



*Comparative Education*  
Vol. 41, No. 4, November 2005, pp. 433–454

 Routledge  
Taylor & Francis Group

## ‘The influence of market force culture on British and German academics

Rosalind Pritchard  
*University of Ulster, UK*

Higher education (HE) in Germany and the United Kingdom is being continually subjected to the discipline of market forces. An empirical study was conducted using questionnaires with academic staff in twelve institutions in each country to discover the extent to which their values and attitudes were converging, and were in keeping with what might be expected within a marketized system. Academics in both countries felt that HE was seriously under-resourced, yet they were not strongly in favour of increased executive power for their leaders; they believed that the good functioning of their higher education institution (HEI) was impeded by excessive state-sponsored interference, but did not agree that their HEIs should act more commercially and entrepreneurially. The British especially were opposed to greater privatization of the system. Attitudes in keeping with a market force philosophy seem to be superficially embedded in the value system of these academics, and though the British were more stressed, more hard-worked and suffered from a status-deficit in comparison with the Germans, there was no statistical difference between the two groups on a *summative* judgement of professional satisfaction. There appears to be an underlying professional ethos that enables the academics to remain positive despite the turbulence that market forces may cause, though this dedication may also make them vulnerable to exploitation.

### Market forces and globalization

The ‘traditional’ ethos of modern-day universities both in the United Kingdom and in Germany was established in the nineteenth century and has been through many changes since then, usually rooted in social, political and economic imperatives. In Germany, the idea of the university was most resonantly articulated by Wilhelm von Humboldt and his colleagues during the foundation of the University of Berlin (Anrich, 1956). It was consciously intended to help restore Prussian self-confidence after that country’s defeat at the hands of Napoleon as a result of which Prussia lost all its territories west of the Elbe. It was founded on principles of idealism, wholeness of view and neo-humanism. It espoused a philosophy of *Bildung* (self-improvement and inner

---

\*School of Education, University of Ulster, Coleraine BT52 1QT, UK. Email: r.pritchard@ulster.ac.uk

ISSN 0305-0068 (print)/ISSN 1360-0486 (online)/05/040433–22

© 2005 Taylor & Francis

DOI: 10.1080/03050060500300980

cultivation through the cultural and educational environment) over and against the vocationalism of the French university ethos championed by Napoleon (Pritchard, 1990, pp. 2–58). In the British Isles too, there was tension between different types of values. Some of Cardinal Newman's Discourses (II–IV) derive from the Utilitarian proposal (1825) for the erection of a non-sectarian, non-residential university for the middle classes, the future London University, arguing that any university that failed to teach theology was not what it claimed to be: the home of all sciences (Svaglic, 1960/1966). Newman (1956), believed that liberal knowledge was a state or condition of mind which was 'of itself a treasure, and a sufficient remuneration of years of labour' (p. 93). The dialectic between the liberal and the utilitarian has been a constant theme in the many structural and epistemological changes which have taken place within higher education, and in recent times the exposure of universities to market force mechanisms has posed a particular challenge to the values and ethos of those who work within them. The present paper will explore the nature of this challenge.

Market forces imply the impact of supply and demand, which, in a free-market economy, determine price and the allocation of resources (Bannock *et al.*, 1972/1992), and can be regarded as an essential feature of globalization. Although some scholars argue that globalization is nothing new (Beck, 2000, p. 11), the technology that powers it is distinctively and qualitatively different from what prevailed prior to development of the Internet and jet-powered aeroplanes. Electronic communication media and international travel have made time and space contract dramatically causing a compression or shrinkage of the world as a whole—so much so that Zygmunt Bauman (1998) speaks of 'the end of geography' rather than 'the end of history'. Neo-liberalism implies deregulation of markets, the loosening or lifting of cross-border controls and the removal of government-imposed restrictions in order to create an open borderless world economy leading to international economic integration (Bauman, 1998, pp. 15–16). 'Stateless' multinational corporations 'are the cutting edge of the market' and 'dominate the global economy, establishing a new division of labour and outsourcing production to where it is cheap' (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, p. 28). In a system strongly characterized by neo-liberalism, institutions are disciplined by competition, and welfare becomes a matter of individual responsibility rather than a social responsibility invested in the state (Heywood, 1998, p. 96). This paradigm is increasingly being transferred to sectors of public life, including schools and universities.

The importance attributed to the state within the theory of globalization is particularly important for a study in comparative higher education. Scholte (2000) believes that the traditional model of the sovereign state as answering to no higher authority is outmoded, and that it will become 'post-sovereign' under globalization. If he is correct, this would imply a convergence in educational structures and cultures, and a move towards greater homogeneity; indeed Slaughter and Leslie (1997, pp. 24, 61) in their study of academic capitalism note that 'system effects' can be so powerful that higher education policies in access, curriculum, research autonomy for faculty and institutions converge, and claim that this convergence is best explained by globalization; they state that the public universities of most westernized countries are moving

towards academic capitalism, 'pushed and pulled by the same global forces at work in the English speaking countries'. In this case, the historical product of a national education system would effectively cease to have a function in the new order. By contrast, scholars such as Beck (2000, pp. 104,108) and Fisher and Rubenson (1998, p. 79) claim that the state is indispensable not just for geopolitical reasons but also to guarantee basic rights, and give political shape to the process of globalization by helping to regulate it transnationally. They believe that a strong state is needed if for no other reason than to shift resources away from welfare and free the market. Neither does Green (1997) support the notion of convergence. He believes that there is a double movement of cultural particularisms and dominant cultures in the west which 'produces an international veneer of cultural homogenisation but ... an infinity of cultural hybrids and mixes' (Green, 1997, p. 163). He argues that globalization hinges on the present and future role of the nation state as a political entity, and '[n]ation states are the very building blocks of international governance' (Green, 1997, p. 165).

The aim of the present paper is to investigate the extent to which such convergence is evident in the attitudes of British and German academics. It is based on the assumption that the implementation of market forces has certain predictable effects within a system, such as a trend towards privatization, quality assurance and executive leadership. To what extent do academics share the same attitudes and values? How far have market values and orientations become embedded in their professional culture and been embraced by them personally? If the convergence theory is correct, then similar attitudes will be expressed in each system; if this is not the case, then it will be necessary to account for why differences have arisen.

It is of course evident that different types of convergence exist and can be applied within or across nations. The relationship between the convergent and the divergent is complex and puzzling, involving as it does, interplay between the global, the national and the local (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002). Inkeles and Sirowy (1983) have undertaken a systematic assessment of whether and how far the educational systems of nations are becoming more alike. They believe that economic development levels may account for movement towards common forms of organization, and that such 'imperatives' drive nations towards similar responses to common problems. Working against convergence are differences in economic development, political systems and historical traditions such as centralized control versus federation. They postulate a typology of convergence and divergence across various realms: administrative-financial, interpersonal-institutional, ideational and legal, structural, curricular, and demographic. Some of these are more suitable for school than for university. For example, the last-mentioned covers enrolment and class repetition rates at school, pupil-teacher ratios and secondary school comprehensiveness. Like many such typologies, the categories overlap to some extent, but they remain useful aids to conceptualization. It is beyond the scope of the present paper to deal with all of these dimensions, and the analysis will concentrate upon the first two realms: administrative-financial and interpersonal. These will be conceptually related to marketization in the main section of the paper where research questions will be formulated in relation to each one.

### Methodology of the study

This is part of a larger project whose aim is to investigate the differential perceptions of staff and students in the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany. Chronologically, the research project was conducted first in Germany where it was sponsored by the Leverhulme Trust, and then replicated in the UK where it was sponsored by the Economic and Social Research Council. Twelve universities were chosen in each country, and were visited by the researcher who interviewed the staff personally, and gave them questionnaires to complete at the beginning of the discussion.<sup>1</sup> In this way, it was possible to select a particular sample of staff and achieve an almost complete response rate. Normally this is especially difficult in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) where response was only 28% in the Carnegie Study of the Academic Profession, and the authors remarked that 'most academic staff are not very supportive of surveys of this kind' (Enders & Teichler, 1996, p. 445). The German higher education institutions (HEIs) were all in the university sector, and the British universities included a number in the Russell Group<sup>2</sup>, together with one university college and one post-1992 institution, geographically spread across all four countries of the United Kingdom. The number of cases was 87 in the UK and 82 in Germany. The work was carried out within the subject discipline of Education, and included both staff engaged in teacher training, as well as those who were engaged in Education-related degrees that did not confer qualified teacher status; hence there was a balanced spread ranging all the way from research professors with international reputations to those who worked much nearer the chalkface. In the terminology of Becher (1989) Education is 'soft applied' and, in interpreting the results, it must be constantly borne in mind that they may not be generalizable to all disciplines.

It would be interesting to explore at some future point in time whether the results would differ if one studied the sub-cultures of, say, Physics, History or Medicine. Becher and Trowler (2001) extrapolate *cultural* characteristics from epistemological characteristics, postulating various disciplinary groupings: Pure Sciences (e.g., Physics): is said to be atomistic, impersonal, value-free; Humanities (e.g., History): holistic, value-laden, concerned with particulars and qualities; Technologies (e.g., Clinical Medicine): purposive and pragmatic, applying heuristic approaches; and Applied Social Sciences (e.g., Education and Law): functional, utilitarian, concerned with professional practice. The last of these four to which Education belongs is said by Becher in his original 1989 book to be 'a means of understanding and coming to terms with human situations' (Becher, 1989, p. 15, and although the boundaries between disciplines are shifting, even poorly demarcated, the notion remains that a disciplinary culture carries with it certain implications for social behaviour and *Weltanschauung* [worldview]).

The wording, layout and design of the questionnaire were established on the basis of pilot studies conducted with colleagues in the UK and in Germany; translations were done by the researcher personally. Most of the questions consisted of statements to which there were five responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Uncertain or

Inapplicable (same category), Disagree and Strongly Disagree. A number of supplementary questions were added to the UK version of the instrument in order to probe some developments particular to that country like access or top-up fees. Occasionally, it was necessary to devise questions that were not exactly the same in their formulation, but attempted to probe the same issue. Thus, for example, at a time when new salary scales were legally planned but not yet fully operational in Germany, the wording of the statement was: 'The new salary scales will lower the status of university teachers', whereas the equivalent in the UK was 'Our salary scales, compared with those of other professions, lower our status'. However, apart from the country-specific questions, the organization, sequencing and presentation of the questionnaire were the same in each country. At the end of the questionnaire, there was an item about professional satisfaction which the respondents were requested to rate on a scale running through Very High, High, Moderate, Not Very High, and Low. There were three open-ended items to establish the academics' main sources of pride, worry and enjoyment, and these were analysed using NUD\*IST. The closed-category statements were analysed using frequencies and percentages. Chi-square tests were applied to test for statistical significance, and a finding of 'no significant difference' between countries was interpreted as evidence of convergence between them. In order to avoid cells with expected counts of less than 5, it was often necessary to collapse cells. In the sections that follow, the categories of Strongly Agree and Agree have been merged for ease of reporting, as have the Disagree and Strongly Disagree categories. Exact percentages are given in tables, and in the prose commentary they are rounded or approximated for ease of communication. The research questions are re-stated before each cluster of research findings, and are preceded by a background statement to contextualize the questions and establish a conceptual link between the idea of market forces and certain features characterizing change within the HE systems (this replaces the more usual, separately 'blocked' review of the literature).

### **The administrative and financial functioning of universities**

#### *State and non-state resources in an academic market*

In a marketizing system, universities need to widen their sources of funding, resulting in what Clark (1998) terms a 'diversified funding base'. In the UK, fees for undergraduate courses were introduced in 2000, and it is now intended to replace them by a graduate tax, whereas in Germany, the Sixth Amendment to the Federal Framework Law for Higher Education explicitly excluded the possibility of charging fees. This law was the object of legal dispute as many HEIs wanted to be allowed to charge fees and has now been over-turned after a judicial review. German higher education (HE) was thus traditionally less fee-oriented than UK HE, and there was deep opposition to fee introduction. Nevertheless, as Shattock (2003) states, 'A research intensive university cannot maintain national, if not [sic] international competitiveness by relying on state funding alone' (p. 46). Diversification of funding

sources means a change in university-state relations. In the United Kingdom, attitudes towards the state have traditionally not been positive. Alcock (1991) claims that the 'English political tradition is to treat government as at best a necessary evil, to be sceptical of it, to keep it at arm's length, to build defences against it' (pp. 45–46), and it is well known that British higher education was not developed as a 'system' under state auspices. Germany, by contrast, has long had a pro-statist tradition, emanating in part from the German pattern of revolution, which from 1802–1812 and 1862–1871 came from above (Eley, 1984, p. 144). There is a commitment to academic freedom in the German Constitution, which in Article 5 (3) of the Basic Law states that '*Kunst und Wissenschaft, Forschung und Lehre sind frei*' [Art and science, research and teaching are free]. Questions in relation to resources and the provider thereof may be posed as follows:

1. How satisfied are the academics with the resourcing of their institutions?
2. Is there a feeling that universities need to rely less on the state, and move towards increasing privatization?

Table 1 shows that despite increasing marketization within their systems, staff in both countries feel overwhelmingly that their institutions lack sufficient resources. The Germans feel conspicuously more strongly than the British that they lack staff. In fact, almost one third of UK correspondents actually disagree that there is a deficit in this respect.

If universities are felt to be poorly resourced, the question then arises as to whether increased resources should come from the state or increased entrepreneurship (which implies a more commercial approach to the functioning of universities). Table 2 shows that a much larger percentage of the Germans feel that they suffer from excessive state intervention and would be somewhat more prepared to move towards entrepreneurialism than their British counterparts. Almost twice as many Germans as British claim that their HEI should become more entrepreneurial, and reject the statement that the privatization of universities fills them with dismay. However, the majority in both countries do *not* want their HEIs to become more entrepreneurial, the British disagreeing with the trend even more intensely than the Germans. This may be because the UK respondents have more experience of what it is like, and also because of the acrimonious relationship that prevailed between academe and government, especially under the Thatcher regime. It is in keeping with the German historical tradition that they uphold the role of the state as one that in the end 'ensures

Table 1. Perception of resource deprivation by UK and German academics

Statement	Country	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	P*
<b>The good functioning of the HEI is impeded by lack of financial resources.</b>	UK	86	8.1	5.8	p = .797
	FRG	88.9	7.4	3.7	
<b>The good functioning of our HEI is impeded by lack of sufficient staff.</b>	UK	57.5	11.5	31.0	p = .000
	FRG	84	9.9	6.2	

\*p indicates the probability level based on chi-square test.

Table 2. UK and FRG academics' perceptions of the state's role in higher education

Statement	Country	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	p
<b>The good functioning of our HEI is impeded by excessive state-sponsored interference.</b>	UK	69.0	12.6	18.4	p = .003
	FRG	88.9	7.4	3.7	
<b>My HEI should act much more commercially and more like an enterprise.</b>	UK	13.8	8.0	78.2	p = .042
	FRG	27.2	12.3	60.5	
<b>The whole concept of privatising universities fills me with dismay.</b>	UK	70.1	11.5	18.4	p = .0080
	FRG	21.8	20.5	57.7	
<b>The role of the state in higher education ensures academic freedom.</b>	UK	19.8	29.1	51.2	p = .002
	FRG	43.6	28.2	28.2	

academic freedom', but it should be noted that the percentage endorsing this statement is less than 50%. The attitudes emerging in these answers are rather negative towards the state, yet unreceptive towards a more entrepreneurial approach that might give a financial basis for decreasing reliance on state funding.

#### *UK-specific questions*

The British were asked some supplementary questions relating to developments within their own system. Perceptions of institutional efficiency were not very positive.<sup>3</sup> Within the HEIs, almost half of them considered that communication from the top down was *not* good; roughly the same proportion thought that their administrative departments (such as finance, human resources etc) did *not* function efficiently—and these included some of the most prestigious universities in the country. Over 90% of them agreed that 'Higher education is being expanded on the cheap', and almost half of them considered that admitting 50% of the age cohort to HE was too high a target. Yet 72% did not agree in principle with top-up fees, so this suggests that they oppose the increasing massification of HE, and would prefer to have fewer students in better-resourced universities; it also leaves a large question mark over the vexed issue of how to increase funding in an under-resourced system. If there is rejection of top-up fees and of a more entrepreneurial approach, then how are improvements to be brought about?

#### *Executive power*

In a fast-changing world, funding may be volatile, and international developments may quickly threaten institutional prosperity. One has only to think of the Oil Crisis, the 1991 recession or the Far Eastern economic crisis over which university authorities had no control. State 'hard money' can quickly become 'soft money', and Clark (2004), believes that 'collegial entrepreneurship' is the only way to achieve quality in

a context of reduced state funding. In the face of external threat, managers need to be able to act swiftly: to quote Clark (1998) again: 'They need to become quicker, more flexible and especially more focused in reaction to expanding and changing demands. ...A strengthened steering core becomes a necessity' (p. 5). This is facilitated by executive leadership: as long ago as 1985, the UK Jarratt Report advocated a move to such leadership style in universities, and the appointment rather than election of Deans; this has been implemented to varying degrees, though somewhat more in post-1992 than in pre-1992 universities (Shattock, 2003, p. 96). Kogan and Hanney (2000, p. 150) point out that the implementation of Jarratt (1985) led to an increase in the power of the university administration at the expense of senior academics and the academically-led committee system. Similar developments have taken place in other countries: e.g., Marginson (2003) claims that in Australia Academic Boards have been largely side-lined in an entrepreneurial environment. Traditionally in Germany, however, most Deans and Pro-Vice-Chancellors have had relatively short periods of tenure with small emoluments to remunerate them for the extra work (in addition to their usual salary); but this too is changing, and the Humboldt University in Berlin has managing Pro-Vice-Chancellors who are paid much more for their labours. Morey (2003, p. 72) points out that enterprise universities are characterized by strong executive control and diminished authority of traditional academic governance structures. It is therefore possible that in both systems, executive action on the part of managers may have implications for Senate, possibly to the extent of downgrading it from an academic parliament to a receptive role of merely taking note of and endorsing changes. Certainly Henkel (2002) claims that 'the senate is no longer the forum in which major academic policies are forged and decided upon, although securing senate approval of policies remains an important part of the Vice-Chancellor's role' (p. 33).

### 3. So what support is there for executive power in the UK and Germany?

The respondents were asked to express their position on various power constellations; questions were formulated about external and internal power, and also in relation to Senate. The results are shown in Table 3 below.

Faced with the statement: 'Our institution needs to stand up to the government more than it does at present', the British felt much more strongly than the Germans that this should be so. About 60% of them, compared with only 40% of the Germans, agreed—the difference being significant at  $p = .008$  ( $X^2(2, N = 164) = 9.740$ ). Then they were asked a question about the role of Senate, traditionally an organ of collegial self-government. Over 60% in the FRG believed that Senate required 'more power vis-à-vis the Ministry', which implied that they still thought it an important body; (it deals *inter alia* with professorial appointments about which the Ministry has the final say). Many of the British respondents (>60%) were simply uncertain whether its power had diminished or not, which may imply that it has a low profile in their lives, or they think that it is powerful in academic matters, but not standing up to external power. Looking inwards to the relationship between middle and senior management and staff, it emerged that although there was a wish to see these people representing

Table 3: Support for executive power and perceptions of Senate's role

Statement	Country	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Chi-square
<b>Our institution needs to stand up to the government more than it does at present.</b>	UK	60.9	19.5	19.5	p = .008
	FRG	41.6	16.9	41.6	
<b>Our Vice-Chancellor/ President needs more power vis-à-vis the academic colleagues.</b>	UK	5.7	20.7	73.7	p = .004
	FRG	23.5	13.6	63	
<b>Our Deans need more power vis-à-vis the academic colleagues.</b>	UK	8.1	22.1	69.8	p = .001
	FRG	32.1	14.8	53.1	
<b>UK Our Senate's power has diminished in recent years.</b>	UK	25.3	60.9	13.8	Not applied
	FRG	64.1	10.3	25.7	
<b>FRG Our Senate needs more power vis-à-vis the Ministry.</b>					

the interests of the institution more vigorously *outside* the institution, there was a distinct distaste for letting them exercise more power *within it*. Thus, the notion 'Our Vice-Chancellor (VC)/President needs more power vis-à-vis academic colleagues' met with disagreement on both sides, being *rejected* by 74% in the UK, and 63% in Germany. Nor did many British agree that their Deans needed more power—only 8% thought so. By contrast, almost one third of the Germans claimed that the Deans (normally elected by fellow academics) did actually need more power over colleagues, and almost one fifth thought that the VC needed such power. It is notable that the respondents would be willing to accord increased power to someone closer to them (e.g., Dean), and drawn from among their own ranks, as opposed to someone who is further removed (e.g., VC). These percentages suggest that there is some modest support for increased executive power in the FRG contrasted with very little support in the UK. It is striking that although a larger percentage of the British than the Germans thought that the government needed 'standing up to', few of them thought that this should involve more power over colleagues within the HEIs. This may reflect a British perception that executive power and line management have gone far enough, whereas the German data on the other hand suggest perceptions of a deficit in executive power.

#### *The evaluation culture*

Aspects of market force philosophy are being applied to the funding and management of universities with influence on all levels. At the core is the notion that they should be given greater budgetary independence, and made to compete for resources. However, the unfettered rule of market forces may imply negatives such as strategic disorganization, social injustice, and falling quality—so 'fettters' are imposed by government. They involve regulating higher education institutions in terms of the quality and access parameters that must be achieved, and place an emphasis upon output rather than input. The United Kingdom has had separate funding streams and quality assurance (QA) arrangements for teaching and research since 1986. The

Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) was undertaken in 1986, 1989, 1992, 1996 and 2001, with the next one due to take place in 2008. The scores serve as the basis for the calculation of recurrent research funding to HEIs, and contribute to a stratification of institutions. At present, the UK Quality Assurance Agency (QAA, founded 1997, but preceded by the Academic Audit Unit (1990)) reviews teaching of general subjects at university. (The reviews do not carry funding implications.) The Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (founded 1992) performs an additional Quality Assurance function for teacher training courses and for schools. The work of the QAA and Ofsted means that some UK Education departments are never free of QA personnel investigating pre-service or in-service courses, which imposes a considerable administrative stress and burden. The most recent QAA inspections cost £250 million, and involved 2,904 review visits, during which the inspectors found only 16 cases (0.5%) where departments were not meeting their own criteria (Baty, 2004). These judgements were not used to cut or add funding, though they did inform prestige judgements and league tables. They are now to be replaced by a 'light-touch' week-long audit every six years. Although the competitive culture is intended to encourage institutions to profile and diversify themselves, the indications are that most HEIs want to excel according to the same mainstream criteria: excellence in research and teaching. So far, few of them have had the courage to proclaim that they are attempting something different—this may be an example of what Henkel (2000) terms 'a drift of epistemic criteria' (p. 259). Henkel (2000) furthermore remarks that the application of teaching quality assessment 'implies a power-coercive model of change' (p. 74), and Kogan and Hanney (2000, p. 188) claim that QA lent more power to central institutional managers and changed the balance of managerial accountability.

Germany has no central evaluation body for quality assurance in teaching, but it does have a series of regional consortia, such as the *Verbund Norddeutscher Universitäten* [Association of North German Universities], which started work in 1994. The ensuing reports are incorporated in institutional target and performance agreements between the subject discipline areas and the university management. The Standing Conference of [*Länder*] Ministers of Education also runs an Accreditation Council (permanently established by an organization statute of 19 September 2002). It has a meta-function in that it accredits agencies which in their turn accredit courses leading to the award of Bachelor's and Master's degrees (see Schwartz & Teichler, 2000). In Germany (in some ways almost the prototype of the research university), research is not evaluated in the same way as in the British RAE, but reports on institutional performance are drawn up by the *Wissenschaftsrat* [Council for Higher Education and Research]. Ability to 'land' funding for a *Sonderforschungsbereich* [Special Research Area] is an important quality indicator. Like the UK, Germany is beginning to give up the pretence that all its universities are equally good, and doing the same job. An indicator of this sea-change is the governmental 'Excellence Initiative' approved by the *Länder* prime ministers on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2005. It will support some major research institutions outside the university sector, and also build up a number of 'top universities' with funding amounting to over 150 Million Euros per year. The move

is unpopular with some universities that suspect they will forfeit funding in favour of the so-called 'elite' HEIs.

4. To what extent are quality assurance regimes willingly accepted in the UK and the FRG?

#### *Acceptance of the evaluation culture*

This cluster of questions (see Table 4) aimed to probe the extent to which quality assessment is becoming embedded in the academic culture. The British are much more willing than the Germans to undergo research assessment: 93% of them strongly agree with the statement 'Personally, I have nothing in principle against the assessment of research', compared with 78% of the Germans.  $X^2 (2, N = 166) = 8.247, p = .016$ . They also accept the accreditation agencies to a much greater extent than the Germans. Almost 60% rejected the proposition that such agencies were *not* needed, compared with less than one third in Germany. In both countries, however, there is a certain cynicism about performance assessment: over two thirds thought that 'The assessment of university teachers' performance is likely to be rather superficial' (UK 72%: FRG 68% agree), and there was no significant difference on this measure. Yet salary levels may be influenced by such appraisals.

#### *Quality assurance in the domain of teaching*

Table 5 reveals some perceptions in relation to evaluation of teaching. The respondents were asked to react to the statement that 'Evaluation of teaching will not necessarily make it any better'. Most people agreed, but there was much stronger rejection of the proposition in the UK (41%) than in Germany (17%) (though obviously it depends upon the way in which the results of this evaluation are *dealt with* at institutional level). The British were massively more convinced than their continental counterparts that 'the students are overall fairly satisfied with the quality of teaching': 86% of them, compared with only one third of the Germans, agreed that this was so, and 28% of the Germans actually *disagreed* that their students were satisfied, so they are obviously very aware of deficiencies. However, individual lecturers pay a price for 'good teaching'. The British, despite their conviction that their teaching is high in

Table 4. Acceptance of the evaluation culture

Statement	Country	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	p
<b>Personally, I have nothing in principle against the assessment of research.</b>	UK	93.0	3.5	3.5	p = .016
	FRG	77.5	8.8	13.8	
<b>We really do not have any need of the accreditation agencies.</b>	UK	24.4	16.3	59.3	p = .005
	FRG	31.1	33.8	35.1	
<b>The career appraisal of university teachers' performance is rather superficial.</b>	UK	72.1	9.3	18.6	p = .530
	FRG	67.5	15.0	17.5	

Table 5. Quality assurance in teaching

Statement	Country	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	p
<b>Evaluation of teaching will not necessarily make it better.</b>	UK	55.8	3.5	40.7	p = .000
	FRG	62.2	20.7	17.1	
<b>The students are overall satisfied with the quality of teaching</b>	UK	86.2	10.3	3.4	p = .000
	FRG	33.8	38.7	27.5	
<b>We are over-burdened by quality assurance procedures.</b>	UK	82.8	2.3	14.9	p = .000
	FRG	16.9	22.1	61	
<b>Increased demand for accountability (e.g., by QAA) results in marking taking up too much time.</b>	UK only	52.9	11.5	35.6	Not applied
<b>Sometimes I think that our students are not being sufficiently challenged intellectually.</b>	UK only	53.5	1.2	45.3	Not applied

quality, feel that the QA regime is excessively onerous: over 80% of them, compared with only 17% in Germany feel that 'We are over-burdened by quality assurance procedures'. In fact, 57% of Germans actually rejected this statement, so it is clear that the evaluation culture has not yet begun to weigh too heavily with them. In a country-specific question, over half the British agreed that 'Increased demands for accountability (e.g., by QAA) results in marking taking up too much time'; and over half the UK respondents believed that their students were not being challenged enough intellectually.

### **Interpersonal-institutional dynamics among academics**

#### *Attitudes towards research, teaching and administration*

It has been pointed out by Vidovich (2004) that quality policy and globalization rose to prominence in educational discourses at roughly the same time, suggesting that the two may be intimately interconnected. Globalization implies deregulation, and QA implies measures to ensure that increased 'freedom' does not lead to decreased standards. Quality assurance regimes impact upon the traditional roles of academics by absorbing resources of time and money, and linking them to personal and institutional reputation. This may sharpen orientations towards either teaching or research, because in a climate of limited resources it is often difficult to excel in both. Given that Germany and the UK are subject to an evaluation culture, it is pertinent to enquire into how the staff in the present survey feel about the time available for research and teaching. The following questions were posed:

5. What are the relative preferences of university teachers in both systems for teaching, research and administration?
6. Is there a cross-system difference between respondents in their perception of workload and stress?

*Teaching, research and administration*

As shown in Table 6, teaching was strongly and willingly accepted in both cultures. There was little support for the statement 'I would like to reduce my teaching load': over two thirds of the sample in each country rejected it, and there was no statistical difference between them on their answers ( $p = .627$ ). Nor did the academics accept the statement 'I resent the amount of teaching I have to do'. This was strongly rejected in both systems by over 90% of respondents, and again there was no significant difference between systems ( $p = .807$ ). When it comes to research, however, the picture looks different. The proposition 'I would like to have more time for research' was endorsed by over three quarters in each country, but much more strongly by the British than by the Germans (UK 92%: FRG 79%). The difference was significant at the .05% level. It is perhaps a matter for surprise, in view of the fact that the German university has always been regarded as the 'research university', that the British seemed more committed to this part of their role than the Germans. Asked to decide whether 'Research is more important to me than teaching' 23% in the UK and just 16% in the FRG agreed that this was indeed so. Perhaps the RAE now predisposes the British to stress research; but 70% of them, compared with just over 50% of the Germans, disagreed or strongly disagreed with this proposition, the differences being significant at  $p = .000$ . It must be re-stated at this point that this survey was carried out in departments of Education, and that the results could have been different for other subject disciplines. Whereas teaching and research were strongly accepted, the same could not be said of administration. Almost 15% more Britons than Germans claimed to resent it, though the differences did not reach statistical significance.

*Workloads and stress*

As Table 7 indicates, the British feel far more strongly than the Germans that they are hard-pressed in their professional lives: 77% agree that they have too much work to do (compared with only 56% in Germany). The British academics feel very much more stressed than the Germans (UK 61%: FRG 46%). This is not surprising, given

Table 6. Attitudes towards core academic tasks

Statement	Country	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	p
<b>I would like to reduce my teaching load.</b>	UK	20.9	9.3	69.8	$p = .627$
	FRG	20.5	14.1	65.4	
<b>I resent the amount of teaching I have to do.</b>	UK	2.4	6.0	91.7	Pp.807
	FRG	2.6	3.8	93.8	
<b>I would like to have more time for research.</b>	UK	91.9	3.5	4.7	$p = .053$
	FRG	78.8	7.5	13.8	
<b>I resent the amount of administration I have to do.</b>	UK	51.2	8.1	40.7	$p = .143$
	FRG	36.3	8.8	55.0	
<b>Research is more important to me than teaching.</b>	UK	23.0	6.9	70.1	$p = .000$
	FRG	16.3	32.5	51.3	

Table 7. Perception of work burden by UK and FRG academics

Statement	Country	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	p
<b>I have far too much work to do.</b>	UK	77	2.3	20.7	p = .000
	FRG	56.3	21.3	22.5	
<b>I feel quite stressed by my work</b>	UK	60.9	31.0	21.2	p = .000
	FRG	45.6	21.5	32.9	
<b>I feel very free in my academic work</b>	UK	67.8	11.5	20.7	p = .166
	FRG	78.5	11.4	10.1	

the fact that there is no upper limit to teaching loads in the UK, whereas in German universities the maximum is about eight hours. The UK percentage of 61% corresponds very closely to that found by a British survey of the RAE (McNay, 1999) in which 64% of active researchers claimed that the RAE had increased their stress levels; 79% spent more time than formerly on administration because the QA processes ate away at research time, and for 70% of them, especially females, research work encroached on their private time. The Association of University Teachers (Kinman & Jones, 2004) has also recently carried out a survey of staff stress in which over half of the respondents reported borderline levels of psychological stress. Being constantly evaluated is stressful, and stress, though a part of life, is all the more likely to be painful if the sufferer is powerless, lacking sufficient control over his or her position (Fisher, 1994). However, in both countries, the academics claimed to feel 'very free' in their academic work, and there was no significant difference between countries in this respect, so it is clear that academic freedom does not necessarily mitigate stress (though a lighter administrative load might).

#### *Perception of professional status*

Macro-systemic factors such as marketization, competition, quality assurance and regulation cannot fail to impact upon the status, the psyche and the central self-perception of academics. It has been noted by Teichler (1998) that life-time employment for staff is lessening, while salary increases are being increasingly based on merit. British academic salaries do not come out well in international comparisons; in 2001–2002, only lecturers in Malaysia earned less than UK lecturers, and academic pay rises lagged behind those of teachers (Maxwell & Murphy, 2003). In fact, a teacher who accepts a job as a university lecturer may take a payment cut of several thousand pounds, with concomitant impact upon pension. German academics too are under pressure regarding their salary: new 'W-scales' replace the former 'C-scales', and apply to all new members of staff. Existing staff have the right to choose whether to stay on their existing scales or move to the new ones. The market context may in fact imply a downward mobility for those working in the field of Education since it is not a directly wealth-generating discipline like technoscience. Slaughter and Leslie (1997) note that salaries in the US, for example, are partially determined by staff's value in the market; and that 'As decisions about professors'

performance of academic work [are] moved into the purview of professional expertise, professors [become] more like all the other informational workers, and less like a community of scholars'. However, academics in Germany have long enjoyed a particular prestige for which there are country-specific reasons: Ringer (1969) has pointed out that during the time when 'Germany' did not really exist as a national unity, knowledge played an integrative role, and even contributed to state formation. Having reached their apotheosis of prestige in the early twentieth century, their star waned. In the United Kingdom, academics were mistrusted by the Thatcherite government, and the move towards market forces was regarded as justifiably punitive towards them. The following questions may be posed:

7. How does the relative status of German and British academics compare?
8. What are their perceptions of professional satisfaction?

Since professorial status in Germany has been almost legendary in the past, it is a matter for surprise that, as shown in Table 8, more British than Germans agree that professors deserve a very high social status (UK 78%: FRG 71%), though the difference failed to reach statistical significance. A larger percentage of British than Germans believe that 'the status of professors has fallen in recent times' (UK 81%: FRG 59%). Almost 90% of Britons believe that their salary scales, compared with those of other professions, lower their status. Although new and less advantageous salary scales are being introduced in Germany, some staff at present in post do not seem to be particularly worried about them: the numbers agreeing and disagreeing with the statement are roughly equal, whilst 23% remain uncertain. Faced with the statement 'We are clearly underpaid for the work we do', over twice as many British (85%) as Germans agreed; and perhaps surprisingly 35% of the Germans even rejected the statement. The massive differences in response here, with the Germans much more satisfied with their pay than British, are hardly surprising since some UK schoolteachers are better paid than lecturers. The percentage of British claiming that they deserve a very high social status may be due to feelings of deficit, and there may also be an undercurrent of resentment due to lack of trust arising from heavy QA implementation.

Table 8. Differential perceptions of status among British and German academics

Statement	Country	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	p
<b>University teachers deserve a very high social status.</b>	UK	78.2	13.8	8	p = .204
	FRG	70.9	24.1	5.1	
<b>The status of university teachers has fallen in recent times</b>	UK	81.4	8.1	10.5	p = .005
	FRG	58.5	14.6	26.8	
<b>UK Our salary scales, compared with those of other professions, lower our status.</b>	UK	89.7	2.3	8	Not applied.
	FRG	39.7	23.1	37.2	
<b>FRG The new salary scales and conditions will lower professorial status.</b>					
<b>We are clearly underpaid for the work that we do.</b>	UK	85.4	7.3	7.3	p = .000
	FRG	40.2	24.4	35.4	

*Satisfaction levels*

Staff in both systems were asked about their levels of professional satisfaction (see Table 9). A chi-square test was performed, merging the categories of Moderate and Not Very High in the UK, so as to equalize the number of cells between systems. Chi-square came out as  $X^2 (2, N = 168) = 3.99$ ,  $p = .136$ , so there was no significant difference in staff satisfaction between systems. There is no gainsaying the fact that in some respects, the British academics in the present study seem to be suffering more than their German counterparts, partly as the result of living in a system where pay is low, stress is high, and much energy is consumed in coping with an onerous quality assurance regime and unsatisfactory administrative workings within the HEIs. In view of the strong perceptions of strain and QA overload in the UK, it is little short of astonishing that satisfaction levels between the UK and Germany were about the same. What is happening here? There appears to be some kind of inviolable essentialism, possibly an internalized ‘ideal type’ of a university, which sustains core values in spite of adversity. This finding chimes with that of some other scholars: Bargh *et al.* (2000) imply that there is a private life in institutions that is largely impervious to the managerial power of the Vice-Chancellor; and Henkel (2000) discerns ‘a strong continuity of values’ (p. 249) in how academics deal with new challenges: in her work, the academics held on to their values and the control of their research, but in a hostile culture that challenged their sense of self-esteem. Kogan and Hanney (2000, pp. 33, 116) go so far as to point out that a normative mode of HE may become a source of resistance to government policies, and that essentialism is in contention with overriding economic and social policy. Of course, the alternative possibility also exists that if staff are willing to work for love of the job, it makes them more vulnerable to exploitation by state forces out for ‘efficiency gains’.

**Accounting for cross-country differences**

The initial hypothesis of *convergence* due to the impact of market forces can only be partially sustained, as there are obviously many differences between the two groups: in the questionnaire items where chi-square was applied, 19 out of 27 were significant, thereby showing incomplete convergence. The German academics demonstrate

Table 9. Overall satisfaction ratings

Question: How would you rate the extent of your professional job satisfaction?	UK	FRG
Very high	32	30.5
High	49.3	57.3
Moderate	16	11
Not very high	2.7	
Frankly low		

$X^2 (2, N = 168) = 3.99$   $p = .136$

less negativity about their work, whereas the British are more pressured and stressed. Much of this UK pressure emanates from over-zealous exercise of centrist government power, excessively onerous quality assurance regimes, overwork, underpayment and perceived lack of recognition for what is being achieved (e.g., high levels of student satisfaction with teaching). Most of these features have their origins in political developments.

Especially under Prime Minister Thatcher, there was an acrimonious relationship between academe and government, accompanied by increasing use of centrist power. Hugo Young's biography of Mrs Thatcher (Young, 1989) states that during her premiership:

Assaults on the very home of intellectual life ensured a state of something like continuing war, which transcended any auguries that might have foretold a certain mutual trust and toleration. ... In 1981, universities were given a month to plan an 18 per cent cut in budgets over three years, and 3,000 posts were eliminated. (p. 414)

Policy then and since has been implemented centrally and vigorously, and the preoccupation with economy, efficiency, value for money, performance measurement, quasi-markets and managerialism continues. Though neo-liberalism claims to roll back the frontiers of the state, UK central government has massively increased its strategic control in education through target-setting, quality control and performance-based funding (Green, 1997, p. 168; Pritchard, 1998).

The point is worth making that 'the market' and 'marketization' actually mean rather different things in each HE ecology. As Goedgebuure *et al.* (1993) proclaim: "'the" market does not exist with respect to higher education, neither as a pure form of coordination, nor as a unitary phenomenon' (p. 5). This is because the political culture—and therefore the relationship between universities and the state—is different in the UK and in Germany. Neave (2001) postulates three stereotypic systems as ideal types of university: Continental European, British and American. Germany of course belongs to the first, the UK to the second and both are currently being influenced by the eponymous third. The 'state control' European model was realized in the long process that incorporated the universities into the territorial service of the state; indeed the *Kanzler* (head of administration in German universities) 'incarnated the direct presence of central administration within the university, the very personification of public accountability' (Neave, 2001, pp. 18, 29). For the FRG, globalization poses the return of a superordinate ideology, and elements of control that had formerly belonged to the state are being returned to the university (Neave, 2001, p. 49). This is reflected in trends towards de-juridification of higher education, and the lightening of framework statutory requirements. In a very real sense, therefore, marketization involves 'getting out from under the state' in Germany, and making the institutions more autonomous. In the English model, however, the reform of public administration and of universities was kept in two separate spheres, and the status of the university as a self-governing, property-owning corporation—in short the time-honoured medieval notion of the university community—remained intact (Neave, 2001, p. 28). The state was facilitatory rather than interventionist, and a bulwark

against the temptation to set down a plethora of regulations (Neave, 2001, p. 40). Now, however, the paradox of marketization is that in order to promote the 'freedom' that is supposed to accompany the exercise of market forces, it has been necessary to appoint vigorous UK quangos that wield quasi-state power in an untraditional fashion. Marketization is experienced in Germany as *Entstaatlichung* [de-étatisation<sup>4</sup>] resulting in a decrease of state-regulation whereas in the UK it is experienced as akin to privatization—but accompanied by an increase of regulation ostensibly in order to control quality and promote the process of globalization. Beck (2000) is right: the influence of the state does seem indispensable in order to promote the process of globalization.

Whereas the UK government has moved sharply from consensus towards conviction politics, the German government has been slower to abandon the social democratic market model which was established in the post-Second World War period under Ludwig Erhard, and which aimed to 'combine prosperity with entrepreneurial opportunity' in a system that 'could not be exploited by centrist political forces' (Lewis, 2001, p. 119). A system of checks and balances exists, based upon federalism, and the rule of law enshrines a commitment to freedom in the Constitution (Basic Law): Article 5 (3) explicitly protects academic freedom and teaching. The country's economic recovery reinforced its reputation as 'a model economy in which private enterprise, the state and labour co-operate to maintain prosperity and social balance' (Lewis, 2001, p. 121). In academe the German response to the market force 'imperative' has been slower than the British, less acrimonious and less centrist in implementation. Whereas Germany maintained a broad continuity, the UK under Thatcherism actually experienced a *break* with post-second world war consensus making it more prone to full-blown neo-liberalism. Why was there a break in one country but not in the other? A discussion of 'regulation theory' may suggest some causes.

#### *Regulation theory as a way of accounting for cross-country differences*

Globalization is basically a capitalist concept, just as market forces are an economic concept. Regulation theory, though also economically-based, moves away from the idea of economic superstructure as sole determinant of culture, and attends to the social nature of capitalist society. It requires the establishment of a relatively stable relationship between the mode of accumulation (systems of economic growth and distribution) and the mode of social regulation (MSR) that includes habits and customs, social norms, enforceable laws, state forms—and history (Peck & Tickell, 1992, pp. 152, 154). In fact, Green (1997, pp. 156–157) remarks that globalization theory requires a historical perspective both in evidence and arguments to allow us to assess its claims properly. Regulation theory permits this. The nature of the state and of government power are vital elements in modes of regulation.

Jessop (2001, p. 121), in a comparative analysis of regulation theory in Great Britain and Germany, points out that Britain, having survived the second world war undefeated, retained its institutions virtually unchanged whereas Germany was given

new systems of industrial relations, unions, political parties, education and governance. These often worked to its advantage. Corporatist arrangements linked business, the state and the unions, which were integrated into crisis management, in an attempt to block a movement from economic to political crisis. Moreover, the unions and employers were protected from state interference through the principle of *Tarifautonomie* [autonomy in bargaining] (Jessop, 2001, pp. 122–124). West Germans followed an export-oriented Fordism, based on a social market economy incorporating co-determination and worker participation, whereas the British attempted to overcome the inadequacies of domestic production by importing mass consumer durables without compensating by mass export of capital goods. The stability and longevity of the German model provided the basis for resistance to a purely neo-liberal strategy and made a break along neo-liberal lines unlikely. There was no ‘Kohlism’ to equate to Thatcherism, thus no disruption of German regulation and continuity. By contrast, the Thatcherite ‘revolution’, faced with a long-term structural decline and the need to respond to the crisis of the 1970s, broke with the post-second world war settlement and socialism to create a popular capitalist basis for a neo-liberal accumulation strategy (Jessop, 2001, p. 134). There was a vacuum into which authoritarian politics could enter and be exploited by a dominant leader. This was manifested in all domains of public life, including education, which became more centralized through a national curriculum and quality assurance measures (Jessop, 2001, p. 129).

Such macro-societal features as these may help to explain the differential impact of the market on British and German academics. Globalization is not unidirectional or top-down only. It operates by reciprocal interaction between international, national and local agencies; the quality of this interaction is different in each country, partly for historical reasons and partly due to different patterns of ‘regulation’. In Germany, the Federal State sets the broad parameters within which HE operates, but it is the *Länder* [federal states] that exercise the more powerful direct effect upon HE, often checkmating the federal government. As Walsh (2004, p. 361) states: ‘The German political system reveals many veto points, some of them associated with federalism’. In the UK, notwithstanding increasing devolution (Court, 2004), there is no equivalent to the *Länder* which might serve to mitigate the influence of a centrist state, with the result that British universities have seen ‘an increase in direct state intervention’ (Henkel, 2002, p. 30) of a type that would scarcely be possible in Germany. This power is exercised especially through the demands of quality assurance—for example in the teaching audit and the RAE—which is claimed to have ‘overshadowed more traditional notions of “excellence” as judged within the academy by peers and has resulted in greater external controls over universities’ (Vidovich, 2004, p. 342). Clark (2004, p. 181) castigates the British approach for its ‘dirigiste tendency’ and the ‘bitter adversarial relationship’ that it has created between government and universities, in which ‘the HEIs seek to “game” the assessment to get high scores, and funding bodies reciprocate by announcing belatedly that they will not pay for all that grade inflation and change the rules after the game is played’. He asserts that state-established blockages involve efforts to steer all universities by enforced performance



452 R. M. O. Pritchard

budgeting in which 'no good deed goes unpunished', and incentives turn into punishments for three out of four institutions (p. 173).

It has been stated by Vaira (2004:487) that neoliberalism is not only a political rhetoric, or ideology, but a wide project to change the institutional structure of societies at a global level. It would, however, be an error to view the market as deterministic or teleological. In fact Prange (2003), in a review of Science and Technology policies in Germany, argues persuasively that European and national factors come *first*, and globalization second, and that it is *domestic* institutions that determine the depth and direction of national policy in relation to globalization; and Vaira too believes that the way organizations translate the institutional patterns gives rise to unique combinations. The nation state therefore remains important in communicating imperatives to staff and students within the HEIs under its jurisdiction, and has a very direct, immediate influence upon them. Although policy *directionality* may be shared to some extent between European nations, countries hybridise policy in their own ways, thereby ensuring that the nation is still of central importance in theorizing the global market.

### Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the Leverhulme Trust and the Economic and Social Research Council (grant number RES-000-22-0313) for the financial resources to carry out this research. I would also like to thank my colleagues, Mike Shattock, Maurice Kogan, Mary Henkel and Joe McCormack, for commenting helpfully on earlier drafts of this paper.

### Notes

1. For reasons of space, this paper will concentrate upon reporting the questionnaire rather than the interview data.
2. The Russell Group is an association of 19 major research universities of the UK. The group was formed in 1994 at a meeting convened in the Hotel Russell, London.
3. These results are non-tabulated.
4. 'De-étatization' refers to a decreasing reliance on state power, regulation, funding and steering in HE.

### Notes on contributor

Rosalind Pritchard is Professor of Education at the University of Ulster where she runs a Master's course in the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages and manages research within the School of Education.

### References

- Alcock, A. (1991) On Britain, England—and Europe, *Yearbook of European Studies*, 4, 41–66.  
Anrich, E. (Ed.) (1956) *Die Idee der deutschen Universität* [The idea of the German university] (Darmstadt, Hermann Gentner).

- Bannock, G., Baxter, R.E. & Davis, E. (1972/1992) *The Penguin dictionary of economics* (London, Penguin).
- Bargh, C., Boccock, J., Scott, P. & Smith, D. (2000) *University leadership: the role of the chief executive* (Buckingham, Open University Press).
- Basic Law [Grundgesetz]* (1998) (Bonn, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung).
- Baty, P. (2004, February 20) Flaws in marking revealed by QAA & Was it all worth it? *The Times Higher Educational Supplement*, p. 9.
- Bauman, Z. (1998) *Globalization: the human consequences* (Cambridge, Polity/Blackwell).
- Becher, A. (1989) *Academic tribes and territories: intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines* (Milton Keynes, Open University Press).
- Becher, A. & Trowler, P. (2001) *Academic tribes and territories* (Buckingham, Open University Press).
- Beck, U. (2000) *What is globalization?* (Cambridge, Polity/Blackwell).
- Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) (2004) *Wettbewerb um Spitzenuniversität startet in diesem Sommer [Competition for top universities begins this summer]* (Bonn, BMBF).
- Clark, B. (1998) *Creating entrepreneurial universities: organizational pathways of transformation* (Oxford, Pergamon).
- Court, S. (2004) Government getting closer: higher education and devolution in the UK, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 58(2/3), 151–175.
- Eley, G. (1984) The British model and the German road: rethinking the course of German history before 1914, in: D. Blackbourn & G. Eley (Eds) *The peculiarities of German history* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), 39–155.
- Enders, J. & Teichler, U. (1996) Germany, in: P. Altbach (Ed.) *The international academic profession* (Princeton, NJ, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), 439–492.
- Fisher, D. & Rubenson, K. (1998) The changing political economy: the private and public lives of Canadian universities, in: J. Currie & J. Newson (Eds) *Universities and globalization: critical perspectives* (London, Sage), 77–98.
- Fisher, S. (1994) *Stress in academic life: the mental assembly line* (Buckingham, Open University Press).
- Goedegebuure, J., Kaiser, F., Maassen, P. & de Weert, E. (1994) Introduction, in: L. Goedegebuure, F. Kaiser, P. Maassen, L. Meek, F. van Vucht & E. de Weert (Eds) *Higher education policy: an international comparative perspective* (Oxford, Pergamon), 1–12.
- Green, A. (1997) *Education, globalization and the nation state* (New York, St. Martin's Press).
- Henkel, M. (2000) *Academic identities and policy change in higher education* (London, Jessica Kingsley).
- Henkel, M. (2002) Emerging concepts of academic leadership and their implications for intra-institutional roles and relationships in higher education, *European Journal of Education*, 37(1), 29–41.
- Heywood, A. (1998) *Political ideologies: an introduction* (Basingstoke, Palgrave).
- Inkeles, A. & Sirowy, L. (1983) Convergent and divergent trends in national education systems, *Social Forces*, 62, 304–333.
- Jarratt Report (1985) *Report of the steering committee for efficiency studies in universities* (London, Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals).
- Jessop, B. (2001) Conservative regimes and the transition to post-Fordism: the cases of Great Britain and West Germany, in: B. Jessop (Ed.) *Regulation theory and the crisis of capitalism: four country studies* (Cheltenham, Elgar), 113–151.
- Kinman, G. & Jones, F. (2004) *Working to the limit: stress and work-life balance in academic and academic-related employees in the UK* (London, Association of University Teachers).
- Kogan, M. & Hanney, S. (2000) *Reforming higher education* (London, Jessica Kingsley).
- Lewis, D. (2001) *Contemporary Germany: a handbook* (London, Arnold).
- Marginson, S. (2003) Higher education reform in Australia—an evaluation, in: H. Eggins (Ed.) *Globalization and reform in higher education* (Maidenhead, Open University Press), 133–163.

## 454 R. M. O. Pritchard

- Marginson, S. & Rhoades, G. (2003) Beyond national states, markets and systems of higher education: a glonacal agency heuristic, *Higher Education*, 43, 281–309.
- Maxwell, J. & Murphy, D. (2003) *Academic staff salaries and benefits in seven Commonwealth countries 2001–2002* (London, Association of University Teachers).
- McNay, I. (1999) The paradox of research assessment and funding, in: M. Henkel & B. Little (Eds) *Changing relationships between higher education and the state* (London, Jessica Kingsley), 191–203.
- Morey, A. (2003) Major trends impacting faculty roles and rewards: an international perspective, in: H. Eggins (Ed.) *Globalization and reform in higher education* (Maidenhead, Open University Press), 68–84.
- Neave, G. (2001). The European dimension in higher education: an excursion into the modern use of historical analogues, in: J. Huisman, P. Maassen & G. Neave (Eds) *Higher education and the nation state: the international dimension of higher education* (Oxford, Elsevier), 1–74.
- Newman, J. H. (1956) *The idea of a university* (J. M. Dent, Ed.) (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- Peck, J. A. & Tickell, A. (1992) Local modes of social regulation? Regulation theory, Thatcherism and uneven development, *Geoforum*, 23(3), 347–363.
- Prange, H. (2003) Rethinking the impact of globalization on the nation-state: the case of science and technology policies in Germany, *German Politics*, 12(1), 23–42.
- Pritchard, R. M. O. (1990) *The end of elitism? The democratisation of the West German university system* (Oxford, Berg).
- Pritchard, R. M. O. (1998) Academic freedom and autonomy in the United Kingdom and Germany, *Minerva*, 36, 101–124.
- Ringer, F. K. (1969) *The decline of the mandarins: the German academic community 1890–1933* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).
- Scholte, G. (2000) *Globalization: a critical introduction* (Basingstoke, Palgrave).
- Schwartz, S. & Teichler, U. (Eds) (2000) *Credits an deutschen Hochschulen: kleine Einheiten—große Wirkungen* [Credit points in German HEIs: small units, large effects] (Neuwied, Luchterhand).
- Shattock, M. (2003) *Managing successful universities* (Maidenhead, Open University Press).
- Sixth amendment to the Federal Framework Law* [Hochschulrahmengesetz] (2002) (Berlin, Bundestag).
- Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. L. (1997) *Academic capitalism: politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university* (Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Svaglic, M. J. (Ed.) (1960/1966) *The idea of a university* (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston) (an edition of J. H. Newman's work).
- Teichler, U. (1998) Massification: a challenge for institutions of higher education, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 4, 5–23.
- Vaira, M. (2004) Globalization and higher education organizational change: a framework for analysis, *Higher Education*, 48, 483–510.
- Vidovich, L. (2004) Global-national-local dynamics in policy processes: a case of 'quality' policy in higher education, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25, 341–354.
- Walsh, H. (2004) Higher education reform in Germany: reform in incremental steps, *European Journal of Education* 39, 359–376.
- Young, H. (1989) *One of us: a biography of Margaret Thatcher* (London, Macmillan).

## Author Query Sheet

<i>Manuscript Information</i>	
Journal Acronym	cCED
Volume and issue	41/4
Author name	PRITCHARD
Manuscript No. (if applicable)	4

**AUTHOR:** The following queries have arisen during the editing of your manuscript. Please answer the queries by marking necessary corrections **at the appropriate positions on the PROOFS. Do not answer the queries on the query sheet itself.**

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
	<b>NO QUERIES</b>



## PROOF CORRECTION MARKS

Instruction	Mark in text	Mark in margin
Leave unchanged	<u>text</u>	( <i>stet</i> )
Extraneous marks or damaged letter	encircle	x
Delete	/ or  —	∩
Insert or replace text	λ	/text to be added
Add (λ) or substitute (/): full stop	λ /	⊙
decimal point	λ /	⊙
comma	λ /	∩
semi-colon	λ /	∩
colon	λ /	⊙
apostrophe or quotation mark	λ /	∩ ∩
superscript	λ /	2
subscript	λ /	2
hyphen	λ /	/-
short or long rule	λ /	/ <sup>en</sup> / or / <sup>em</sup> /
oblique	λ /	⊙
Wrong typeface or size	encircle	wf
Change to: roman (upright)	encircle	(rom)
italic	<u>underline</u>	(ital)
capital letters	<u>underline three times</u>	(caps)
small capitals	<u>underline twice</u>	(s.c)
bold type	<u>wavy underline</u>	(bold)
lower case letters	encircle	(l.c)
Greek letters	encircle	(gk) adding Greek letter
Delete and close up	copy	∩
Reduce space	in / copy	less #
Close up space	in copy	∩
Insert space	in copy	#
Make space in line equal	λ	eq #
Insert space between lines	) ————— (	
Reduce space between lines	( ————— )	
New paragraph	[	(para)
Run on, no new paragraph	2	(run on)
Transpose letters or words	∩	∩
Transpose lines	=====	
Take character to next line	∩	(take over)
Take character to previous line	∩	(take back)
Raise text on page	⌌	(raise)
Lower text on page	⌌	(lower)
Check vertical alignment		
Check horizontal alignment	=====	=====



**AN AGREEMENT FOR THE TRANSFER OF COPYRIGHT**

**IN RELATION TO THE CONTRIBUTION OF YOUR ARTICLE ('THE ARTICLE') ENTITLED:**

.....  
**By:**.....

**WHICH WILL BE PUBLISHED IN C-CED ('THE JOURNAL')**

.....

In order to ensure both the widest dissemination and protection of material published in our Journal, we ask authors to assign the rights of copyright in the articles they contribute. This enables Taylor & Francis Group Ltd ('us' or 'we') to ensure protection against infringement. In consideration of the publication of your Article, you agree to the following:

1. You assign to us with full title guarantee all rights of copyright and related rights in your Article. So that there is no doubt, this assignment includes the assignment of the right to publish the Article in all forms, including electronic and digital forms, for the full legal term of the copyright and any extension or renewals. Electronic form shall include, but not be limited to, microfiche, CD-ROM and in a form accessible via on-line electronic networks. You shall retain the right to use the substance of the above work in future works, including lectures, press releases and reviews, provided that you acknowledge its prior publication in the journal.
2. We shall prepare and publish your Article in the Journal. We reserve the right to make such editorial changes as may be necessary to make the Article suitable for publication, or as we reasonably consider necessary to avoid infringing third party rights or law; and we reserve the right not to proceed with publication for whatever reason.
3. You hereby assert your moral rights to be identified as the author of the Article according to the UK Copyright Designs & Patents Act 1988.
4. You warrant that you have at your expense secured the necessary written permission from the appropriate copyright owner or authorities for the reproduction in the Article and the Journal of any text, illustration, or other material. You warrant that, apart from any such third party copyright material included in the Article, the Article is your original work, and does not infringe the intellectual property rights of any other person or entity and cannot be construed as plagiarising any other published work. You further warrant that the Article has not been previously assigned or licensed by you to any third party and you will undertake that it will not be published elsewhere without our written consent.
5. In addition you warrant that the Article contains no statement that is abusive, defamatory, libelous, obscene, fraudulent, nor in any way infringes the rights of others, nor is in any other way unlawful or in violation of applicable laws.
6. You warrant that wherever possible and appropriate, any patient, client or participant in any research or clinical experiment or study who is mentioned in the Article has given consent to the inclusion of material pertaining to themselves, and that they acknowledge that they cannot be identified via the Article and that you will not identify them in any way.
7. You warrant that you shall include in the text of the Article appropriate warnings concerning any particular hazards that may be involved in carrying out experiments or procedures described in the Article or involved in instructions, materials, or formulae in the Article, and shall mention explicitly relevant safety precautions, and give, if an accepted code of practice is relevant, a reference to the relevant standard or code.
8. You shall keep us and our affiliates indemnified in full against all loss, damages, injury, costs and expenses (including legal and other professional fees and expenses) awarded against or incurred or paid by us as a result of your breach of the warranties given in this agreement.

9. You undertake that you will include in the text of the Article an appropriate statement should you have a financial interest or benefit arising from the direct applications of your research.
10. If the Article was prepared jointly with other authors, you warrant that you have been authorised by all co-authors to sign this Agreement on their behalf, and to agree on their behalf the order of names in the publication of the Article. You shall notify us in writing of the names of any such co-owners.
11. This agreement (and any dispute, proceeding, claim or controversy in relation to it) is subject to English law and the jurisdiction of the Courts of England and Wales. It may only be amended by a document signed by both of us.

Signed

---

Print name

---

Date

---