–June). Review of *The institutions of education: A comparative study of educational development in the six core nations*. *Canadian Review of Sociology* (pp. 1–2).

de Boer, H. & Huisman, J. (1999). The new public management in Dutch universities. In D. Braun, & F.-X. Merrien (Eds.), *Towards a new model of governance for universities? A comparative view* (pp. 100–118). Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

de Boer, H., Leisyte, L., & Enders, J. (2006). The Netherlands—'Steering from a distance.' In B.M. Kehm & U. Lanzendorf (eds.), *Reforming university governance: Changing conditions for research in four European countries* (pp. 59-96). Bonn, Germany: Lemmens.

de Weert, E. (2001). Pressures and prospects facing the academic profession in the Netherlands. *Higher Education, 41*(1–2), 77–101.

Deutsch, S. E., & Fashings, J. (1971). *Academics in retreat*. Albuquerque, Mexico: University of New Mexico Press.

Dobbins, M., & Knill, C. (2009). Higher education policies in Central and Eastern Europe: Convergence towards a common model? *Governance, 22*(3), 397–430.

Dobbins, M., & Leisyte, L. (2014). Analyzing the transformation of higher education governance in Bulgaria and Lithuania. *Public Management Review, 16*(7), 987–1010.

Edwards, R. (1979). *Contested terrain: The transformation of the workplace in the twentieth century*. New York: Basic.

Enders, J. (2001a). Between state control and academic capitalism: A comparative perspective on academic staff in Europe. In J. Enders (Ed.), *Academic staff in Europe: Changing contexts and conditions* (pp. 1–23). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Enders, J. (2001b). A chair system in transition: Appointments, promotions, and gate-keeping in German higher education. *Higher Education, 41*(1-2), 3–25.

Enders, J. (2006). The academic profession. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education, Part 1* (pp. 5–21). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Enders, J. (2011). The academic profession. In Forest, J. J. F. & Altbach, P. G. (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education, part 1* (pp. 5–21). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Enders, J., & de Weert, E. (Eds.). (2004). *The international attractiveness of the academic workplace in Europe*. Frankfurt/Main, Germany: Herausgeber und Bestelldresse.

Enders, J., & de Weert, E. (Eds.). (2009a). *The changing face of academic life: Analytical and comparative perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Enders, J., & de Weert, E. (2009b). Towards a T-shaped profession: Academic work and career in the knowledge society. In J. Enders & E. de Weert (Eds.), *The changing face of academic life: Analytical and comparative perspectives* (pp. 251–272). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Enders, J., & Musselin, C. (2008). Back to the future? The academic professions in the 21st century. In OECD, *Higher Education to 2030, Volume 1, Demography*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Espeland, W. N., & Stevens, M. (1998). Commensurations as a social process. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24*, 313–343.

Espeland, W. N., & Stevens, M. (2009). A sociology of quantification. *European Journal of Sociology, 49*(3), 401–436.

Feller, I. (2016). This time it really may be different. In E. P. Berman & C. Paradeise (Eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations: The university under pressure* (pp. 453–488). Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Finkelstein, M. J. (2010). Diversification in the academic workforce: The case of the US and implications for Europe. *European Review, 18*(S1), S141–S156.

Finkelstein, M. J. (2015). How national contexts shape academic careers: A preliminary analysis. In U. Teichler & W. K. Cummings (Eds.), *Forming, recruiting and managing the academic profession* (pp. 317–328). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R. K, & Schuster, J. H. (1998). *The new academic generation: A profession in transformation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fish, S. (2014). *Versions of academic freedom: From professionalism to revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fumasoli, T., Goastellec, G., & Kehm, B. M. (Eds.). (2015). *Academic work and careers in Europe: Trends, challenges, perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Galaz-Fontes, J. F., Arimoto, A., Teichler, U., & Brennan, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Biographies and careers throughout academic life*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Geiger, R. L. (1999). The ten generations of American higher education. In R. O. Berdahl, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *Higher education in the twenty-first century* (pp. 38–69). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gerstmann, E., & Streb, M. J. (Eds.). (2006). *Academic freedom at the dawn of a new century*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Goldstein, M., & Schaffer, F. (2015). Academic freedom: Some considerations. In A. Bilgrami & J. R. Cole (Eds.), *Who's afraid of academic freedom?* (pp. 247–274). New York: Columbia University Press.

Gouldner, A.W. (1957–1958) Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles I and II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 281-306.

Greenfeld, L. (Ed.). (2012). *The ideals of Joseph Ben-David: The Scientist's role and Centers of learning revisited*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Halsey, A. H. (1992). *Decline of donnish dominion: The British academic professions in the twentieth century*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Halsey, A. H., & Trow, M. A. (1971). *The British academics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Herbst, J. (1985). Review of *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30*(4), 608–610.

Hermanowicz, J. C. (1998). *The stars Are not enough: Scientists—Their passions and professions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hermanowicz, J. C. (2005). Classifying universities and their departments: A social world perspective. *Journal of Higher Education, 76*(1), 26–55.

Hermanowicz, J. C. (2009). *Lives in science: How institutions affect academic careers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hermanowicz, J. C. (2012). The sociology of academic careers: Problems and prospects. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 207–248). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Hermanowicz, J. C. (2013). The culture of mediocrity. *Minerva, 51*, 363–387.

Hermanowicz, J. C. (2016). The proliferation of publishing: Economic rationality and ritualized productivity in a neoliberal era. *American Sociologist, 47*(2), 174–191.

Heston, A., Summers, R., & Aten, B. (2011). *Penn world tables version 7.0*. Philadelphia: Center for International Comparisons of Production, Income, and Prices at the University of Pennsylvania.

Hodson, R. (2001). *Dignity at work*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffman, D. M., & Välimaa, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Re-becoming universities? Higher education institutions in networked knowledge societies*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Hofstadter, R. (1955). *Academic freedom in the age of the college*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hofstadter, R., & Metzger, W. P. (1955). *The development of academic freedom in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Höhle, E. A., & Teichler, U. (2016). Appendix: A new bibliography of publications of the project 'The changing academic profession' (CAP) and related projects. In J. F. Galaz-Fontes, A. Akimoto, U. Teichler, & J. Brennan (Eds.), *Biographies and careers throughout academic life* (pp. 314–392). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Hoye, W. J. (1997). The religious roots of academic freedom. *Theological Studies, 58*(3), 409–428.

Huang, F. (2009). The internationalization of the academic profession in Japan: A quantitative perspective. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(2), 143–158.

Huang, F., Finkelstein, M. F., & Rostan, M. (Eds.). (2014). *The internationalization of the academy*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Hüther, O., & Krücken, G. (2013). Hierarchy and power: A conceptual analysis with particular reference to new public management reforms in German universities. *European Journal of Higher Education, 3*(4), 307–323.

Hüther, O., & Krücken, G. (2016). Nested organizational fields: Isomorphism and differentiation among European universities. In E. P. Berman & C. Paradeise (Eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations: The university under pressure* (pp. 53–83). Bingley: Emerald.

Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Kalleberg, A. L. (2011). *Good jobs, bad jobs: The rise of polarized and precarious employment systems in the United States, 1970s to 2000s*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kehm, B. M. (2006). Germany. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education, Part 2* (pp. 729–745). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Kehm, B. M., & Lazendorf, U. (2006). Germany—16 länder approaches to reform. In B. M. Kehm & U. Lazendorf (Eds.), *Reforming university governance: Changing conditions for research in four European countries* (pp. 135–185). Bonn, Germany: Lemmens.

Kehm, B. M., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2013). *The academic profession in Europe: News tasks and new challenges*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Kennedy, D. (1997). *Academic duty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

King, R., Marginson, S., & Naidoo, R. (Eds.). (2013). *The globalization of higher education*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Kramer, R., & Cook, K. S. (Eds.). (2004). *Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kwiek, M. (2003). Academe in transition: Transformations in the Polish academic profession. *Higher Education, 45*, 455–476.

Kwiek, M. (2012). The growing complexity of the academic enterprise in Europe: A panoramic view. *European Journal of Higher Education, 2*(2-3), 1–20.

Kwiek, M. (2015). Inequality in academic knowledge production: The role of research top performers across Europe. In E. Reale & E. Primeri (Eds.), *The transformation of university institutional and organizational boundaries* (pp. 203–230). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Kwiek, M. (2016). The European research elite: A cross-national study of highly productive academics in 11 countries. *Higher Education, 71*, 379–397.

Lawrence, J. H. (1998). A framework for assessing trends in Academic careers. *New Directions for Higher Education, 104*, 19–28.

Leisyte, L., de Boer, H., & Enders, J. (2006). England—Prototype of the 'evaluative state'. In B. M. Kehm & U. Lanzendorf (Eds.), *Reforming university governance: Changing conditions for research in four European countries* (pp. 21–56). Bonn, Germany: Lemmens.

Locke, W., Cummings, W. K., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Changing governance and management in higher education*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Lucas, L. (2006). *The research game in academic life*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Maassen, P. A. M., & van Vught, F. A. (Eds.). (1996). *Inside academia: New challenges for the academic profession*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: DeTijdstroom.

Marginson, S. (2014). Academic freedom: A global comparative approach. *Frontiers of Education in China, 9*(1), 24–41.

Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McGee, R. (1960). The function of institutional inbreeding. *American Journal of Sociology, 65*(5), 483–488.

McLaughlin, M. M. (1977). *Intellectual freedom and its limitations in the University of Paris in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries*. New York: Arno Press.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: The Free Press.

Merton, R.K. ([1942] 1973a). The normative structure of science. In N.W. Storer (ed.), *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations* (pp. 267-278). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merton, R.K. ([1957] 1973b). Priorities in scientific discovery. In N.W. Storer (ed.), *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations* (pp. 286-324). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merton, R.K. (1996). *Robert K. Merton: On social structure and science* (Edited and with an Introduction by P. Sztompka). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merton, R.K. ([1938] 2001). *Science, technology, and society in seventeenth century England*. New York: Howard Verlag.

Metzger, W. P. (1951). Some perspectives on the history of academic freedom. *Antioch Review, 13*(3), 275–287.

Metzger, W. P. (1961). *Academic freedom in the age of the university*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Metzger, W. P. (1967). Essay II. In S. Gorovitz (Ed.), *Freedom and order in the university* (pp. 59–78). Cleveland, OH: The Press of Western Reserve University.

Metzger, W. P. (1987). The academic profession in the United States. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), *The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional Settings* (pp. 123–208). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Metzger, W. P. (1988). Profession and constitution: Two definitions of academic freedom in America. *Texas Law Review, 66*, 1265–1322.

Meyer, J. W. (1977). The effects of education as an institution. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*, 55–77.

Meyer, J. W., Kamens, D., Benavot, A., & Cha, Y. K. (1992). *School knowledge for the masses: World models and national primary curricular categories in the twentieth century*. Washington, DC: Falmer.

Meyer, J.W., Ramirez, F.O., Frank, D.J., & Schofer, E. (2007). Higher education as an institution. In P. Gumport (Ed.), *Sociology of higher education: Contributions and their contexts* (pp. 187–221). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Meyer, J. W., Ramirez, F. O., & Soysal, Y. N. (1992). World expansion of mass education, 1870–1980. *Sociology of Education, 65*, 128–149.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*, 340–363.

Mignot Gerard, S. (2003). Who are the actors in the government of French universities? The paradoxical victory of deliberative leadership. *Higher Education, 45*(1), 71–89.

Mora, J.-G. (2001). The academic profession in Spain: Between the civil service and the market. *Higher Education, 41*(1-2), 131–155.

Moscati, R. (2001). Italian university professors in transition. *Higher Education, 41*(1-2), 103–129.

Musselin, C. (2001). *The long march of the French universities*. New York: Routledge.

Musselin, C. (2005a). Towards a European academic labor market? Some lessons drawn from empirical studies on academic mobility. *Higher Education, 48*, 55–78.

Musselin, C. (2005b). European labor markets in transition. *Higher Education, 49*, 135–154.

Musselin, C. (2006). France. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education, Part 2* (pp. 711–728). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Musselin, C. (2009). Profession, market and organization: How is academia regulated? In J. Enders & E. de Weert (Eds.), *The changing face of academic life: Analytical and comparative perspectives* (pp. 117–133). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Musselin, C. (2010). *The market for academics*. New York: Routledge.

Musselin, C. (2011). The academic workplace: What we already know, what we still need to know, and what we would like to know. In D. Rhotten & C. Calhoun (Eds.), *Knowledge matters: The public mission of the research university* (pp. 423–456). New York: Columbia University Press.

Musselin, C. (2014). Empowerment of French universities by funding and evaluation agencies. In R. Whitley & J. Gläser (Eds.), *Organizational transformation and scientific change: The impact of institutional restructuring on universities and intellectual innovation* (pp. 51–76). Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Neave, G., & Rhoades, G. (1987). The academic estate in Western Europe. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), *The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional settings*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Parsons, T. (1949). The professions and social structure. In T. Parsons (Ed.), *Essays in sociological theory* (pp. 34–49). New York: The Free Press.

Patai, D., & Koertge, N. (2003). *Professing feminism*. New York: Lexington.

Perna, L. W. (2016). Throwing down the gauntlet: Ten ways to ensure that higher education research continues to matter. *Review of Higher Education, 39*(3), 319–338.

Power, M. (1997). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ramirez, F. O., & Meyer, J. W. (2013). Universalizing the university in a world society. In J. C. Shin & B. M. Kehm (Eds.), *Institutionalization of world-Class university in global competition* (pp. 257–273). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Rashdall, H. ([1895] 2010) *The universities of Europe in the middle ages, Volumes 1–2*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Riley, M.W., Johnson, M., & Foner, A. (1972). *Aging and society. Vol. 3, A sociology of age stratification*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Risser, D. (2003). Governance and functioning of British universities. *Beiträge zur Hochschulforschung, 25*(1), 84–101.

Rostan, M. (2010). Challenges to academic freedom: Some empirical evidence. *European Review, 18*(S10), S71–S88.

Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American college and university: A history*. New York: Vintage.

Russell, C. (1993). *Academic freedom*. London: Routledge.

Schrecker, E. (1983). Academic freedom: The historical view. In C. Kaplan & E. Schrecker (Eds.), *Regulating the intellectuals: Perspectives in academic freedom in the 1980s* (pp. 25–43). New York: Praeger.

Schuster, J. H. (2011). The professoriate's perilous path. In J. C. Hermanowicz (Ed.), *The American academic profession: Transformation in contemporary higher education* (pp. 1–17). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schwartzman, S. (2011). Brazil. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 613–626). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Shattock, M. (2001). The academic profession in Britain. A study in the failure to adapt to change. *Higher Education, 41*(1/2), 27–47.

Shiell, T. C. (2006). Three conceptions of academic freedom. In E. Gerstmann & M. J. Streb (Eds.), *Academic freedom at the dawn of a new century* (pp. 17–40). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Shils, E. (1961 [1975]). Center and periphery. In E. Shils *Center and periphery: Essays in macrosociology* (pp. 3-16). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shils, E. (1983). *The academic ethic: The report of a study group of the international council on the future of the university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Reprinted from *Minerva* (1983), 20(1–2).

Shils, E. (1991). Academic freedom. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *International higher education: An encyclopedia* (pp. 1–22). New York: Garland.

Shin, J. C., Arimoto, A., Cummings, W. K., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2014). *Teaching and research in contemporary higher education: Systems, activities and rewards*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Shin, J. C., & Kehm, B. M. (Eds.). (2013). *Institutionalization of world-class university in global competition*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Shin, J. C., & Teichler, U. (2014a). The future of the university in the post-massification era: A conceptual framework. In J. C. Shin & U. Teichler (Eds.), *The future of the post-massified university at the crossroads* (pp. 1–9). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Shin, J. C., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2014b). *The future of the post-massified university at the crossroads*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Shin, J. C., Toutkoushian, R. K., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2011). *University rankings: Theoretical basis, methodology and impacts on global higher education*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Slantcheva, S. (2003). The Bulgarian academic profession in transition. *Higher Education, 45*, 425–454.

Slaughter, S. (1993). Beyond basic science: Research university presidents' narratives of science policy. *Science, Technology, and Human Values, 18*(3), 278–302.

Slaughter, S. (2011). Academic freedom, professional autonomy, and the state. In J. C. Hermanowicz (Ed.), *The American academic profession: Transformation in contemporary higher education* (pp. 241–273). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smelser, N. J. (2013). *Dynamics of the contemporary university: Growth, accretion, and conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Smolentseva, A. (2003). Challenges to the Russian academic profession. *Higher Education, 45*, 391–424.

Teichler, U. (2010). The diversifying academic profession? *European Review, 18*(1), S157–S179.

Teichler, U. (2014a). Possible futures for higher education: Challenges for higher education research. In J. C. Shin & U. Teichler (Eds.), *The future of the post-massified university at the crossroads* (pp. 145–166). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Teichler, U. (2014b). On the move towards a new convergent design of higher education systems? In J. C. Shin & U. Teichler (Eds.), *The future of the post-massified university at the crossroads* (pp. 229–248). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Teichler, U., Arimoto, A., & Cummings, W. K. (2013). *The changing academic profession: Major findings from a comparative survey*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Teichler, U., & Cummings, W. K. (Eds.). (2015). *Forming, recruiting and managing the academic profession*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Teichler, U., & Höhle, E. A. (Eds.). (2013). *The work situation of the academic profession in Europe: Findings of a survey in twelve countries*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Thelin, J. R. (2011). All that glittered was not gold: Rethinking American higher education's golden age, 1945–1970. In J. C. Hermanowicz (Ed.), *The American academic profession: Transformation in contemporary higher education* (pp. 332–350). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tierney, W. G., & Lankford, M. (2014). The question of academic freedom: Universal right or relative term. *Frontiers of Education in China, 9*(1), 4–23.

Trow, M. ([1974] 2010) Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education. In M. Burrage (Ed.), *Martin Trow: Twentieth-century higher education, elite to mass to universal* (pp. 88–142). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tuchman, G. (2009). *Wannabe U: Inside the corporate university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tuchman, G. (2010). Review of *The market for academics*. *Contemporary Sociology*, *40*(1), 66–68.

Vogt, W. P. (1978). Review of *Centers of learning: Britain, France, Germany, United States*. *The School Review, 87*(1), 87–92.

Vostal, F. (2016). *Accelerating academia: The changing structure of academic time*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wajcman, J. (2015). *Pressed for time: The acceleration of life in digital capitalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Yan, F. (2010). The academic profession in China in the context of social transition: An institutional perspective. *European Review, 18*(S1), S99–S116.

Yudkevich, M., Altbach, P. G., & Rumbley, L.E. (Eds.). (2015a). *Young faculty in the twenty-first century: International perspectives*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Yudkevich, M., Altbach, P. G., & Rumbley, L. E. (Eds.). (2015b). *Academic inbreeding and mobility in higher education: Global perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Yudkevich, M., Altbach, P. G., & Rumbley, L. E. (Eds.). (2016). *The global academic rankings game: Changing institutional policy, practice, and academic Life*. New York: Routledge.

Zha, Q. (2011). Is there an emerging Chinese model of the university? In R. Hayhoe, J. Li, J. Lin, & Q. Zha (Eds.), *Portraits of 21st century universities: In the move to mass higher education* (pp. 451–471). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Zuckerman, H. (1988). The sociology of science. In N. J. Smelser (Ed.), *Handbook of sociology* (pp. 511–574). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zuckerman, H., & Merton, R. K. (1971). Patterns of evaluation in science: Institutionalization, structure and the functions of the referee system. *Minerva, 9*, 66–100.