The Academic Profession in the Light of Comparative Surveys

Ester Ava Höhle and Ulrich Teichler

1 The Academic Profession in Focus

In recent decades, conviction spread that knowledge is becoming more and more the key resource for ensuring technological progress, economic growth, societal advancement and cultural enrichment. All over the world, universities and other institutions of higher education are viewed as the institutions responsible to generate, retain, and disseminate knowledge through research and through the teaching of students. The scholars active at these institutions, with the professors at the apex of the career ladder, can be viewed as the "key profession" (Perkin 1969), i.e. those persons whose activities consist of research and teaching. They are the most superior carriers of knowledge in all disciplines and thereby also shape the knowledge of the experts working in influential positions in the various professional areas; as a consequence, high prestige in society characterises the academic profession.

Three features characterise the academic profession all over the world, even though the conditions might vary considerably among countries. First, the *process of learning and maturation* until being eventually considered a full-fledged member of the academic profession is *very long*. While in other occupational areas, university graduates might become fully competent professionals mostly after 1–3 years after graduation, academics often concurrently learn and do productive academic work for a period of 10–15 years after graduation. Only those in senior positions are acknowledged as fully competent personnel. Second, academic careers are *highly selective*; it is accepted as a matter of prestige that rigorous examinations such as those linked to the award of a doctoral degree or other assessment prior to entering professorial positions are narrow-entry gates. More of those who aim at becoming an academic might have to leave the academic profession after a while that is

E. A. Höhle (✉) · U. Teichler
International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel (INCHER-Kassel),
University of Kassel, Moenchebergstr. 17, 34109 Kassel, Germany
e-mail: hoehle@incher.uni-kassel.de

U. Teichler
e-mail: teichler@incher.uni-kassel.de

B. M. Kehm, U. Teichler (eds.), *The Academic Profession in Europe: New Tasks and New Challenges,* The Changing Academy – The Changing Academic Profession in International Comparative Perspective 5, DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-4614-5_3,

customary in most other intellectually demanding occupations. Third, the academic profession enjoys a higher degree of freedom in determining its work tasks than other professions do. "Academic freedom" is the key notion concept for the exceptionally high degree of professional disposition; it is considered necessary in order to generate new knowledge and in order to prepare students for indeterminate work tasks. In many countries, "academic freedom" is reinforced by a high degree of institutional "autonomy", whereby academics used to have influence on administrative matters of the institution as a whole.

In most countries of the world, the most creative institutions of higher education ensure that their academics are responsible both for teaching students and for independent research. In Europe, the term "university" usually is confined to institutions where teaching and research are closely linked. The close tie between research and teaching, most impressively advocated by Wilhelm von Humboldt in the process of the foundation of the University of Berlin at the beginning of the nineteenth century, tends to be regarded as a key characteristic of the modern university. The close tie is expected to stimulate research through communication in teaching and learning and to make sure that teaching is undertaken on the intellectually most demanding level and is based on the most recent state of knowledge.

Many historians point out that the concepts of modern institutions of higher education, which became dominant at the beginning of the nineteenth century, remained the dominant concepts till today (see, for example Perkin 1991). However, there is an agreement among experts as well that higher education has changed dramatically after World War II (see Ben-David 1977; Rüegg 2011). *Expansion, diversity* and *knowledge society* are key terms in the discourse about dramatic changes in recent decades. In economically advanced countries, the rate of new student entries among the corresponding age group increased from less than 5 % on average around 1950 to more than half on average in the first decade of the twenty-first century; the coining of the words "elite, mass and universal higher education" by the American higher education researcher Martin Trow (see Trow 1974) had an outreaching impact on the public debate and contributed to the fact that this process of expansion of student numbers was accompanied in many countries by increased diversity of tasks and functions of the institutions of higher education and the scholars; in many countries, the proportion of higher education institutions grew which have only a limited research function or no official task of research at all. Therefore, reputational differences between institutions increased in many countries as well. An enlarging number of institutions opted for specific profiles in order to serve the growing diversity of motives, talents, and job prospects of students (Trow 1974; see also Burrage 2010). Finally, the term "knowledge society" spread since the 1970s and emphasises how the diffusion, creation, dissemination, and use of information and knowledge has gained increased importance in all societal fields and became a serious counterpart to what used to be the most relevant resources: work, raw material, and financial capital (cf. Drucker 1969; Bell 1973; Stehr 1994; Knorr-Cetina 1998; Bindé 2005). As *the* knowledge creating institution, higher education has an increasing potential to serve society. On the one hand, more experts are needed on the labour market because the breadth and depth of available knowledge

has expanded rapidly. More highly qualified employees are needed since highly specified and knowledge-intensive sectors have expanded their share of the overall economic production. Knowledge has become an important resource in a market of scientification. On the other hand, higher levels of formal education have become increasingly expected even where high degrees were usually not demanded in former times, thus carrying the meaning of a symbolic expertise rather than disciplinary qualification (Enders 2001c).

The expansion and increasing relevance of higher education, in principle, could enhance the status and reputation of the core profession in academia: working as scholars could be expected to be more prestigious, and perceived as relevant for the progress of society. It could be better paid and more satisfying than ever before. However, a closer look revealed that expansion and increasing relevance did not automatically mean paradise. There were a number of signs that the rising role of systematic knowledge concurrently leads to a decline of the social exclusiveness of the academic profession in various respects. In the public debates within various countries about the future developments of societies, academics by no means seem to play a more important role. Surveys of the reputation of professions show a declining position of the professoriate in many countries (Jacob and Teichler 2011, p. 9; Altbach and Lewis 1996, p. 45). In some countries, scholars' salaries show a loss of exclusiveness as well (Karpen and Hanske 1994, p. 42). Last but not least, professors in various countries feel more restrained as far as academic freedom and their power in shaping their institutional environment are concerned. The key literature on the academic profession in the 1980s and early 1991 indicates a growing sense of crisis around the academic profession (see Clark 1987, various articles in European Journal of Education 1983, *18*(3); Finkelstein 1984; Bowen and Schuster 1986; Altbach 1991). Even though the relevance and a certain degree of prestige by no means was called into question, the view spread that the changing nature of knowledge in society is accompanied by changes in higher education that are a mixed blessing for the academic profession (see Enders and Teichler 1997).

2 The Carnegie Study 1991–1993

2.1 The Initiative and the Design of the Study

Entry rates to higher education beyond 10 %, years later beyond 20 %, and eventually beyond 30 % were reality in the United States of America substantially earlier than in European countries. Moreover, activities of analysing developments of higher education systematically emerged in the United States earlier and more forcefully than in other countries. Already in 1969, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching started the first survey of the academic profession. The survey addressed the attitudes, values, and professional orientations of the professoriate, reviewed the working and employment situation as well as chronicled its changing demographic profile. In the 1980s, various literature studies, surveys,

and expert analyses of the Carnegie Foundation, guided by its President Ernest L. Boyer, stirred up lively debates in the United States about the state of higher education—notably, as these studies made clear that the public debate often had focused too much on the sector of the prestigious research universities and had overlooked the changes of the overall system in the process of rapid expansion and changing social functions.

Ernest L. Boyer took first steps for the preparation of a comparative study already in 1990. He was convinced that the US audience would benefit from knowing whether issues of the academic profession were similar across the globe. Since social changes in the academy were perceived worldwide and issues of the academic profession came out to be global, while in other respects it was obvious that nations had different traditions and different policies, it became apparent that an international comparison was necessary. Moreover, the professoriate had developed more and more international communication and collaboration, colleagues across the countries benefitted from the exchanges, and these exchanges seemed to enrich knowledge production and the world's reservoir of knowledge. The Carnegie Foundation approached possible research partners in different countries of the world, provided funds for partners from middle-income countries to undertake national surveys and volunteered to take the lead for joint data processes and for the analysis of results.

In 1990, researchers of different countries gathered at the headquarters of the Carnegie Foundation in Princeton, New Jersey (United States) to plan the first international study about the academic profession. A subsequent preparatory conference in 1991, addressing the diversity of the higher education systems and the situation of the academic profession in the various countries participating, made clear that there was a sufficiently broad range of common issues to consider such a comparative study as valuable. However, immense activities of developing a joint questionnaire were needed beyond the most recent US predecessor survey (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1989, see Boyer 1990) in order to cover the key issues and the key conditions for a large number of countries.

Actually, the first international survey of the academic profession (commonly called Carnegie Survey of the Academic Profession) was undertaken in 1991–1993. Information was collected about the demographic facts of the profession, the employment and work situation, time spent on various activities, attitudes towards teaching and learning and actual activities in these areas, the governance of academic institutions, and on morale. Scholars from 15 countries (more precisely 14 countries and one "territory") from all continents participated in surveying their academics: Australia; the Asian countries of South Korea, Japan, and Hong Kong; the Latin American countries of Brazil, Chile, and Mexico; the United States; the European countries of United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Russia; and also Egypt and Israel from the Middle East. However, scholars from Egypt and Russia had initially participated, but eventually did not succeed in gathering a representative overview of the academic profession in their country; their data was only included in part in national reports eventually published and was not included in the international data set.

As already pointed out, the questionnaire was loosely based on the Carnegie's questionnaire for the previous survey of the American scholars. The new questionnaire, comprising about ten questions with frequent long lists of response items, was adapted in a collaborative process to the topics and interests of the various countries. It was modified to be relevant to the international context and to focus on the topics that were particularly salient to the members of the research group. "The very process of designing the questionnaire was itself a revealing exercise, as differences in priorities of the professoriate, and even in the meaning of basic concepts, were discussed, debated, and ultimately resolved. The questionnaire was carefully translated into the languages of the countries involved" (Altbach and Lewis 1996, pp. 5–6). For the actual surveying, a common methodology was used to select institutions and individuals. A representative sample of academics teaching and researching at institutions providing programmes at least on the Bachelor's level was constructed. The questionnaire was mailed in 1992 and 1993 to altogether more than 40,000 persons. Response rates varied from about 70 % to less than 30 %, and altogether 19,161 respondents provided the information for the comparative analysis (see Altbach and Lewis 1996; Enders and Teichler 1995b, pp. 5–8; cf. the slightly varying report in Whitelaw 1996).

2.2 Major Results of the Carnegie Study

A first, relatively short overview of the results of this first comparative study was published by the Carnegie Foundation itself in 1994 (Boyer et al. 1994). The major publication, made available 2 years later, was a collection of country reports supplemented by a comparative analysis on the part of two US scholars who had not been involved in the comparative project at the time the joint questionnaire had been developed (Altbach 1996). Scholars involved in the project published various national and comparative data analyses, among them substantial reports in Japan (Arimoto and Ehara 1996) and Germany (Enders and Teichler 1995a, b). Finally, several reports about the project contributed to a major conference of the Academia Europaea held in 1996, the proceedings of which were published in the same year (Maassen and van Vught 1996), and articles were published in a special issue of the journal "Higher Education" in 1997 (Welch 1997).

The first comparative report (Boyer et al. 1994) underscored a broad range of findings. In most countries, the academic profession had remained more strongly male dominated than in the United States in those days, and the proportion of youth considered as well equipped for study in higher education was rated smaller than in the United States. Across countries, scholars felt most closely affiliated to their discipline, but the sense of affiliation to their university varies substantially as well as the role they attribute to research in their overall activities; across countries, the authors observed a relatively low degree of satisfaction as regards the prevailing modes of evaluation. Salaries in most countries were regarded as high or acceptable, the overall satisfaction seemed to be high, and the overall academic climate

was rated positively. Views varied more strongly across countries as regards the assessment of working conditions, and many academics in some countries considered their profession as a source of personal strain. Across all countries, academics expressed dissatisfaction with the prevailing conditions of governance. In most countries, academics felt the academic profession to be sufficiently protected, while the views varied, whether academics play and should play an active role in society. Finally, the majority of academics all over the world believed that international ties were highly important for the academic professions, whereby the actual activities of international collaboration and mobility seemed to differ strikingly. The analysis concludes "Scholars everywhere, while maintaining national distinctions, acknowledge common concerns—not just intellectually but professionally as well. And in the century ahead, three critical issues will influence profoundly the shape and vitality of higher learning around the world" (Boyer et al. 1994, p. 21): student access and the balance of access and excellence, governance ("How can the university reorganise itself to achieve both efficiency and collegiality?") as well as the relationships between teaching, research, and services (rewards and increased contribution to public good).

In the major publication of the Carnegie Study, Altbach and Lewis (1996, pp. 47–48) summarise the findings of the country reports as follows:

> One cannot but be struck by the many similarities among the scholars and scientists in the diverse countries. It is with regard to those working conditions most affected by local political and cultural customs and policies that international differences are most apparent. The professoriate worldwide is committed to teaching and research, and in varying degree to service. While there is a feeling that higher education faces many difficulties and that conditions have deteriorated in recent years, most academics are committed to the profession and to its traditional values of autonomy, academic freedom, and the importance of scholarship, both for its own sake and for societal advancement. Academics are not especially supportive of senior administrators, yet they express remarkable loyalty to the profession and to other academics. They seem prepared to respond to the call that higher education contribute more tangibly to economic development and social well-being. They believe that they have an obligation to apply their knowledge to society's problems.

After pointing to some differences between countries, the authors continue:

> Resiliency, determination, and a focus on the core functions of higher education characterise the academic profession in these 14 countries. While the vicissitudes experienced by the profession in recent years have been considerable, the professoriate is by no means demoralised. In all but three countries, 60 % or more agree that this is an especially creative and productive time in their fields. Professors are generally satisfied with the courses they teach, and with few exceptions are pleased with the opportunity they have to pursue their own ideas. The intellectual atmosphere is good; faculty do not regret their career choices and are generally happy with their relationships with colleagues.
>
> This portrait of the professoriate depicts a strong, but somewhat unsettled profession. Academics around the world are inspired by the intellectual ferment of the times. The intrinsic pleasures of academic life obviously endure. Academe is facing the future with concern but with surprising optimism. (Altbach and Lewis 1996, p. 48)

In the overview of the major results of the Carnegie Study, Teichler (1996) makes two strategic choices from the outset. First, he concentrates the analysis on six economically advanced countries, thereby underscoring the quite different conditions

academics face in middle-income countries. Second, data are presented separately for university professors, junior academic staff at universities and academics at other institutions of higher education, thereby pointing out that the academic profession is distinctively sub-divided by status and function.

In summarising the findings of the Carnegie Survey, Teichler (1996, p. 59) points out, first, that the academic profession "is more satisfied with their profession than the prior public debate suggested". He underscores, though, that satisfaction is higher among university professors than the other two groups, and that the areas for which dissatisfaction is expressed vary substantially by country.

Second, a clear link between teaching and research has persisted for university professors. "Neither is research endangered because of teaching and administrative loads nor is teaching put aside due to research-oriented motives and research-oriented assessment." (Teichler 1996, p. 60). However, individual options vary strikingly among university professors, and the link between teaching and research is less obvious for large proportions of junior staff and, as one could expect, for academics at other higher education institutions.

Third, the author notes surprising commonalities among university professors across disciplines, notably "in their value judgements about the university administration, about the role higher education is expected to play and about the views on how higher education is perceived and estimated in the public" (Teichler 1996, p. 60). In contrast, the author notes substantial differences between senior and junior academics at universities as well as between academics at universities and other institutions of higher education in many respects.

Fourth, more than the other authors Teichler points out differences. Among others, "the English senior academics at universities consider themselves more strongly a profession under pressure than their colleagues in other European countries" (Teichler 1996, p. 61). According to the author, the country differences are striking

> as regards the role foreign languages and international relationships play for their academic life. Sweden belongs to those countries, where a view prevails which I would call 'internationalise or perish'. Germany belongs, as also Japan, to those countries which I would call 'two-arena countries': scholars might opt whether they more strongly prefer national or international involvement and visibility. Actually, the Dutch scholars seemed to be closer on average to their Swedish than to their German colleagues in this respect. Finally, many English scholars, though to a lesser extent than their US-American colleagues, seem to take 'internationalisation through import' for granted. (Teichler 1996, p. 61)

Fifth, junior academics at universities are more heterogeneous groups than professors as far as priorities and actual time spent on various functions are concerned. On average, they assess their working conditions favourably, but are clearly less satisfied than university professors, though they are similar to them with respect to academic values.

Sixth, not surprisingly, views and activities of academics at other institutions of higher education are clearly shaped by the dominance of teaching. They tend to be less satisfied with their overall professional situation than academics at universities.

Seventh, the administration is assessed by academics on average neither positively nor negatively. Most academics do not see any significant infringement as regards their academic work though some point out visible restrictions.

Eighth, finally, Teichler points out as well that academics, though in the majority clearly defending the right to pursue research for its own sake, do not present themselves as an 'ivory tower profession'. Rather they expect research and teaching to help resolve basic social problems.

Altogether, the international comparative study undertaken in 1991–1993 does not depict an academic profession as suffering from status loss, resource restrictions, or adverse administrative conditions. Critique of the conditions for academic work is by no means infrequent, but the academic profession seems to be in the position to opt for activities which they favour and shape their job role themselves in a predominantly satisfactory way.

2.3 Subsequent Years

This does not mean, however, that the Carnegie Study was successful to change the perception of the situation of the academic profession substantially. In depicting the public debate a few years afterwards, Enders—actually a team member of the Carnegie Study who knew its results very well—pointed out that the academic profession continued to be viewed to be under pressure: rapid loss of status, tighter resources, loss of power of the academic guild, and being blamed for not providing the services expected. "Furthermore, one fears a decline in the faculty morale, disillusionment of their mission, seeing themselves as academic workers who are merely doing routine jobs and who are no longer strongly committed to the traditional norms and values of the profession". (Enders 2001b, p. 2). Similarly, Altbach (2000b, p. 1) notes a "deterioration of the academic estate". An even wider range of challenges is listed by Welch (2005a, p. 1) for the academic profession "in uncertain times".

Moreover, some subsequent analyses paid more attention to the situation of junior academics. Notably in European countries, the long process of concurrent learning and productive work and the high selectivity of the profession is often combined with a long period of unsecure employment and reduced access to resources (see Altbach 2000a; Enders 2001a; Enders and de Weert 2004; Welch 2005b; Teichler 2006); but also junior academics in other countries faced similar problems (cf. Schuster and Finkelstein 2006).

It is difficult to judge whether the public debate overrates adverse contexts and underrates the ability of the academics to benefit from the potentials and partly set aside the adverse conditions, or whether in fact the conditions became harsher after the Carnegie Study had been conducted. A question like this could be answered more convincingly on the basis of a comparative study on the academic profession that was undertaken some years later.

3 The CAP Study

3.1 The Approach

More than a decade later, researchers from various countries initiated a second comparative study on the academic profession. On the one hand, they noted that the crisis mood in a variety of issues has persisted. The academic profession still worried about a loss of exclusiveness, both as status and as a loss of the oligopoly of the "knowledge profession" are concerned, about a possible relative decline of the employment and work conditions, and finally about a possible loss of power and even of academic freedom. Therefore, it was seen as worthwhile to explore whether in fact the perception of the employment and work situation, the values and the academic activities had changed since the early 1990s, and this was reflected in the title of the new project: "The Changing Academic Profession" (CAP). On the other hand, the scholars initiating the new project were convinced that three additional themes had gained momentum and therefore should be extensively treated in the new survey which played only a moderate role in the early 1990s, but now might have a pervasive influence on the academic profession: a higher expectation of relevance, a growing internationalisation, and a substantially increased managerial power in higher education. These "three key challenges" were formulated at the outset of the CAP project as follows (see Kogan and Teichler 2007b, pp. 10–11, cf. more detailed explanations in Cummings 2006, Brennan 2006, 2007):

> *Relevance*: Whereas the highest goal of the traditional academy was to create fundamental knowledge, what has been described as the 'scholarship of discovery', the new emphasis of the knowledge society is on useful knowledge or the 'scholarship of application'. This scholarship often involves the pooling and melding of insights from several disciplines and tends to focus on outcomes that have a direct impact on everyday life. One consequence is that many future scholars, though trained in the disciplines, will work in applied fields and may have options of employment in these fields outside of the academy. This provides new opportunities for more boundaryless forms of academic career and knowledge transfer while it may also create recruitment difficulties in some places, and especially in fields such as science, technology and engineering.
>
> There are strong interdependencies between the goals of higher education, the rules for distributing resources, and the nature of academic work. The changes associated with movement from the 'traditional academy' with its stress on basic research and disciplinary teaching to the 'relevant academy' are largely uncharted and are likely to have unanticipated consequences. The task of the project is therefore to understand how these changes influence academic value systems and work practices and affect the nature and locus of control and power in academe.
>
> *Internationalisation*: National traditions and socio-economic circumstances continue to play an important role in shaping academic life and have a major impact on the attractiveness of jobs in the profession. Yet today's global trends, with their emphasis on knowledge production and information flow, play an increasingly important role in the push towards the internationalisation of higher education. The international mobility of students and staff has grown, new technologies connect scholarly communities around the world, and English has become the new lingua franca of the international community.
>
> The economic and political power of a country, its size and geographic location, its dominant culture, the quality of its higher education system and the language it uses for academic

> discourse and publications are factors that bring with them different approaches to internationalisation. Local and regional differences in approach are also to be found. Therefore, questions are raised about the functions of international networks, the implications of different access to them and the role of new communication technologies in internationalising the profession.
> *Management*: In academic teaching and research, where professional values are traditionally firmly woven into the very fabric of knowledge production and dissemination, attempts to introduce change are sometimes received with scepticism and opposition. At the same time, a greater professionalisation of higher education management is regarded as necessary to enable higher education to respond effectively to a rapidly changing external environment. The control and management of academic work will help to define the nature of academic roles—including the division of labour in the academy, with a growth of newly professionalised 'support' roles and a possible breakdown of the traditional teaching/research nexus. New systemic and institutional processes such as quality assurance have been introduced which also change traditional distributions of power and values within academe and may be a force for change in academic practice. The project will examine both the rhetoric and the realities of academics' responses to such managerial practices in higher education.
> A number of views can be discerned about recent attempts at the management of change in higher education and the responses of academics to such changes. One view would see a victory of managerial values over professional ones with academics losing control over both the overall goals of their work practices and their technical tasks. Another view would see the survival of traditional academic values against the managerial approach. This does not imply that academic roles fail to change, but that change does not automatically mean that interests and values are weakened. A third view would see a 'marriage' between professionalism and managerialism with academics losing some control over the goals and social purposes of their work but retaining considerable autonomy over their practical and technical tasks. The desirability of these three different positions is also subject to a range of different views. (Kogan and Teichler 2007b, pp. 10–11)

Finally, the initiators of the CAP study pursued higher ambitions as regards the theoretical and methodological basis of analysis. A closer cooperation between the participating researchers from different countries was envisaged.

3.2 The Design of the CAP Study

In contrast to the Carnegie Study, the CAP study could not rely on substantial funds from a single research-promoting source. In 2004, William Cummings, professor at George Washington University (Washington DC, USA), invited higher education researchers from various countries to collaborate in a new comparative study on the academic profession and to raise funds from their respective national sources. In the framework of five meetings held from 2004 to 2006 in Paris (France), London (United Kingdom), Stockholm (Sweden), Hiroshima (Japan), and Kassel (Germany), the state of research on the academic profession was carefully analysed, the conceptual base of the new project was developed, the methodological approach was specified, and the questionnaire was formulated (see Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University 2006; Kogan and Teichler 2007a; Locke and Teichler 2007).

Scholars from 18 countries (more precisely: 17 countries and one "territory") succeeded in raising funds to participate in the survey in 2007 and 2008. Half of

them had participated in the Carnegie Study and thus provided the basis for the analysis, how the situation and the views of the academic profession have changed over time: Australia, Brazil, Germany, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Mexico, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Nine countries were newly included: Argentina, Canada, China, Finland, Norway, Italy, Malaysia, Portugal, and South Africa. In 2010, the Netherlands conducted the CAP survey as well; data from this country were included in the comparative analysis undertaken from 2011 onwards. Some countries included in the Carnegie Study did not succeed in participating in the CAP Study (Chile, Egypt, Israel, Russia, and Sweden).

The CAP Study was coordinated by William Cummings. Major decisions were taken by a "concepts commission" chaired by John Brennan (Centre for Higher Education Research and Information of the Open University), located in London (United Kingdom) and by a "methods commission" chaired by Martin J. Finkelstein (Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ, USA). The data coordination was undertaken by Ulrich Teichler (International Centre for Higher Education Research, University of Kassel, Kassel, Germany).

The questionnaire was similar in length and in some parts identical or similar to the questionnaire of the previous study. The individual countries undertaking the survey were successful in calculating the number of persons to be addressed in such a way that the actual number of respondents was between 800 and 1,200 in most of the countries. The total number of responses was more than 23,000 in the 19 countries participating. However, the response rates varied substantially by country, and they were very low in some countries where academics were sent an online questionnaire only (not a paper and pencil version or an e-mail version).

Team members wrote analyses on selected themes on the occasion of a dozen joint conferences held from 2007 to 2010 in Argentina, Australia, Canada, Finland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Norway, and the United States. Some results were published in conference proceedings (Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University 2008, 2009, 2010; Diversification of Higher Education and the Academic Profession 2010), and national studies of the academic profession in comparative perspective were published in some countries (Bentley et al. 2010; Jacob and Teichler 2011). The major results of the study, however, are expected to be published in 2011 and 2012 in the book series "The Changing Academy" published by Springer (see the first volume: Locke et al. 2011). In addition to a general overview on the results, specific studies are envisaged on academic careers, job satisfaction and its determinants, the internationalisation of the academic profession as well as on the academic profession in emerging countries.

3.3 First Results

The second comparative study, the CAP Study, suggests—as the Carnegie Study—that respondents in most countries do not consider the academic profession to be in a major crisis. Surprisingly, even the resources for academic work are assessed

more positively in many countries in 2007–2008 than in 1991–1993. Also, overall job satisfaction has slightly increased over the years on average of the countries for which information is available at both points of time.

The academics surveyed observe strong expectations to deliver socially relevant results; most of the respondents, however, believe that efforts to care for academic creativity and pursuit of knowledge for its own sake are not endangered by the growing pressures for relevance. A growth of evaluation activities and an increasing managerial power is noted, but most academics surveyed do not consider their academic work to be subordinated or overtly controlled. The most obvious exception is the United Kingdom, where many academics consider themselves as losing the typical academic life due to managerial pressures.

In various countries, research shapes the daily life of scholars even more strongly than in the past, but this is not a consistent trend across all countries. Junior academics in most countries characterise their situation and their views somewhat similarly than they had done previously. Academics at institutions of higher education primarily in charge of teaching are quite distinct from those at universities with major research responsibilities in some countries, but quite similar in other countries.

One should bear in mind, though, that the first publications on the results of the CAP study often focus on a single theme and the respective findings for a single or only a few countries. Thus, it might be possible that the more thorough and the more comparative analysis expected to be available in the near future will lead to other conclusions than those presented here after a first glance.

4 Subsequent Comparative Studies

The CAP Study triggered two subsequent comparative studies on the academic profession: A study on the academic profession in Europe comprising a larger number of countries, and a follow-up study on the academic profession in Asia.

In Europe, Ulrich Teichler who had coordinated the German CAP study, initiated a research consortium comprising a larger number of European countries. In the study "The Academic Profession in Europe—Responses to Societal Challenges" (EUROAC), funded by the European Science Foundation (ESF) and national research promotion agencies and undertaken in 2009–2012, scholars from six additional European countries (Austria, Croatia, Ireland, Poland, Romania, and Switzerland) undertook a questionnaire survey in 2010 which in most parts was identical to the CAP questionnaire. Through a merger of these data with those of the European countries of the CAP survey, a comparison can be undertaken of 13 European countries; this is based on the assumption that no dramatic changes have occurred between 2007 and 2011. This will provide an opportunity to analyse the extent to which the academic profession faces similar conditions and harbours similar views, as some of the visions of the "European Higher Education Area" and the "European Research Area" suggest, or whether different traditions and different recent policies continue to put their stamp on the academic profession. Moreover, the EUROAC

study foresees interviews in eight countries (the above named as well as Finland and Germany) in order to undertake an in-depth analyses on issues related to those addressed in the CAP survey: the links between the academic profession and "higher education professionals", the service function of higher education, the situation of junior academics and career trajectories, etc.

The Japanese researchers involved in the CAP project initiated a new study on The Academic Profession in Asia (2011) and invited to a preparatory conference held in February 2011. Contrary to the EUROAC study, this project, scheduled for 2011–2012, aims to measure changes within a few years, i.e. from 2007–2008 to 2012. Similarly to the EUROAC study, the Asian study strives to broaden the thematic range beyond the CAP study and to analyse the extent to which variety between countries in Asia is prevailing or whether some common features are visible.

The emergence of these new studies suggests that the comparative analysis of the academic profession does not remain anymore only an occasionally addressed theme of higher education research. Also, the number of countries seems to grow where the quality of systematic information on the academic professions tends to increase.

5 A Final Observation

In reviewing the state of research and of public discourse on the academic profession, Enders (2006, p. 19) ends with a sentence which looks cryptic at first glance: "Overall, the fate of the academic profession may lie solely in how it responds to changes that impact on universities and higher education systems worldwide in the coming years". The comparative studies on the academic profession lead to similar conclusions: The academic profession—possibly more strongly than in the past—is exposed to substantial expectations and pressures, but these expectations and pressures are not enforcing ways how the scholars view their situation and how they act; they have to respond, but they have leeway for interpretation and action.

References

Altbach, P. G. (1991). The academic profession. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *International higher education: an encyclopedia* (pp. 23–45). New York: Garland.

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

Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (2000a). *The changing academic workplace: comparative perspectives*. Boston: Boston College, Center for International Higher Education.

Altbach, P. G. (2000b). The deterioration of the academic estate: international patterns of academic work. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *The changing academic workplace: comparative perspectives* (pp. 1–23). Boston: Boston College, Center for International Higher Education.

Altbach, P. G., & Lewis, L. S. (1996). The academic profession in international perspective. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *The international academic profession: portraits of fourteen countries* (pp. 3–48). Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Arimoto, A., & Ehara, T. (Eds.). (1996). *Daigaku kyôjushoku no kokusai hikaku* [International comparison of the academic profession]. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.
Bell, D. (1973). *The coming of post-industrial society*. New York: Basic Books.
Ben-David, J. (1977). *Centers of learning: Britain, France, Germany, United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Bentley, P., Kyvik, S., Vaboe, A., & Waagene, E. (2010). *Forskningsvilkar ved norske universiteter I et internasjonalt perspektiv* [Research conditions at Norwegian universities from a comparative perspective] (Rapport, 8/2010). Oslo: NIFU STEP.
Bindé, J. (2005). *Towards knowledge societies*. Paris: United Nations Educational.
Bowen, H., & Schuster, J. (1986). *American professors: a national resource imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., & Whitelaw, M. J. (1994). *The academic profession: an international perspective*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
Brennan, J. (2006). The changing academic profession: the driving forces. In RIHE (Ed.), *Reports of changing academic profession project workshop on quality, relevance, and governance in the changing academia: international perspectives* (pp. 37–44). Hiroshima: Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University.
Brennan, J. (2007). The academic profession and increasing expectations of relevance. In M. Kogan & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession* (pp. 19–28). Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel (INCHER-Kassel).
Burrage, M. (Ed.). (2010). *Martin Trow: twentieth-century higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). *The condition of the professoriate: attitudes and trends: a technical report*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
Clark, B. R. (Ed.). (1987). *The academic profession: national, disciplinary and institutional settings*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Cummings, W. K. (2006). The third revolution of higher education: becoming more relevant. In RIHE (Ed.), *Reports of changing academic profession project workshop on quality, relevance, and governance in the changing academia: international perspectives* (pp. 209–222). Hiroshima: Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University.
Diversification of Higher Education and the Academic Profession (special issue). (2010). *European Review, 18*(1).
Drucker, P. F. (1969). *The age of discontinuity*. New York: Harper & Row.
Enders, J. (Ed.). (2001a). *Academic staff in Europe: changing contexts and conditions*. Westport: Greenwood.
Enders, J. (2001b). 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: Greenwood.
Enders, J. (2001c). *Karriere mit Doktortitel* [Career with a doctorate?]. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus.
Enders, J. (2006). The academic profession. In J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 1–21). Dordrecht: Springer.
Enders, J., & Teichler, U. (1995a). *Berufsbild der Lehrenden und Forschenden an Hochschulen* [The professional image of those teaching and undertaking research at institutions of higher education]. Bonn: Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie.
Enders, J., & Teichler, U. (1995b). *Der Hochschullehrerberuf im internationalen Vergleich* [The academic profession in international comparison]. Bonn: Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie.
Enders, J., & Teichler, U. (1997). A victim of their own success? Employment and working conditions of academic staff in comparative perspective. *Higher Education, 34*(3), 347–372.
Enders, J., & Weert, E. de. (Ed.). (2004). *The international attractiveness of the academic workplace in Europe*. Frankfurt a. M.: Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft.

Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). *The American academic profession: a synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Jacob, A. K., & Teichler, U. (2011). *Der Wandel des Hochschullehrerberufs im internationalen Vergleich: Ergebnisse einer Befragung in den Jahren 2007/08* [Change of the academic profession in international comparison: results of the survey of the years 2007–2008]. Bonn: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung.

Karpen, U., & Hanske, P. (1994). *Status und Besoldung von Hochschlullehrern im internationalen Vergleich* [Status and remuneration of professors in an international comparison]. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Knorr-Cetina, K. (1998). Sozialität mit Objekten. Soziale Beziehungen in post-traditionalen Wissensgesellschaften [Sociality with objects. Social relations in post-traditional knowledge-societies]. In W. Rammert (Ed.), *Technik und Sozialtheorie* [Technology and social theory] (pp. 83–120). Frankfurt a. M.: Campus.

Kogan, M., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2007a). *Key challenges to the academic profession* (Werkstattberichte, Vol. 65). Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel (INCHER-Kassel) and UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge.

Kogan, M., & Teichler, U. (2007b). Key challenges of the academic profession and its interface with management: some introductory thoughts. In M. Kogan & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession* (Werkstattberichte, Vol. 65, pp. 9–15,). Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel (INCHER-Kassel) and UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge.

Locke, W., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2007). *The changing conditions for academic work and careers in select countries* (Werkstattberichte, Vol. 66). Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel (INCHER-Kassel).

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

Maassen, P. A. M., & Vught, F. A. van. (Eds.). (1996). *Inside academia: new challenges of the academic profession*. Utrecht: De Tijdstroom.

Perkin, H. (1969). *Key profession: a history of the association of university teachers*. London: Routledge/Palmer.

Perkin, H. (1991). History of universities. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *International higher education: an encyclopedia* (pp. 169–204). New York: Garland.

Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University. (Ed.). (2006). *Reports of changing academic profession project workshop on quality, relevance and governance in the changing academia: international perspectives* (COE Publication Series, Vol. 20). Hiroshima: RIHE.

Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University. (Ed.). (2008). *The changing academic profession in international comparative and quantitative perspectives* (RIHE International Seminar Reports, Vol. 12). Hiroshima: RIHE.

Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University. (Ed.). (2009). *The changing academic profession over 1992–2007: international, comparative and quantitative perspectives* (RIHE International Seminar Reports, Vol. 13). Hiroshima: RIHE.

Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University. (Ed.). (2010). *The changing academic profession in international comparative and quantitative perspectives: a focus on teaching & research activities* (RIHE International Seminar Reports, Vol. 15). Hiroshima: RIHE.

Rüegg, W. (Ed.). (2011). *A history of the university in Europe. Volume IV: universities since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Stehr, N. (1994). *Knowledge societies*. London: Sage.

Teichler, U. (1996). The conditions of the academic profession: an international, comparative analysis of the academic profession in Western Europe, Japan and the USA. In P. A. M. Maassen & F. A. Vught van (Eds.), *Inside academia: new challenges of the academic profession* (pp. 15–65). Utrecht: De Tijdstroom.

Teichler, U. (Ed.). (2006). *The formative years of scholars*. London: Portland.
Trow, M. (1974). *Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education. Policies for higher education* (pp. 51–101). Paris: OECD.
Welch, A. (Ed.). (1997). Special issue on the academic profession. *Higher Education, 34*(3), 323–345.
Welch, A. (2005a). Challenge and change: the academic profession in uncertain times. In A. Welch (Ed.), *The professoriate: profile of a profession* (pp. 1–19). Dordrecht: Springer.
Welch, A. (Ed.). (2005b). *The professoriate: profile of a profession*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Whitelaw, M. J. (1996). The international survey of the academic profession, 1991–1993: methodological notes. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *The international academic profession: portraits of fourteen countries* (pp. 669–678). Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.