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ABSTRACT

The Bologna Process and German higher education reforms over the past decade have created significant waves of change at German universities. This case study focuses on the enduring impact of both the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms on how professors experience their work and define their roles during the winter term 2011-12 at the University of Potsdam. Through an in-depth analysis of 25 professors' interviews, this study provides a detailed account of structural changes, transformations in both teaching and learning, and the increased role that competition plays in academic prestige, W classification, and research funding with an emphasis on both the natural scientist and social scientist experience. The purpose of this study is to provide greater insight to institutional leaders as well as policy makers into the ways in which the intended reforms have equated to reality for professorial work and role definition.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The German higher education system has been transformed over the past 12 years as a result of two major efforts: the Bologna Agreement (1999) and German-specific higher education reforms. The Bologna Process stemming from the Bologna Agreement was an initiative of the European Commission initiated and signed on by a group of European Ministers of Education. It sought to improve transferability of degrees for students across Europe and beyond, support the goals of a united European Higher Education Area (EHEA), restructure all European degrees to the Bachelor's / Master's / PhD model, and address social issues like gender inequality and an increasingly diverse society (Bologna Agreement, 1999; Pritchard, 2010; Witte, van der Wende, & Huisman, 2007). With Germany as an original signatory of the Bologna Agreement and an invested member of the process, the impact on Germany can be seen from the policy's inception.

The German higher education reforms outside of the Bologna Process are often linked with Bologna but remain significant in their own right. Over the past 12 years, Germany shifted to the new degree system and created a German qualification framework, sought to improve internationalization of higher education, introduced tuition fees in some states\(^1\), increased competition in professorial work, increased competition between institutions, expanded the professorial hierarchy, and shifted governance responsibilities (Enders, Kehm, & Schimank, 2002; Hoell, Lentsch, and Litta, 2009; Witte et al., 2007).

Undoubtedly so many changes coming from the European and German levels have impacted the way institutions of higher education operate and how groups within

\(^1\) Not all states in Germany have chosen to introduce tuition fees. The university for this study does not have tuition fees, for example. But the introduction of tuition fees in other German states was an enormous change.
institutions experience their work. This study illustrates the impact of the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms on professorial work and role definition at one university in one state\(^2\): The University of Potsdam\(^3\) in the state of Brandenburg. Brandenburg has the lowest allocation of funding to higher education of any state in Germany. As a unique setting both financially as well as historically (former East Germany), this study sought to provide a clear picture of how the macro (European) and mezzo (German) level reforms impact the micro (Uni Potsdam) level. Doing so will provide greater insight to institutional leaders as well as policy makers into the ways in which the intended reforms have equated to reality for professorial work and role definition.

The Bologna Process directly applies to higher education across the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) while German higher education reforms are designated only in the German national context. Higher education as a social structure plays a significant role in the advancement of society, innovative research, and social change. In addition, higher education institution’s participation in reforms is essential to meeting the goals of a harmonized EHEA. Professors support efforts at every level through their high research productivity and innovation as the creators of new knowledge and the teachers of generations. As a group, professors are “an institution’s intellectual capital” and its “primary and only appreciable asset” (Gappa & Austin, 2010, pp. 4-5). Therefore, amidst

\(^2\) Germany has 16 Länder or states.

\(^3\) University of Potsdam is also known as Uni Potsdam. This nomenclature is most used by the faculty, staff, and students with “Uni” German abbreviation for Universität. Uni Potsdam will therefore be used to identify the university throughout the dissertation.
the many changes, professors have become a primary group of interest to support both German and European policy reforms.

**German System Shifts**

Over the last 50 years in Germany, the massification of higher education in Germany undoubtedly has created some new challenges to professorial work and the university structure as a whole. With increased enrollments but no increase in the number of professors or proportionately the funding, professors are teaching larger classes and advising a larger number of students (Enders et al., 2002). In addition, professors as a group have undergone dramatic shifts to their work with the combination of constant reforms and an increased incentive to produce high quality research to meet the needs of their own prestigious academic trajectory. At times the multitude of demands on professorial work has meant miscommunication among faculty, slow progress towards shifting fully to the degree cycle within institutions, and resistance to change. Professors have found the logistical and organizational dimensions of German higher education increasingly complex.

The Bologna Process and German reforms occurred simultaneously with the shift from a bureaucratic higher education system to a market-driven system in Germany (Pritchard, 2006a). As a result, it has meant increased competition throughout the German higher education system between institutions with new attention to a ranking system but also within professorial work in terms of the paths to attaining the competitive academic prestige in the academy. Over the last century, competition between institutions was not a cultural norm. Instead, Mayer and Ziegele (2009) posit that the most recent
shift to greater competition across Europe occurred in the 1980s with Reagan and Thatcher; at first, however the competition was rejected in Germany. "The idea of institutions outperforming each other was seen as alien and dysfunctional among the majority of German intellectuals" (Mayer & Ziegele, 2009, p. 55). In terms of professorial work, while some form of competition has always been present, professors' competition for research funding and their own academic prestige have recently intensified as a result of the German higher education reforms. This paradigm shift for German professors has meant additional pressure on their work and the need for changing priorities.

The Academic Hierarchy

Arguably the professorial system prior to these major reform efforts was in need of some change due to its long path to appointment and its insecurity for young scholars (Cavalli & Teichler, 2010; Enders, 2001). The traditional career path within the professorial hierarchy requires that a scholar must complete a PhD in addition to a Habilitation, a second book length dissertation, in order to be eligible to apply for a professorship (Adams, 2002; Böhmer & von Ins, 2009). Therefore, the career path often stretches over a long and involved road. The ultimate goal of being a professor who is a civil servant for life promises absolute job security and autonomy (Enders et al., 2002). Those without this elite designation, namely junior academics, find their career path quite insecure in comparison (Böhmer & von Ins, 2009; Enders, 2001; Hahn, 1977). Upon successful completion of the Habilitation, academics are granted venia legendi, the "permission to teach" and then and only then is one given consent to apply for a
professorship (Böhmer & von Ins, 2009). Reforms today, however, have changed the early options in the professorial hierarchy profoundly to include a junior professorship. A Junior Professor (JP) is an academic at the post-doctoral level (after completing their PhD) who is appointed to teach and conduct research in a university setting without a Habilitation. They are, however, situated on a path to qualify towards Professor. The Habilitation requirement for the appointment to Professor(in) remains but now JPs have three options for how they obtain their Habilitation: (a) monographic, (b) cumulative, or (c) the Habilitation equivalent awarded after a successful third year review in the JP. These reforms to the professorial career path have created hierarchical, structural, and philosophical changes. This study analyzes the ways in which these changes have impacted professorial work and role definition at one German university.

**Professorial Roles**

A professor is a very elite status in Germany and it is considered one of the top five most important professions in society. When participants were asked what it means to be a professor in Germany today, they answered around three main themes: it is a privilege, a responsibility, and the best job in the world. It is a privilege enjoyed after a long, difficult path to the professorate; a responsibility in which they must manage the trust and funds of the state; and the best job in the world as the opportunity to work with talented students, enjoy constitutionally granted academic freedom, and engage in the scientific questions that most interest them. The unique status of a German professor informs how they define their professional roles.

---

4 The suffix -in is added in German to indicate a female Professor
Traditional professors' roles within a German university involve research, teaching, and some service. The Bologna Process and German higher education reforms, according to the literature, have directly impacted German professorial work namely in the areas of research and teaching and in some ways service with the increased administrative demands. For research, Germany has increased incentives for competition in professorial work (e.g., the Excellence Initiative, research funding, personal and institutional prestige). For teaching, professors are meeting the needs of a growing population while also dealing with the bureaucratic hurdles of these policy initiatives (instituting reforms, large class sizes, increased emphasis on teaching quality). Now Germany has refocused teaching as a greater priority in higher education and associated merit pay to its quality (European Quality Assurance Standards, 2005; Fallon, 2008; Hoell et al., 2009; Mayer & Ziegele, 2009). For service, professors have played an important role on committees and commissions discussing reform efforts and supporting university leadership (to varying degrees) in implementing changes. Amid recent changes, professors have a heightened need for service to students through advising and support in navigating the reforms. With the increased demands of the institutional change on top of the intense demands to revamp the curriculum, the overall demands on professors have increased tremendously. This study demonstrates how the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms altered the way that professors experience their many roles within their professorial work.
Problem Statement

Bologna changed the degree structure across Europe, improved mobility between countries, amplified internationalization, and created a shared European meaning of higher education while German higher education reforms sought to create new opportunities for young academics and continue to build Germany’s competitive edge in the global knowledge economy (Böhmer & von Ins, 2009; Bologna Process, 2010). Together these policies overtly placed higher education at the center of reforms. Professors in Germany unmistakably play a prestigious and essential role to the successful operation and competitiveness of their own institutions but also as the individuals who create a large portion of the research that contributes to a dynamic knowledge economy (Baker & Lenhardt, 2008; Charlier, 2008; Enders et al., 2002). As such, they play a crucial role in higher education and the way that they experience their roles and their work matters. Therefore, this study is significant as a case study portrayal of the impact of these macro-level (Europe) and mezzo level (German) reforms of a micro-level (professors at one university).

For professors in a university, role requirements have accelerated across Germany in terms of teaching, research, and service, but also in terms of the dynamics of enrollment and new degree structures. How do these reforms alter the daily lives of professors? In what way have they changed the ways that professors experience their work and define their roles? Each constituent group and national situation provides a richer context to inform policymakers’ future action; this study is no exception.
Therefore, the problem of this study is to analyze the enduring impact of the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms on the ways that professors legally and personally define their professional roles and experience their work at one German institution. In order to address this research problem, professors from two disciplines from both early stages of their career and later stages were interviewed to bring light onto the impact of change across the spectrum of time and context. The two different disciplinary areas included *Wirtschaft- und Sozialwissenschaft* (economics and social scientists abbreviated as WiSo) and *Naturwissenschaft* (natural scientists abbreviated as NatSci). The purpose of this division is to analyze the professorial experience in the context of two research-intensive disciplines that consist of a similar proportion of student majors but a large discrepancy in the amount of external research funding earned at this one university. In terms of career stages, early career are those individuals classified as either *Juniorprofessor(in)* and/or *Professor(in)* who have been employed by a German university in a research and/or teaching capacity within the time range of 1 to 10 years. Later career faculty members are those individuals who are classified as *Professor(in)* and have been employed in a research and/or teaching capacity at a university within the time range of 11+ years. Because of the recent changes to the professorate, these distinctions provided context in terms of length of time on the professorial career path as opposed to the official rank, a viable choice for understanding many of the frustrations with the length of the path itself, changes to the hierarchy, and a the perspective across time by permitting an exploration in shifts in roles as they relate to length of service.
The study seeks to understand how professors themselves have and are experiencing these changes. Several research questions outline this study.

**Research Questions**

1. Historically, what has been the structure of professorial work in Germany and at this one institution?
2. Historically, what have been the manifest and latent roles of professorial groups at this one institution?
3. How did the old structure affect professorial roles at this one institution?
4. What have been the organizational reforms implemented at this one institution as a result of the Bologna Process?
5. What have been the organizational reforms implemented at this one institution as a result of German higher education reforms?
6. What effect have these policy reforms had on the professorial role definitions and professorial work at this one institution?
7. What is the enduring impact of the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms on professorial roles and professorial work at one German institution?

**Significance of this study**

Researchers agree that the magnitude of impact from Bologna on higher education in Europe has been extensive (Adelman, 2008; Kehm, 2010; Kehm & Teichler, 2006; Mayer, Müller, & Pollak, 2007; Welsh, 2009). For German higher education, reforms have been equally substantial. First, the path towards Professor now includes a
junior professorship that provides more open access and security to budding new scholars. The creation of this role has meant greater autonomy, teaching privileges, and status towards the professorate. Next, policy reforms now place a greater value on both teaching and research excellence for professors as opposed to only a greater weight on research. This expanded role is a significant shift that affects professorial salaries and pressures on professors’ time. Also, within institutions, organizational authority has shifted from professorial chairs that previously maintained absolute power to a new system of management by university leadership. This change has strengthened institutional power across Germany but it also has meant a change in the way professors are having policy reforms imposed by the institutions (Adams, 2002). Finally, the state and federal government together with the Wissenschaftsrat (German Science Council) and the Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation) created the Excellence Initiative, a national competition for excellent research that created institutional prestige and well-funded research projects. The Excellence Initiative has shaped a new hierarchy among institutions like never before and further increased the emphasis of research as central to faculty work (Fallon, 2008; Mayer & Ziegele, 2009; Welsh, 2009).

This study provides a timely, in-depth analysis of the multitude of changes on the university level and how they have affected professorial work and role definition. By analyzing these two components of professorial life, it provides a fuller picture of the professorial experience than either one could alone. This study focuses on understanding the policies’ implementation from the macro- to micro-level, and provides information that can aid the University of Potsdam in meeting their institutional goals. Ultimately,
the study seeks to offer this one institution an understanding from an external view of
how professors experience their work and define their roles as well as to suggest future
policy formation.

The pressures on professors individually, institutionally, nationally, and
internationally are numerous. Nationally and internationally in terms of meeting goals
for the knowledge economy and institutionally in serving the needs of an increasingly
diverse student body with larger class sizes and teaching loads. On an individual level,
professors also engage in their own research agenda, professional advancement, and the
building of their academic reputation. These combined dynamic pressures have
undoubtedly impacted the way professors experience their professional roles. This study
investigated how and to what degree.

Delimitations

A delimitation of this study is that it is one case study at one German university in
one German state. It is not intended to be generalizable to the larger German higher
education context nor Europe as a whole. Instead this study seeks to understand the
macro-level education reform on the micro-level of professors. The participants include
two groups split two ways: early career and later career professors/junior professors and
then between the two cohorts of professors, they will be divided between
economics/social science faculty and natural science faculty. Therefore this study’s
results will only speak to the experiences of social scientists and natural scientists at one
German university, not any other disciplines or universities.
The data collected for this study is in the form of interviews, observations, and document analysis; all qualitative measures. This study approaches professorial work in terms of roles. "A role is a comprehensive pattern for behavior and attitude that is linked to an identity, is socially identified more or less clearly as an entity, and is subject to being played recognizably by different individuals" (Turner, 2000, p. 112). Therefore anything outside the realm of this role definition or roles occupied within professorial work are outside the purview of this study. In addition, the professors' roles are analyzed only in terms of professional roles. While a person holds many roles in their lives including many personal ones, the focus of this study is professional and personal roles are only discussed in terms of their direct connection to the professional.

In terms of institutional type, this study is only about one Universität. It does not include Fachhochschulen, an applied science institution of higher education in Germany. This Universität used for this study has participated as a participant on three teams from three categories of the Excellence Initiative as secondary and tertiary partners to local Berlin universities; two for clusters of excellence and one for graduate schools. However, this institution is not technically a "winner" of the Excellence Initiative nor tagged as Ausgezeichnet (excellent). Nonetheless, professors' perceptions of the Excellence Initiative are explored in terms of how they see its impact on competition in the German higher education system as a whole. This study does not, however, claim to provide full insight into what this competition has meant for all of the "have-nots" nor the top winners. It is instead, a research university that is involved in the discussion but not a winner of the competition.
Limitations

The limitations of this study are that it is not generalizable across other institutions, states, or countries but instead will be a case study of this one German university from November 1, 2011-March 1, 2012. Also, while four months is a prolonged engagement with the culture of the country and the university, it is not equivalent to being a native German in terms of understanding cultural context. Other limitations include my national origin as a U.S. citizen studying professors who work within the German higher education system, mainly Germans. A cultural divide was inevitable and therefore provided a limitation to this study that would not have been present if I were German. Innate in that was the to which degree professors felt comfortable sharing their personal feelings about recent reforms. In the large majority of interviews, professors felt very free to discuss their opinions and were very open to my questions. However, it is still likely a limitation as I am unaware what they may have decided to hold back. To account for this limitation, in each and every interview I purposefully included an introductory time for building rapport, a foundational principle in fieldwork like interviewing. However, it is still recognizable as a limitation. Finally, a limitation of this study was the language barrier. I am fluent in German but I am not a native speaker. Therefore language was at times a limitation especially during the five interviews conducted in German. That is also the case in data analysis as I translated and interpreted the findings but in some instances may not have grasped the full colloquial intent.
Conclusion

Higher education reforms in Germany and across Europe have in fact been plentiful over the past decade and this study analyzes professors in one institutional context in an effort to provide deeper insight and inform future institutional initiatives. Professors are important to the future of the knowledge economy that both Europeans and Germans seek to strengthen. This study offers institutional leaders and professors a deeper understanding of the professorial experiences in terms of reforms at one German university.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

This literature review provides an exhaustive review of all relevant literature related to the focus of this study. First, this chapter provides a backdrop for understanding the European context of higher education and the need for reforms that led to the Bologna Process. Next, the significant connection is made between the Bologna Process and the professorate across Europe. Thereafter, German higher education’s history leading up to the reforms over the past decade will be discussed as a foundation for understanding this study. Finally, the focus of this study, German university professors, will be explored by critiquing the extant literature on the impact of the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms on German professorial work and role definition.

The Massification of Higher Education

The number of students seeking higher education across Germany has dramatically increased over the last half century while the numbers of professors and universities have not proportionately increased (Enders, 2001). Simultaneously, German higher education has shifted from being a highly selective, elite institution for the few (Leichsenring, 2011) to an institution of greater access for the many (Enders, 2001). Higher education’s purpose is to train society’s work force and advance the knowledge economy even amidst the challenges with growing enrollments (Baker & Lenhardt, 2008; Wolter, 2004). In order to be more productive and innovative, the best and brightest required support. Within the last decade, though, the existing German tertiary infrastructure was not sufficient to provide the needed support to become a reality.
Hence, major systematic reforms to German higher education were deemed necessary (Cavalli & Teichler, 2010).

Germany did not create all of these changes in a vacuum, however. With an increased emphasis for a united European Higher Education Area (EHEA), all member countries brought higher education as a system to the forefront of the conversation. Clearly, higher education would play an important role in the future of knowledge economy (Baker & Lenhardt, 2008). To meet the growing needs of the continent, ministers from across Europe created one major systematic reform to higher education over the past decade to meet these needs: the Bologna Process (1999). The Bologna Process sought to align European higher education systems, emphasize greater mobility between countries, greater internationalization, increased competition, and a boosted knowledge economy (Bologna Process, 2010). Professors have obviously been a primary group of interest. "Professors were expected to contribute to promoting the great European objective" (Charlier, 2008, p. 108), which keeps them central to policy considerations. Like all policies, the question remains, is Europe truly accomplishing its goals?

**Background of Bologna Process**

For many years, the ideas of a unified system were explored in Europe and especially in Germany. Nugent (2004) argues many of these discussions dating back to the 1960s on two-degree cycles and unified learning systems serve as impetus for the Bologna reforms. The catalyst immediately prior to the Bologna Declaration is a significant earlier document initiated the united European higher education interest: the
Sorbonne Declaration (1998). The Sorbonne Declaration, agreed upon by France, Germany, Italy and United Kingdom, declared the need for a European Higher Education Area (EHEA). The EHEA was projected as a united European system with aligned degrees, increased mobility, and common goals (Reinalda, 2008; Papadaki & Tsakanika, 2006; Sorbonne Declaration, 1998). Then a year later, the Bologna Agreement (1999) established the Bologna Process (Bologna Process History, 2011). As a structural policy initiative, the Bologna Process supports the concept of the EHEA by promoting aligned degree structures, providing greater mobility for professors and students between countries, and the further internationalization of Europe (Bologna Process, 2010). It also established a new reciprocity for course transfers between European institutions using a centralized data collection system known as the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) (Bologna Process, 2010; Dale 2007-8). These changes provide students in theory the opportunity to “move freely and without bureaucratic hurdles between universities” (Hoell et al., 2009, p. 9). Together the efforts of Bologna and the EHEA propelled the EU towards meeting its overarching goals.

At the Bologna table in 1999 were seated 29 European education ministers. The process opened the discussion to all European countries and as a result, today the Bologna Process applies to 47 member states (Bologna Process, 2010). The subsequent reforms have changed the way higher education operates across Europe and as part of the agreement, the goals continue to be assessed and revised. At the 2001 Prague Communiqué, the Bologna Process added lifelong learning as well as an emphasis on student’s role in shaping the mission of institutions. Also, the EU reiterated its continued
investment in the success of the EHEA (Terry, 2006). At the 2003 Berlin Communiqué, the two-degree cycle (BA/MA) focus of the 1999 Bologna Agreement was expanded to include the Ph.D. resulting in Europe’s new three-degree cycle (BA/MA/PhD) (Terry, 2006). Streamlining doctoral work across the EHEA was intended to improve the knowledge economy within EU nations (Kehm, 2006). At the 2007 Lisbon Communiqué, learning outcomes became more central to the conversation as well (Adams, 2006). At the 2009, Leuven and Louvain Communiqué, participants outlined the remainder of work that needs to be done moving forward towards 2020.

Philosophically, the Bologna process also challenged European nations to define what an ideal higher education structure would look like not only in terms of organizational structure but also social structure—increased diversity and gender equality among faculty and staff (Charlier, 2008; Pritchard, 2010). The ideal was a collective goal among countries aimed at improving access to higher education and maximizing efforts towards building the strongest knowledge economy across the EU countries. Doing so required open communication across countries to make it all happen (Maassen & Stensaker, 2010; Papadakis & Tsakanaka, 2006). The Bologna effort over the past decade really has been no small feat. The most significant impacts of the process have been the creation of common degree structures, a heightened academic communication across borders, and a unified focus on higher education across Europe.

The Bologna Process is a popular area of research in terms of its impact on European countries. Scholars have conducted research on countries such as Italy (Aittola, Kiviniemi, Honkimäki, Muhonen, Huusko, & Ursin, 2009), Russia (Gaenzle, Meister, &
King, 2009; Grigor’eva, 2007), and Spain (Fernández Díaz, Carballo Santaolalla, & Galán González, 2010). In Italy, Aittola et al. (2009) interviewed Italian academics at one Italian university on the internationalization of the academic life as a result of Bologna and found that the reforms on the European level changed the way professors approached their teaching in a positive way. Professors reported that their teaching had become more engaging as a result of institutional values promoting the recruitment of students. The Bologna Agreement also had improved international mobility for Italian students and staff. A challenge specifically for Italy, however, was there was an imbalance in the number of Italian students going out to the number coming in to study; therefore professors realized that they had to make the universities more attractive to international students (Aittola et al., 2009).

In Spain, Fernández Díaz et al. (2010) studied 257 Spanish faculty members at Universidad Complutense de Madrid on their knowledge and impression of the EHEA and found “a degree of ignorance” as well as “resistance” to change among the faculty (p. 101). In Russia, Grigor’eva (2007) interviewed “college and university administrators and instructors” on their knowledge of and understanding of the impact of Bologna Process on Russian higher education. Grigor’eva found that faculty overall perceived value in the Bologna Process and believed to varying degrees the usefulness of it for Russia. At one end of the spectrum, however, a notable group of respondents agreed that Russia should stay out of the Bologna Process and keep the old system intact. As illustrated in just these examples of Italy, Spain, and Russia, professorial experience is
interrelated with the Bologna policy reforms and countries want to understand how professors perceive the experience.

Other scholars point to the unintended outcomes and failures of the Bologna Process. Some point to the implementation taking longer to fulfill than the envisioned time intended and have led to a “Bologna Fatigue” (Hoell et al., 2009; Reichert, 2008). Hoell et al. (2009) argues that given the problems with students dropping out and confusion with the ECTS between transferring student credits within and between new and old degree systems, Bologna has not yet accomplished its mission. Erling and Hilgendorf (2006) argued the huge impact of internationalization on Europe; the English language (as the common EU language) has caused an “Englishization of the domain” (p. 273) at the Freie Universität Berlin. For their study, the impact of an English language-centered internationalization effort on the German institutional level forced the unintended consequences of offering classes requiring English language as prerequisites and others unofficially requiring it.

Few scholars have studied the direct impact of the Bologna Process on professors in Germany. Winkel (2010) studied the German interpretations of the Bologna process and specific to professors he found that the added time spent now with the increased accountability and degree reforms set up roadblocks to progress in professorial work. He recommended, “faculties should be given much more autonomy to act when it comes to degree reform. This way better results can be achieved, barriers to acceptance dismantled, and phenomena of demotivation reduced” (p. 310). Keeling (2006) warns of the growing European Commission’s control over higher education in countries other
than Germany; the increased accountability specifically for professors made it difficult for them to plan as priorities were "externally-defined priorities" (p. 215). Kehm (2010), a well-known German higher education scholar, posited that some issues with Bologna (on the European level) were the attempt to standardize quality measurements without defining what quality really means and the desire for competition and rankings with high quality in both teaching and research; concepts can at times philosophically and practically contradict. She concludes, "it remains to be seen whether Europe can harmonize its systems of higher education and at the same time maintain that rich diversity and honor more than one form of excellence" (p. 42).

The diversity of Bologna-related literature at various levels of higher education in different realms of interest clearly illustrates how multifaceted this policy really is and how its impact cannot really be considered in a purely linear manner. Instead each study focuses on one aspect of interest.

**German Higher Education**

Independent of the Bologna Process, the German higher education system has been in a state of reform for many years. Among these reforms have been an introduction of tuition fees, a shift to the new degree system and creation of a German qualification framework, desire for greater internationalization of higher education, increased competition in professorial work, increased competition between institutions, and an expanding professorial hierarchy and shifting governance responsibilities (Enders et al., 2002; Hoell et al., 2009; Witte et al., 2007). In order to understand the effect of these
changes on the professorial work and role definition in German universities a brief
history of Germany provides a context for their impact.

An Abridged History of German Higher Education

In the late 18th century, Prussian censorship, especially in the name of Protestant
orthodoxy, repeatedly interfered with professor's freedom of thought on an all too
immediate level. This intrusion provoked a revolt among the leading intellectuals that
lasted until 1810 (Ringer, 1969). During this upheaval, major German intellectuals such
as Immanuel Kant, Friedrich Schiller, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, F.E.D. Schleiermacher,
and of course, Wilhelm von Humboldt, “developed their ideal for academic freedom”
(Ringer, 1969). As a means of protecting the professorate from outside forces, these
gentlemen established the concepts of Wissenschaft, Lehrfreiheit, and Lernfreiheit as
foundational principles of the freedom to research, to teach, and to learn—and Germany
served as the ideal for what professor's academic freedom should be (Lee, 2008; Schmidt
& Landberg, 2007-8). Oftentimes, Humboldt is cited in the literature as playing a
significant role in the conceptualization and influence of the three concepts. Nyhart
(1995) posits that this is one among many histories of Prussian higher education during
this time and motivations came also from the German states themselves when they sought
to “reinvigorate the moribund universities by institutionalizing [the] two grand,
intertwined ideas” of Wissenschaft “pure knowledge” and Bildung “development of self
to the highest potential” (p. 14). Nyhart rationalizes that although professors played a role
in encouraging these concepts, the government’s influence on them was greater than
“through the efforts of faculty to increase it” (p. 15). The 19th century German concepts
of Wissenschaft, Lehrfreiheit, Lernfreiheit, and Bildung (none of which are mutually exclusive of the other) have undeniably influenced today’s German higher education, whether they were originated with faculty or government. No discussion of German higher education can be complete without an understanding of their legacy. Though some believe it to be a myth (Ash, 2006), Humboldt, as a legacy will always remembered as encouraging a university created by a community of scholars and students who freely intellectualize and advance knowledge without external interference (Enders et al., 2002, Hahn, 1977; Mayer et al., 2007; Witte et al., 2008). German higher education over the past 200 years has been “inspired by the Humboldtian” ideal (regardless of his sole influence) and policy seeks to make that an ideal a reality (Enders et al., 2002; Hahn, 1977; Mayer et al., 2007, p. 242; Witte et al., 2008). To understand the legacy of Humboldt is to understand the modern German university of today.

During the early 19th century, Prussia while under French rule, Germans wanted more than anything to intellectually and culturally identify with their German nationalistic Kultur. Kultur sought meaning in “art, learning, and morality” (Pritchard, 1991, p. 21). In the spirit of Kultur, Humboldt, himself, deeply believed in individualism, liberalism, and access to education. He believed that “schools should cater for the whole community” and he therefore “sought to obliterate the notion that children from different social classes ought to be educated differently” (Pritchard, 1991, p. 22). Thus, German Kultur combined with the German Enlightenment influenced the ideals of a university by focusing more on reason and analytical thoughts. In a university

---

5 Between 1806 and 1815 when Napoleon was finally defeated at Waterloo, a major section of Prussia was controlled by France.
setting, it meant building one’s knowledge full time irrespective of a need to make a living. This concept, however, was not sustainable in the long term for enrollment and societal advancement because practically only those with means could be educated without the need to work (Pritchard, 1991). The belief that knowledge should be sought for knowledge’s sake has held true through the past two centuries as an ideal by which all universities should model: an appreciation for knowledge and the intellectual space to advance society.

The 20th century. The 20th century was a tumultuous time for Germany. During this century, Germans fought two World Wars and scathingly overcame a genocidal dictatorship, Soviet, British, and American partition and command, the rise of the metaphorical Iron Curtain that led to the physical Berlin Wall, and ultimately German reunification. Germany can best be described in one word: resilient.

During the Hitler era, one of the most infamous acts against the German universities was the Book Burning of 1933. On May 10, 1933, an event unseen since the Middle Ages occur[red] as German students from universities formerly regarded as among the finest in the world, gather in Berlin and other German cities to burn books with ‘unGerman’ ideas. Books by Freud, Einstein, Thomas Mann, Jack London, H.G. Wells and many others go up in flames as they give the Nazi salute (The History Place—WWII in Europe, 2010, para. 1).

The freedoms provided to the German university participants by Humboldtian values were in fact in peril during this unparalleled time.
World War II ended in 1945, shortly after Adolf Hitler’s suicide (Fulbrook, 1992). Post-1945 Germany embarked on creating a new society and within it higher education changed also. Post-1945 is often thought of as a zero hour for West Germany—a restart button that led to the democratization, denazification, demilitarization, and decentralization of the traumatized country (Browder, 2008). Naturally too, divisions existed between the bifurcated desolate East and prosperous West, especially in terms of higher education (Fulbrook, 1992). Funding for universities in the East was minimal while the West prospered with freedom of thought as the country democratized (Watercamp, 2009-10).

**Higher Education Post-Reunification.** In 1990, the Berlin Wall officially was torn down (both symbolically and in many sections physically) to unite the East and West Germany. Fulbrook (2000) argues that “it did not take very long to realize that what was effected by the merger in 1990 was less the reunification of two halves torn asunder than the unification of two very different sociopolitical, cultural, and economic entities” (p. 26). Reunification was evident in the divisions between higher education systems in the East and West. In the 1990s, “some 134,000 students from East Germany were absorbed into the united system of higher education” (Mayer et al., 2007, p. 243). In the new system, East German teachers who had been politically active in the former East German government (the German Democratic Republic or GDR) were asked to leave (Watercamp, 2009-10). While the West undoubtedly influenced East, the East German higher education system also positively influenced West Germany’s system too. In fact, Watercamp argues that many West Germans would not necessarily recognize this
connection because the history of the Eastern bloc is wrought with negative historical events. "The more that is known about the men and inhuman methods of power exercised on behalf of the socialist party and the state organizations in the GDR, the more obsolete every comparison with today's Germany must appear" (Watercamp, 2009-10, p. 15). But researchers such as Watercamp illustrate some of the positive influences as well. In light of the reunification of East and West, they have naturally influenced one another and together they are now co-constructing their new reality—one Germany. This reunification has influenced German higher education policy with the implication of systematic reforms in two distinctly different systems, even two decades later.

German history is wrought with so many dimensions, political ideologies, historical interpretations, and significant challenges to the sacredness of academic thought. Each layer of history provides another dimension in which to understand what these professors' stories must entail and how their roles have been influenced not only by their personal academic experiences, but also those epic eras that have irreversibly influenced the German professorate as a whole.

The German Professorial Experience

For professors, now in the 21st century, the stagnant funding and increased student enrollments have enlarged course and advisee loads making the Humboldtian ideal of a university more difficult (Pritchard, 2006b). A variety of challenges face the professorial career path. To meet those challenges and make the professoriate more accessible, German academics and policy makers reexamined it. The German national and state desires to reform the path to the professoriate in Germany can be attributed to a
professor's central role in the advancement of German society. Conceptually, professorial work and roles for this study are organized in terms of the German academic professorial work (in the context of teaching, research, and service) and professorial role definition (advisor, teacher, mentor, researcher, scientist, etc.). First, however, the following section describes the path by which one becomes as professor as a means of understanding the context in which they experience their work and how the various stages of a professor—early career and later career—may differ based on where they are on their career path.

**The German academic career path.** For professors at all levels, the career path that they have followed has often been for the ultimate quest for the desirable professorship and *venia legendi* (permission to lecture). Backes-Gellner and Schlinghoff (2010) use a Tournament Model to describe the professorial career path in Germany as a means of winning brackets and moving through promotion to the ultimate prize of civil servant for life. In Germany, the path is typically quite long and the average age of academics to become professors is 38 (Böhmer & von Ins, 2009). The professorial “tournament” is ultimately a zero/sum process. Enders (2001) points out “every other final outcome is more or less tinged with failure” (p. 13). Therefore professors’ choices along such a path are significant at every turn.

The path to a career in the German professoriate has typically been somewhat linear. A potential academic must first pass the *Abitur* (via *Gymnasium*) to be considered eligible for university. After attaining a Bachelor’s and perhaps a Master’s degree, the aspiring scholar must earn a Ph.D., which historically has meant “one student, one thesis,
one advisor, 3+ years” (Buckow, 2010, p. 3). Then, a post-doctoral research appointment either means working directly with a senior researcher at a university or an external research organization (e.g., Max Planck, Emma Noether to name a few) where they build their research experience and publication record (Bohmer & von Ins, 2009). The post-doc has always varied across Germany by appointment type. Post-docs may or may not include teaching but always focus on research. Lastly, in the past, academics on the path to the professorship had to earn their Habilitation, a second book-length dissertation, to even be considered for a professorial appointment (Lola & Meyer, 2006). And yet a professor position still was not guaranteed (Enders, 2001). An appointment depended on the results of a state and national (and at times international) search for each and every professorship. Thus, the search process in Germany is highly competitive, demanding very productive research agendas of candidates (German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, 2008). Once appointed, however, professors enjoy a permanent status in a university as a civil servant (Buckow, 2010; Orr, Jaeger, & Schwarzenberger, 2007).

Today the professorial career path is no longer as linear. Now, budding academics have more choices in terms of building their research agenda and their post-doc training as a result of the higher education reforms in Germany. The three options for young academics include: (1) the Habilitation—either as a traditional book-length doctorate or the newer cumulative Habilitation which is compilation of published articles into a compendium, (2) the junior professorship with a Habilitation equivalent, or (3) the junior research group leader position (Buckow, 2010). Everts (2008) distinguishes among the three main career paths as the “habilitand is financially depending on a supervisor and
cannot decide when his or her own students graduate; the junior professor doesn’t have
start-up funds or financial support from the university but possesses the power to graduate
students; the junior research group leader has financial and research independence but no
power to graduate students” (p. 2). Each has its attributes, but the diversity of choice
characterizes the new pathway for aspiring academics in Germany.

**Habilitation.** After completing a Ph.D., an academic hopeful may choose to
pursue the Habilitation, in the past the obstacle between a candidate and their *venia
legendi* (permission to lecture). The Habilitation provides evidence of advanced research
skills. With it, scholars are qualified to apply for a professorship. Much debate has
ensued about the need for this requirement. Böhmer and von Ins (2009) showed that 76%
of the Emmy Noether grant recipients (all early academics in this particular study) “do
not perceive the Habilitation as a good tradition but rather a meaningless and obsolete
ritual” but at the same time a little less than half of the grant recipients still planned on
obtaining the *Habilitation* for professional advancement (p. 183). Buckow (2010) in her
PowerPoint presentation on behalf of the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG or
The German Research Foundation) explained that some professors want to hold strong to
require the Habilitation as a means of preserving the difficulty of entrance into the
professorate. Both sides, professors who wish to retain the Habilitation requirement and those
who do not, agree that the *Habilitation* has played a significant role as a gatekeeper to the
faculty career path.

**Professorship.** A *Professor* in Germany “enjoy[s] high levels of institutional
power, prestige, and autonomy”; they are actually “civil servants with tenure” (Enders,
As such, they are not particularly regulated in their specific duties (teaching, research, and at times governance). Professors are classified in one of four categories: C1-C4 professors with C4 being the highest distinction (Enders, 2001). A recent reform effort has altered the pay scale within these distinctions away from age-based to performance-based criteria (Mayer & Ziegele, 2009). Imbedded in the recent reform efforts has been an increased desire for transparency of professor compensation and work. "The classic German solution is to have a high degree of inequality within institutions, in the form of the chair system, and a less-pronounced inequality between institutions" (Enders, 2001, p. 9). This inequality is quite clear in the fact that "professors have no superiors within their institutions;" they enjoy veto power, autonomy, and unrestricted space to accomplish their research (Enders et al., 2002). It is obvious, therefore, why with the high level of autonomy, prestige, and ranking, the tight gatekeeping of the professorship has been an area of concern for policy makers and academics.

**Research Positions and Post-doctoral Fellowships.** For some PhD graduates, an externally funded research position such as a Research Group Leader position or a post-doctoral fellowship is their preferred alternative route in seeking a professorial position. With the increased international competition for professorships encouraged by the German federal government (German Federal Ministry of Education & Research, 2008), more academics are turning to programs like "Emma Noether, German Research Foundation [DFG], Max Planck Society, Helmholtz Association, Boehringer Ingelheim Foundation, and Volkswagen Foundation" (Böhmer & von Ins, 2009, p.177) for generous
funding of postdoctoral fellowships and research projects. Such a research path boasts that it “offers excellent young researchers opportunities for independent research and an alternative path to qualifying for a professorship much quicker” (p. 177). Thus, these paths have also become attractive for early career academics as opposed to the traditional university setting. A downside for some academics who have chosen this path explain that reemerging into a university setting is somewhat challenging after being out for an extended period (Lola & Meyer, 2006).

**Junior Professorship.** As a means of improving the career path to a professorship, the junior professorship was first introduced in 2002 as part of the Fifth Amendment of Higher Education Federal Framework Act requiring institutions to create positions for junior professors (Welsh, 2009). Interestingly, two years later, the German Federal Constitutional Court ruled this action (after opposition by 3 German states) to be outside the jurisdiction of federal lawmakers and declared the act to create a junior professorship null and void. Because institutions between 2002 and 2004 had created some JP positions resulting from the law, in response the Federal Government passed a “repair act” on December 31, 2004 suggesting the creation of junior professor positions across Germany rather than requiring them. The final result was that officially, since 2007, “the junior professor has been embraced legally by all German federal states” (Welsh, 2009, p. 6). Thus, the professorial hierarchy had a new structure imposed and the government sent a message to institutions that junior professorships⁶ would play a role in overarching German goals.

---

⁶ For candidates with a Ph.D. and not yet a Habilitation.
Choosing this junior professorship path now means that a more prestigious appointment within the professorate is available to young academic aspirants. When it was created in 2002, its "aim was to supersede the Habilitation as the most important precondition for a *venia legendi*" (Böhmer & von Ins, 2009, p. 177). One of the main debates in creating the junior professorship was whether or not one should have professorial rights without a *Habilitation* (Everts, 2008). With a junior professorship one can teach before having obtained a *Habilitation* and enjoy the same academic freedom as a professor in article five of the German constitution. As such, junior professors teach, conduct independent research, and build their CV, as well as act as an advisor and provide service to their discipline and the institution. However, their status is tentative as the professorship still requires *Habilitation* either as a Habilitation equivalent awarded after a successful three year review in some German states, a cumulative series of publications compiled like a dossier, or a monographic dissertation at the completion of the junior professorship if ever one wants to don the status of professor (Buckow, 2010, p.4). In addition, after the six-year period of qualifying under a junior professorship, an individual must leave the institution in order to find a permanent full professorship at another university. This means that the long-term view for a junior professor is filled with uncertainty.

The career path for a German academic is nothing short of complicated. From the demands from the European, German, state, and institutional levels as well as individual professional goals, professorial life is unique and within it each aspect holds meaning. Along the German professorial career path, faculty for the purpose of this story will be
classified as Professors and Junior Professors. Now the primary shared roles within those two positions: research, teaching, and service.

**Professorial Work and Role Definitions**

*Professors* and *Junior Professors* teach and conduct research while also advising students, serving on university committees, and living personal lives. Each of these roles impacts the university as a social structure. Teaching in its simplest terms transfers knowledge from teacher to student, research is the creation of new knowledge, and service\(^7\) is acting in a collaborative manner with colleagues to assist in institutional governance as well as service to students as advisors and mentors. This study concentrated namely on three primary professorial roles in German higher education—research, teaching, and service; these roles are aligned with the Humboldtian ideal, synergizing professorial and student efforts within a community of scholars. In addition, within each aspect of professorial work, the participants in this study identified the ways in which they identified their roles within each area of professorial work. For example, in research they define themselves as scientists, scholars, members of the larger academic community; in teaching as teacher, advisor; and in service as a member of the institution, member of their department, and contributor of ideas.

**Research.** Although not all professors conduct research, oftentimes research is deemed a primary focus of professorial work and can potentially yield funding and prestige on many levels. German policy makers focused on improving German higher

---

\(^7\) When discussing professorial work in Germany, the literature describes it as two primary roles—teaching and research. Although through my study I found service to be an important role in lives of professors interviewed, for this portion of the literature review, only research and teaching are fully explored to match the literature available.
education by establishing funding streams, time, and creative space for professors to conduct research that would simultaneously build their individual prestige and advance their institutions and their country's knowledge economy. The connections between the recent reforms to professorial research are focused here in three areas: (a) advancing society by supporting top minds so as to prevent Brain Drain, (b) shifting incentive structures, and (c) professorial motivation towards scholarship.

**The Brain Drain.** The Brain Drain, an outflow of the best and brightest scholars and students to other countries lured away with more attractive offers, is a real concern in Germany (Federal Ministry of Education and Research, 2008). In the late 1990s, Everts (2008) explained that many young scholars felt that the *Habilitation* caused the Brain Drain from Germany due to its cumbersome nature in advancement. Recent initiatives throughout the German system overtly state their desire to prevent the Brain Drain (German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, 2008). Further, the increased mobility between European countries resulting from the EHEA actually has been positive for Germany as it enables their best and brightest to gain new knowledge outside of Germany and return to share the benefits of their sojourn. At the same time the mobility paths attract top professors and students to Germany, which also contributes to the country's knowledge production (*Die Bundesregierung*, 2011).

**Shifting incentive structures.** The German government also has revised the once opaque faculty reward structure to be more transparent. The new system not only encourages research excellence but also motivates scholars to stay in Germany for their careers. Backes-Gellner and Schillinghoff (2010) found that the new career incentive
structure creates a more market-driven professorial system as it "does affect faculty behavior, as measured empirically" (p. 26). The new professor reward system in German universities in theory includes both incentives for research and teaching (Franck & Opitz, 2006). However, Enders et al. (2002) warns, "any conflict between teaching and research will be resolved in favor of research" (p.102). Therefore professors already value research over teaching because it has been rewarded at a higher level. Additionally, institutions via this new professorial reward structure seek to use incentives to successfully motivate professors to achieve research that in turn will accomplish national and continental goals. Of course, the autonomy of a German professor does not always lend well to externally imposed incentives.

Germany's Excellence Initiative executed by both the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG or German Research Foundation) and the Wissenschaftsrat (German Science Foundation) in collaboration with German state and federal governments to be a motivating factor for professors to conduct research and universities to encourage this activity to gain a competitive edge in the national competition. The Excellence Initiative proposed a nationwide university competition to recognize the top German institutions in three categories: (1) graduate schools, (2) excellence clusters, and (3) top level research institution named "Future Concept" or "Excellent" institutions (Fallon, 2008; Mayer & Ziegele, 2009). The purpose of this competition was to improve research productivity and excellence nationwide, show a stronger international presence in research, and allocate funding specifically for new, creative, and innovative initiatives (Fallon, 2008; Mayer & Ziegele, 2009).
Unmistakably, professors play an enormous role in the success of this initiative on the institutional level. And, in turn, professors associated with the *Excellence Initiative* institutions earn prestige that can positively affect their own personal competitiveness in the labor market. Of course, very few institutions are winners in the Excellence Initiative so its impact as a motivating factor varies greatly from institution to institution and department to department.

Beyond the *Excellence Initiative* though, research is generally a central responsibility of professors on the university level (Enders et al., 2002). Research as a vehicle for policy goal achievement is likely different through the eyes of policy makers as opposed to those of professors. The time, energy, and creative space necessary for an effective and prolific researcher to be productive are sometimes not the direct concern of policy makers. Instead, policymakers’ concern is to produce financial carrots that will entice professors to produce more and better research.

The topic of research in German universities has been the subject of extensive scholarship, often within the context of a larger higher education focus. For example, many studies offer an international comparative approach like Backes-Gellner and Schillinghoff’s (2010) study of career incentives for United States and German professors and Pritchard’s (2010) comparison between Great Britain and Germany in terms of the gender equality of academics. Backes-Gellner and Schillinghoff (2010) found that research incentives did in fact impact professorial behavior in both the U.S. and Germany based on “publication patterns” of two groups of faculty. Pritchard (2010) surveyed male and female academics on gender inequality initiatives (as a result of Bologna) in
both Germany and the UK and found that women wanted better maternity conditions and felt men still led their fields, but they were supported and did not have an overall negative experience. Böhmer and von Ins (2009) surveyed Emmy Noether postdoctoral researchers in Germany and cited the advantages (like creativity and autonomy) and disadvantages (disconnections from higher education) of an externally funding research career path as opposed to a university one. Enders et al. (2002) provided a thorough outline of the entire German higher education system and called for further study into the effects of policy shifts on research in the European, German, and institutional levels of higher education. Mayer and Ziegele (2009) studied the significance of competition in Germany on professor hiring practices, increased performance incentives, and the Excellence Initiative’s creation of an “increased focus on research” (p. 62). They found that Europe has been transformed as a result of Bologna and competition has emerged despite so many different systems. They offer suggestions for ways to further improve this competitive market. Much of the literature on German higher education directly discusses the connections between reform, professors, and research but none specifically in terms of how professors experience their work or define their roles from a qualitative perspective; very often they have been quantitative measures.

Teaching. Although historically teaching has not been valued as much as research in Germany, it has always been very important to any professor’s career (Enders et al., 2002). Professors in Germany spend on average eight hours per week teaching in a Universität (Enders et al., 2002). Due to the recent institutional incentive to focus on research, professors typically shift time away from teaching (including preparation) and
towards research that will be rewarded (Backes-Gellner & Schlinghoff, 2010). Because of the disparate weighting of research and teaching, however, teaching has been characterized as weak in German higher education and at times quality has suffered (Enders et al., 2002). Adams (2002) described "concerns over prevailing rigidity and the declining quality of teaching" (p.12) for professors across universities. Prior to any specific reforms in terms of teaching, professors were not thoroughly evaluated on their teaching quality, which resulted in students suffering (Adams, 2002; Enders et al., 2002). Instead Orr et al. (2007) explain that the professors historically were only evaluated on teaching in quantitative terms counting the number of students in and out (entrance and graduation rates) including the variable of time to degree and teaching evaluations. Similar to Axtell's (1998) account of U.S. faculty work, those professors in Germany who engage in both teaching and research seek to find time to balance both well (Enders et al., 2002). Many of the reform efforts for quality over the past decade have focused on improving teaching through professional development and pedagogical training (Bologna Process, 2010). European Quality Assurance Standards explicitly state the need for external review of teaching practices on the institutional level (European Quality Assurance Standards, 2005). The ideal for any scholar in Germany, however, is not to receive the best teaching evaluations, it is the Humboldtian nexus between research and teaching in which one is not independent of another; one that, like Humboldt himself, is a never-ending journey for new technique and knowledge (Pritchard, 1991).
Conclusion

The Bologna Process and German higher education reforms have undoubtedly created waves of changes across Germany. Ultimately the Bologna Process is a call for shared values across Europe and German higher education reforms sought to improve the structures and functions of a growing, evolving system that can remain competitive in the global market. Professors as a group play an important role in accomplishing those shared values and positioning Germany among the best. The purpose of this study is to analyze how and to what degree these two lines of reform efforts have impacted professorial work and role definition at one institution. Doing so will provide greater insight into the needs of the professors as well as the successes and challenges of policy implementation on the institutional level.
Chapter 3

Methodology

This qualitative study analyzed German professorial work and role definition at the University of Potsdam as a means of understanding how and to what degree the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms have made an impact. As described in the first two chapters, German higher education has dramatically changed over the past 12 years as a result of major higher education reforms. As a result, the professors as a group have been affected in a multitude of ways. The purpose of this chapter is to outline the conceptual framework, the paradigm within which I operated, and the methods that I employed to conduct the study.

Conceptual Framework

Conceptually this study concentrated on one level of inquiry: the micro level (university/professor). Structuralism is the primary theoretical framework that was used to explore the micro level as a means of describing the change to structures. Symbolic interactionism is the secondary and complementary theoretical framework also utilized on the micro level to understand the professorial interactions with one another and their students.

Structuralism

Structuralism as a social concept originally emerged from linguists such as Saussure, and Jakobson and anthropologists like Lévi-Strauss. The concept then expanded to work of psychologists like Freud and Piaget, sociologists such as Marx, Durkheim, Parsons, and Blau, and then spread across the social sciences as a whole (Baert, 1998; Ritzer, 1988). For the purpose of this study, I utilized a combination of
structuralist thought. Gardner (1973) defined structuralism as “an attempt to discern the arrangements of elements underlying a given domain isolated by an analysis” (p. 170). Structuralism is the study of the pattern and existence of elements within a social entity. For this study, one university setting provided the general parameters within which to understand structure. By observing and organizing elements, I was able to see how the pieces of the structure related to and integrated with one another.

In addition to Gardner's definition, I adopted Baert's (1998) articulation of structuralist research:

Structuralists acknowledge the existence of a deeper stratum of reality far below the surface level of observed phenomena. The underlying structures are not immediately visible to the people subjected to them, nor to an observer. It is the task of the social scientist to uncover these latent structures in order to explain the surface level. (p. 10)

Like Gardner, I saw structuralism for this study as a means of uncovering and organizing the underlying elements of an institution and like Baert, as a method of finding a newfound overarching meaning from the minute details of deeply imbedded structures. Structure is both the parameters and depth of a context and the relationships among its components.

The primary structuralist method is a tool for establishing structural boundaries on each level of inquiry while paying careful attention to the relationship within and between each structural component (Runciman, 1969). On the micro level, however,
structure was interpreted from the combination of written policies as well as perceived structures of professors and observed structures of the university as a whole.

At the university and professorial level, structures emerged. I acknowledged the parameters of these structures as they emerged, their components, and the relationships within, between, and among them. From there, I drew meaning from the way that these structures were organized and related. Structuralism does not, however, attach *a priori* categories and structural meaning, but instead seeks to understand the structural dimensions as a product of the individuals who construct and occupy them (Runciman, 1969). This study, thus, allowed structural meaning to emerge directly from the data collected.

**Symbolic Interactionism**

On the micro level, I also employed symbolic interactionism as the theoretical framework to understand the interactions of professors with one another and their students. “Symbolic interaction research studies human interaction and emphasizes the need to keep in mind that human interaction is not based solely on the way the external world ‘really’ is. That interaction is based, instead on how humans interpret their world” (Willis, 2007, p. 177). The interactions that humans experience hold meaning and “are symbolically defined” (Stryker, 2001, p. 213). From the symbols produced in professorial interactions as well as content from interviews at this one university, I was able to interpret an observable meaning. For this study, methodologically I interpreted professorial perception of interactions with fellow colleagues and students. The concept
of roles served as the focus of my use of symbolic interactionism and was influenced by role theory.

**Roles**

The unit of analysis for this study is role. “A role is a comprehensive pattern of behavior and attitude that is linked to an identity, is socially identified more or less clearly as an entity, and is subject to being played recognizably by different individuals” (Turner, 2000, p. 112). Roles for this study are those defined by professors at one university. Professorial role definitions were collected (via interview, observations) and analyzed to understand the professorial experience in two distinctive ways: in terms of professorial work (such as teaching, research, and service) and in terms of the role definitions associated with the comprehensive pattern of behaviors and attitudes linked to the many roles a professor occupies (advisor, teacher, mentor, colleague, etc.). Roles provided definable units in which to organize the dynamic faculty experience both in terms of structuralism and symbolic interactionism.

In terms of roles, structuralism enabled me to uncover both the system itself and the movement of the players within it, and analyze both in relation to each other. Stryker (2001) argues symbolic interactionism and structuralism together “examine ways in which social structures impact persons and interaction and the reciprocal impact of persons and interaction on social structures” (p. 212). The symbolic interactions observed demonstrated behaviors and attitudes of professors within two distinctive ranks—JPs and professors, the position each rank holds in relation to the other ranks, and the interactions between and among the ranks. Issues such as authority, collegiality, as well as isolation
were among some of these interactions. Interestingly, as the roles were in the process of being redefined, the interactions were also in flux. Symbolic interaction as a method allowed for the shifts in the perceptions of roles and the interactions between and among the roles. Structurally, similar dynamic entities affected each level of analysis and structuralism provided a means for allowing the shifting context to emerge as a new reality. Together structuralism and symbolic interactionism in terms of roles helped to uncover the enduring impact of the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms professorial work and role definition at this one university.

Role Theory

According to Biddle (1979), “role theory differentiates individual behaviors, social activities, and the phenomenal processes that presumably lie behind them” (p. 12). Within those terms, it is important to understand a brief history of role theory as it relates to the evolution of concepts such as these. Role theory is often likened to a theatrical play with actors playing their assigned roles (Biddle, 1979; Clouse, 1989; Stryker, 2001). Shakespeare’s literary imagery of role in his play As You Like It is revealed by the character Jacques’ when he exclaims that “All the world’s a stage and all the men and women merely players; They have their exits and their entrances; And one man in his time plays many parts” (Shakespeare via MIT, 2011). The theatrical concept was appropriated by sociologist Erving Goffman in his dramaturgical orientation of “life as a theater” (Kivisto & Pittman, 2007, p. 272). With this in mind, this study operationalized roles on the stage of higher education in terms of how they have been perceived and enacted by professors before and after the two major reform efforts.
Methods

Research Paradigm

This study was grounded in an interpretivist paradigm. The interpretivist paradigm is a system of thought in which new knowledge can be acquired through subjective forms of inquiry. Within the interpretivist paradigm, researchers seek to understand rather than change the status quo (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Willis (2007) explains that "interpretivists [are concerned with]...the situatedness of knowledge" (p.99). As a result, the interpretivist paradigm’s epistemology holds the belief that interpreting both the subjective meaning of individuals and groups as well as the contexts in which their stories, lives, and situations are positioned is essential. Researchers working in the interpretivist paradigm believe that "humans behave the way they do in part because of their environment" and in part "influenced by their subjective perception of their environment—their subjective realities" (Willis, 2007, p. 6). The ontology of this paradigm posits that reality is not absolute nor can it be fully defined. Instead the axiology of the interpretivist paradigm is that individual’s perceptions of situations or phenomenon are valuable and worthy of being researched. Interpretivist researchers value the individual’s story and context. Hence, within the interpretivist paradigm, researchers can better understand "how humans interpret the world around them" (Willis, 2007, p. 6). This study interpreted meaning from participants’ experiences in their own words and actions through interviews and observations.
Strategy of Inquiry

The strategy of inquiry for this study was a case study. This study was conducted as an embedded single-case design with two primary areas of interest: professorial work and role definition (Yin, 2003). The case study as a method of inquiry and data analysis was chosen for this particular study because it provided a space within which such a distinctive policy impact study could freely develop. Policy impact while it would be desirable to be highly predictive, it does not always work that way. As an American scholar studying German professors at one university, I sought to understand policy impact in the natural reality of the case, not in terms of any other policy context. This case study was an explanatory case study; this method is used when “you deliberately want to uncover contextual conditions—believing they might be highly pertinent to your phenomenon of study” (Yin, 2003, p. 13). Aligned with the structuralist theoretical framework and symbolic interactionism, this study uncovered meaning from context. The primary context was one university. But impacting that university environment and the professorial experience were many other “contextual conditions.” They flowed on a continuum from macro- to micro-level circumstances (European to group/institutional level), each impacting the university setting. This case study left space for each level of impact to be uncovered when applicable with a primary focus on how they relate to professors at this one university.

Sampling and Participants

This particular university setting was selected as a representative case study of a German Universität that is research intensive, former East German, and a non-winner of
the *Excellence Initiative*. Further, Dr. Thomas Gruenewald and Dr. Regina Neum-Flux were willing to sponsor me, as they are interested in my area of research. Therefore, the selection of the university itself was purposive (Patton, 2002). This institution provided a unique landscape to understand a very young university that also represents a former East German university and all of the historical and financial challenges associated with the former East. Uni Potsdam, which is highly engaged in the German scientific community, provided landscape for understanding macro-level initiatives on a micro-level through the eyes of professors at a university-type that is not often being studied like many of the “Excellence-winning” universities.

The participants for this study were sampled from two disciplines: economics/social sciences (WiSo) and natural sciences (NatSci). The two disciplines were chosen as two research-intensive fields of study. Additionally, they each occupy equivalent portions of this university’s student body. Twenty-six percent of students at this university major in *Wirtschaft- und Sozialwissenschaft* (economics and social sciences), while twenty-seven percent major in *Mathematik und Naturwissenschaft* (mathematics and natural sciences). Interestingly, however, there are significantly fewer WiSo professors than NatSci professors meeting the needs of the same percentage of students, therefore offering a good comparison group. Also, in terms of external research funding, these two departments look very different. In 2009, the *Wirtschaft- und Sozialwissenschaft* department brought in € 2.791 million of external research funds to the university while the *Mathematik und Naturwissenschaft* secured €27.068 million (Statistics of the University, 2011). This difference in research funding served as an
important point of comparison for how professors worked differently with varying
degrees of research funding yet similar teaching demands.

Professors were further divided into two groups: early career (1-10 years) and
later career (11 years+). Twelve early career and 13 later career professors participated
for a total sample of 25 professors. The sampling method was purposive non-random
criterion sampling as I selected participants based on their discipline first and then an
equally divided sample of each early career and later career professors within the
disciplines (Patton, 2002). One additional later career natural scientist wanted to be
interviewed in the end making there an uneven number between the groups.

Demographics included five females and 20 males and eight non-German professors one
of which was a dual citizen and 17 German-born professors. In terms of status, 21 were
full professors including two who were former JPs, one former Apl\textsuperscript{8} Professor and one
current Apl Professor. In addition, I interviewed five Junior Professors.

To begin my sampling process, first I sent an introduction email to professors in
German introducing my study and what would be involved to participate (See Appendix
A). I also included a link to www.surveymonkey.de where I provided them with a
preliminary survey that helped me to see their years of service, background, specialty
area, and campus location (See Appendix B). From there I was able to begin the
interview process and throughout my four months in Germany, I continued to contact

\textsuperscript{8} Ausserplanmäßiger Professor, which translated mean Outside the Plan professor. A unique distinction for professors
who do not technically enjoy the full privileges of a professor like pay, departmental funds, or secretary administrative
support but do teach and conduct research. They have typically been appointments for former East German professors
who did not have extensive research portfolios after reunification, as they were not the cultural norm in the insular East
German society.
professors, speak with ones I already interviewed, and emailed Deans in order to complete my sample size. Up until the very last day I conducted interviews and actually exceeded my participant goal. In addition to the professorial interviews, I interviewed three institutional leaders as a means of providing further university context and understanding the Bologna and German higher education structures from their perspective. These three interviews were only used for understanding structures in this study and no perceptions or opinions from these interviews were included in the data analysis.

Having two groups that included (1) 12 early career faculty and (2) 13 later career faculty is important to the design of this study. In terms of professorial work and role definition, it was interesting for my study to understand a wide span of time across the professorial career path as it is highly cited as very long and often insecure for new scholars in Germany (Böhmer & von Ins, 2009; Cavalli & Teichler, 2010; Enders, 2001; Everts, 2008). As such, understanding the professorial experience in terms of years provides a much richer perspective for the impact of reforms. This group included professors with long-term institutional knowledge, participants who were products of the new junior professorship reforms, professors with a full range of experiences that clearly spoke to the impact of change, and as a very interesting point of comparison—some had a Habilitation and others did not.

Data Collection

The four methods of data collection for this study included: interviews, document analysis, and observations.
**Documents.** Document collection is an essential reality in any research study. For this study, the documents served as the structural foundation for analyzing professorial roles. The Bologna Process, German legal documents, and university policy documents (when available) were extensively analyzed for structural organization, policy foci, legal role definitions and structural relationships. By analyzing the original Bologna documents including the Bologna Agreement and the Qualifications Framework, the details of the reforms were very clearly outlined and analyzed. Without understanding fully the intent of the written Bologna Agreement, an impact interpretation would be inaccurate. In addition, I analyzed many of the German legal documents from the German Constitution to the Higher Education Framework Act. Also the state-level documentation for the definition of the junior professor in the state of Brandenburg and other state documents were necessary to understanding a state university context. All higher education in Germany is state-governed therefore it was important to always begin with the state legal documents when understanding university structure. Document analysis provided a process to understand the discrepancy between the vision of the policy or initiative as it may differ from reality. Such information illuminated any discrepancies between the policy intent of the Bologna Process and their practical application and impact a decade later.

**Interviews.** I conducted 25 professorial individually interviews and three university leader interviews total (see Appendix C for institution leader interview protocol). Twenty-three of these interviews (see Appendix D for professor interview protocol in English) were conducted in English and five were conducted in German. All
interviews were recorded via digital sound recorder and transcribed verbatim. Member checking, an important method that provides quality assurance in data generation (Shenton, 2004), was employed in three ways. During the interview, I posed questions such as "I hear you saying... is that accurate?" as well as repeated my interpretation of what they have said to assure it was understood as intended. Second, I emailed verbatim transcriptions to each interviewee via email after the interview. With these transcripts, participants were given the opportunity to adjust, add to, or clarify points from their interviews and many of them did. I asked them to then send back the transcripts to me via email and I updated their transcription prior to data analysis with additional information and/or changes (Manning, 1997). Each level of member checking is a way of ensuring that I was accurately representing the participants’ thoughts and feelings (Glesne, 2006). Following each interview, I made personal notes in my reflexive journal as to personal observations of the participants and points of interest from their interviews. My journal provided an immediate form of reflection for me as the researcher and provided additional texture to the participants’ interviews.

Observations. Throughout my four-month stay, observations of professorial daily interactions and my own personal professor conversations were recorded daily and understood within the context of the university. As a visiting scholar, I was given my own office on campus where I worked under one professor and his doctoral group of students. In addition, in our building were quite a few other professors and I became familiar with everyone over the fourth month period. I was able to observe daily interactions between professors in my normal daily life and then also in the departments...
that I visited. Observation is a very important aspect of data collection as it provided one aspect of basis for my theoretical lens of symbolic interaction. Symbolic interaction by definition is the social interactions within a context that hold meaning in some way, definable by the observer. The other aspect of symbolic interactionism for this study was the perception of interactions through the eyes of professors and then my interpretation of these interactions from their interviews. For professorial roles, I observed as much professorial activity as I could on a daily basis to the degree that it was permissible and pertinent. The data gathered from these observations formed my field notes. I reviewed these field notes during data analysis as a reminder of my thoughts throughout the four months.

Data Analysis

This study employed the method of data analysis in qualitative research known as coding. “Coding is a procedure that disaggregates data, breaks them down into manageable segments, and identifies or names those segments” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 32). This was done in four ways: initial coding, focused coding, axial coding, and theoretical coding (Charmaz, 2006). Following each interview and subsequent transcription, I read the data generated and began the initial coding process. This required that I broke the data into smaller units, each of which represented one idea or part of a larger idea. Conceptually, these units were small, logical concepts directly from the data. Charmaz (2006) explains that this process provides the backbone for the rest of the data analysis process—“it moves us toward later decisions about defining our core conceptual categories” (p. 47). This process produced one code (or category) per unitized concept.
Through the three forms of data collection in this study, unitizing will look somewhat
different for each (See Appendix E for examples of coding). For interviews, the unitized
codes were the deconstruction of the professors’ narratives into smaller parts. For
observations, these unitized concepts were data from my own perspective and smaller
units of participant/general professor behavior observation. Observations were first
physically observed then written, next broken into units of data, and lastly organized for
themes. For document analysis, policy documents from government agencies were
unitized and coded as well but as a means of distinguishing between overarching policy
goals and not as a thorough analysis of each line of text.

When doing initial coding, I employed a constant comparative method, in which
related categorical titles are matched. To constantly compare means that I began with the
first data unit and assigned a category to it (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Then, for each
subsequent unit, I compared it to all previous units before it to see if there were any
shared categories. If so, it allowed for groups of units to form shared codes with similar
data information. If not, I then created a new code specific to that unit. Charmaz (2006)
explains this as “compar[ing] data with data” (p. 49).

I continued using this method with every transcript, used consistent codes across
cases (see Appendix F for a list of all codes created through this method). This is a type
of inductive analysis often found in grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss,
1990). Of course, this study is not grounded theory; instead it is merely using a similar
method for analysis. Charmaz (2006) describes this initial coding process as quick and
free flowing. Its purpose is for initial recognition of segments of data to be analyzed
further through future coding processes. It helps the researcher to recognize the interconnectedness of data units and categories, and as such allows for the inductive emergence of findings (Patton, 2002).

Upon completion of initial coding using the constant comparative method, focused coding was used to further categorize each code into larger emerging themes. For example, units of data included initially coded “hours teaching per week,” “student learning,” and “lectures” and data units were then categorized during the focused coding process as “teaching.” Once the data were defined both by initial and focused codes, I then organized each category “into subcategories, [which] specific[d] the properties and dimensions of a category, and reassemble[d] the data you have fractured during the initial coding to give coherence to the emerging analysis” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 60). This process is known as axial coding. After axial coding, the most abstract level of coding is theoretical coding. This is the point during data analysis when I analyzed overarching themes from the data into connected theoretical ideas. In this case, I was attentive to structuralism and symbolic interactionism. From this larger conceptualization of data, I depicted the relationships among data through a visual representation in charts that were matrices by early career natural scientists (ECNatSci), early career social scientists (ECWiSo), later career natural scientists (LCNatSci), and later career social scientists (LCWiSo) so I could see comparisons across groups. Charmaz (2006) explains that theoretical codes “not only conceptualize how your substantive codes are related, but also move your analytic story in a theoretical direction” (p. 63). This level of coding led to
my final conclusions for this study through both a lens of structuralism and symbolic interactionism.

Conclusion

This chapter identifies the conceptual framework, paradigm, and methods used to execute this study. This embedded single, exploratory case study in the interpretivist paradigm sought to understand policy impact on professorial work and role definition both in terms of structure and the symbolic interactions of professors at one German university. Structuralism was the primary theoretical framework for this study and was analyzed on the micro level at this one university but in the context of the larger, macro and mezzo level reforms. Also on the micro-level, the symbolic interaction between professors and the ways they define their work and roles was also analyzed. Data were collected from document analyses, interviews, and observations. This qualitative study carefully explored how both the Bologna Process and German higher education reshaped professorial work at the University of Potsdam in the winter term 2011-12.
Chapter 4

The Heritage of the University of Potsdam

An institution built in a region with a deep heritage and a colorful history, the University of Potsdam (Universität Potsdam or Uni Potsdam) is a mid-sized German research university established in 1991 after the fall of the Berlin Wall in former East Germany. This “new” university was developed from intercultural negotiation, merging national identities, and a hope for its future in a reunified Germany. The University of Potsdam today is comprised of three vibrant university campuses located in Golm, Griebnitzsee, and Am Neuen Palais (At the New Palace) across the state of Brandenburg. Each campus houses distinct disciplines and possess their own campus histories. The purpose of this chapter is to outline the deep heritage of the University of Potsdam and set the stage for the context of this case study on professorial work during the winter semester 2011-12, amid the university’s 20th anniversary. Knowledge of the history of the university provides a deeper understanding of how this young German institution of higher education has evolved and expanded, and why it prides itself as a scientific community of scholars focused on the acquisition of new knowledge and the teaching of generations.

The Early Years

Before the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the University of Potsdam’s main campus (Am Neuen Palais) was the largest East German Pedagogische Hochschule (Pedagogical College)\(^9\). The institution’s headmistress, Margot Honecker was also the

---

\(^9\)The original name of this institution was Karl Liebnecht Pedagogische Hochschule (1971-1991). Liebnecht was a socialist activist, son of the founder of Socialist Democratic Party (SDP), and the founder of the German Communist
German Democratic Republic's (GDR) Minister of Education as well as the wife of Erich Honecker, the head of state for the GDR. With this relationship came a strong tie between the GDR governmental goals and the ways that teachers were instructed to teach. A highly regulated government, the GDR required all individuals who attended college to agree to the philosophy and principles of Socialism.

The legacy of this campus as a former East German teachers college was not lost with the fall of the Wall. Even today the teacher’s education program at Uni Potsdam remains strong. Many former employees from the teacher’s college continue their work on campus today, namely as university secretaries and a few professors. At the time of transition after the fall of the Berlin Wall and as reunification began, students were still enrolled at the teacher’s college and were on track to complete their coursework to become teachers. They could not be asked to just stop their course work. So, together the new West German and the former East German professors who taught during the GDR continued to teach the *Pedagogical Hochschule* students as they completed their coursework. For East German professors their appointment often equated to short-term contracts, instead of full appointments into the new system. Historically the East German professors were not absorbed into the new university out of fear of their allegiance to the GDR and its Socialist principles. But today at Uni Potsdam, a few East German professors still remain. One LCWiSo explained,

Party. Upon the establishment of the University of Potsdam in the reunited Germany, his name and statue were removed to make way for the new German political ideology—democracy (Zimmerman, 2011).
But I think in recent years in particular, we made great progress in fully integrating these colleagues as well. And I don’t think we look at them differently and I’m not sure they look at us differently: the Western imports. But of course you know you see there, in social science and humanities it matters even more than natural sciences, the paradigm is totally different. And these were people who were on a career path to be the academic elite of the GDR and that didn’t happen. That didn’t happen. And so you got, you have a degree of sensitivity for that, I think.

In fact, those that were not integrated into the new system often had to discontinue their academic career path and instead find new work. The transition was a delicate one.

The genesis of Uni Potsdam required a significant level of negotiation by leadership and professors both to accomplish the goals of the university and to respect individuals past (East) and present (West). The first president of Uni Potsdam was Dr. Rolf Mitzner, an East German. One current Uni Potsdam professor, who was employed when the university was founded, characterized Dr. Mitzer’s reign positively. “And he came from the East, but he was enthusiastic, making a lot of mistakes, because he didn’t know how it happens but he wanted to build up. [It was] fantastic. Really impressive for someone – he dream[t] and envision[ed].”10 As years went on, Uni Potsdam emerged as a research university by recruiting many university leaders and professors from the West and beginning the university anew. Originally professors worked only on the Am Neuen

---

10 Many of the interviews for this research were conducted in English, which is not the first language of those participating. Often in qualitative research, participants’ responses are not as complete as written responses, but when the language is secondary; the responses may be a bit more awkward. I will use direct quotations regardless of the linguistic problems and with only small adjustments for clarity. Further, other interviews were conducted entirely in German. I will translate these responses and am responsible alone for their accuracy.
Palais\textsuperscript{11} campus, a historical landmark. Today professors and students are situated on three different university campuses and the university continues to expand with new buildings and renovations each year.

**The Uni Potsdam Campuses**

Uni Potsdam's three campuses of today are each very distinctly different. The university divides them by discipline and every campus holds its own unique history. Students today are able to travel between campuses by train or bus with ease and often students have courses on more than one of campus in a given day. Each offers student housing in close proximity and typically professors either live in the state of Brandenburg or close by in Berlin. All of the Uni Potsdam campuses contribute to the university as a whole.

**Am Neuen Palais Campus**

The *Am Neuen Palais* campus houses the majority of university leadership (President, Vice Presidents) as well as the Philosophy Faculty, which includes modern and classic languages, art, media, religious studies, philology as well as two Institutes—Institute of Mathematics and Institute of Physics. *Am Neuen Palais* is considered the main campus. It is the most picturesque of the three, most centrally located to the city of Potsdam and the downtown tourist attractions, as well as the leadership hub for the university.

\textsuperscript{11} As a point of clarification, there are three locations referred to around Schloss Sanssouci. The Schloss Sanssouci is the oldest and most famous "palace without worries," a Prussian historical landmark. Neues Palais is Emperor Frederick the II's "new palace" he built about 1 mile away from the Schloss and which is very close proximity to the campus. *Am Neuen Palais* which literally translated me "at the new palace" is Uni Potsdam's university campus directly behind Neues Palais.
*Am Neuen Palais,* is located on the same land as the *Neues Palais Sanssouci,* a renowned Prussian landmark and the former “new” palace of Emperor Frederick II in the 18th century, only a short distance from the grand *Schloss Sanssouci* (the Palace without Worries) built in 1747. In the 19th century, the Emperor William II occupied these palaces after Emperor Frederick. The university uses many of the Emperors’ buildings today. Located on *Am Neuen Palais,* the current cafeteria, where students enjoy lunch or quick snack, was actually William II’s former horse stable (Zimmerman, 2011). Although much is anew on the *Am Neuen Palais* campus, the university utilizes the historical buildings throughout the campus by restoring and reusing space and equipping it with Wi-Fi, coffee machines, classroom technology, and using it for administrative space.

**Golm Campus**

The *Golm* campus accommodates the Faculties of Mathematics and Natural Sciences (including the Institute of Biology/Biochemistry, Institute for Earth and Environmental Science, Institute of Physics, Institute of Chemistry) and human sciences, the departments of teacher education, linguistics, psychology, and education. The *Golm* campus holds powerful memories from the Nazi (1930s-1940s) and the DDR (1950s-1980s) eras. From 1930-1945, *Golm* was used as a barracks for air force intelligence until the end of World War II (Zimmerman, 2011). According to numerous professors, Admiral Canaris, once a friend of the Nazi party and later in opposition, used the campus in the 1930s to plan counter-espionage strategies against Hitler and the Nazi regime. One professor explained,
Previously, before the Stasi came, in the back of that, in these older buildings, there sat the defense of General Canaris and he conducted counter espionage. So [it] was not the Gestapo or something, but this was the Military. Of course, [it] was highly secretive. In that respect the site also has a Nazi past.\textsuperscript{12}

From 1951 forward the Ministry for State Security used Golm (\textit{Ministerium für Staatssicherheit}) for the "\textit{Juristische Hochschule Potsdam-Eiche}."\textsuperscript{13} The school taught psychological warfare to the DDR military. Professors explained the curriculum as training military to interrogate prisoners.

Today, Golm is the largest physical campus of Uni Potsdam and is close both in physical proximity and collaboration to three Max Planck Institutes. In fact, the physical movement of the natural science program from the \textit{Am Neuen Palais} campus to the Golm campus in 2000 was envisioned by the former Director of the Max Planck Institute and executed by the University. The director believed the close relationship could build strong, scientific collaborations between university and the world-renowned research institutes. Today, many natural scientists cited the Max Planck Institute relationship as a selling point for joining the University of Potsdam. One ECNatSci shared,

Of course there are some additional aspects to it like in my case, the proximity to the Max Planck Institute over there and [my natural science department] where we have some overlapping interest with, so that's good to have such an environment to interact with. And Potsdam is a great city [to] live in, I think, it's very nice.

\begin{footnotes}
\item Translated from German to English by author.
\item In English "Law School of Potsdam-Eiche" with Potsdam as the city and Eiche a neighboring village
\end{footnotes}
In addition, natural scientists appreciated the opportunity to be adjacent to so many Max Planck Institutes. One LCNatSci explained, “This is the only place in Germany where you have three Max Planck Institutes in one single location.” The unique location of the Golm campus provides fertile ground for many scientific collaborations and advancements in professorial work.

**Griebnitzsee and Park Babelsberg**

Griebnitzsee is home to the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences. The latter consists of four main departments: economics, political science, sociology, and business. In Griebnitzsee’s vicinity is the Park Babelsberg (all located on the University’s Campus III as it is called), which houses the government and public management schools and is a part of Uni Potsdam’s third campus. The Griebnitzsee campus is an interesting setting as it is located on the East/West border of the Berlin Wall. It was:

Highly visible when the Berlin Wall was built in 1961: It encompassed almost 2/3 of the whole site, which seemed to protrude like an arrowhead into the “class enemy’s” territory. At some points the Wall ran only a few meters in front of the buildings and through properties and paths likewise, lined by watch towers. Today the streets are reconnected and the once deserted sand strip is now the site of the university’s new buildings. (Zimmerman, 2011, p. 72)

The German Red Cross owned the property from 1896 until the mid-20th century when the university bought it. Towards the end of World War II it was used as a Red Cross headquarters (Zimmerman, 2011). About 12 years ago, the Hasso-Plattner-Institute,
which houses information technology systems and engineering studies, became a partner of Uni Potsdam on the Griebnitzsee campus. Professors from the University teach at Hasso-Plattner and university officials host meetings in their buildings. Like the Max Planck Institutes on the Golm campus, Hasso-Plattner partners with the university.

**Former East Influence**

The University of Potsdam is the youngest and largest university in the state of Brandenburg. Inevitably the university is influenced by its former East German context of Potsdam. Participants for this dissertation come from a variety of different European countries and from the East, West, North, and South areas of Germany. Each person offered his or her perspective of what the East German influence looks like still today for the University. Interestingly very often this came from an outsider’s view (either West German or European) and in a few instances from an insider’s view (East German). One LCWiSo explained that transitioning from the East to the West was eye opening. He/she shared,

> You must see, in the GDR, one did not have the possibility to read a book from West Germany; we had only East German books and Soviet Union books. So far it was sort of a new worldview. I think one’s own belief [system] comes from the fact that you can watch the world, and this possibility was only for the first time allowed and through close contact with many professors and other people from West Germany, this is where we were able to get a different view of the world. I think that was a good process.  

---

14 Translated from German to English by the author.
In today’s Uni Potsdam, one LCWiSo believes there is no real difference in terms of East and West because so much time has passed. The professor explained,

But that has absolutely no institutional meaning now because the staff there actually was replaced completely. Where there was a meaning was at student level because the students in the first generation [after the fall of the wall], when I came, still had a certain GDR socialization. Who had been in the FDJ, a large part is because they had even done military service in the East German army who were really more educated than [typical] DDR youth. Then if you asked a student today, “who is Honecker,” the students do not know even know if they came from East Germany. That is gone, largely. Sometimes people may believe [in the past] everything used to be better if they come from the East.

But otherwise it does not matter anymore. And there are also studies that have been done on this, so 2001, if there are differences of East German and West German students, then, ten years later. There is a consciousness and today there are some still that are like, we are from the east and we are from the West. But in terms of musical tastes, there are no differences. That is, the differences are imagined differences. In reality there are not.

Some professors interviewed shared that the East characteristics they do notice are those intangible characteristics of staff members, especially secretaries, who were in the former Pedagogical Hochschule and remained on staff. Some professors shared the belief that many kept the Socialist mentality to not question authority, suppress individual

---

15 Freie Deutsche Jugend—Translated as “Free German Youth,” a Communist activist student organization
16 Translated from German to English by the author.
thought, and ensure duplication of proof in the event it may be requested in the future. This characteristic was illustrated when paperwork was submitted to secretaries and professors were required to sign triplicates of each document. Also professors cited that they faced challenges in getting requests answered in a timely manner because there was not a sense of "customer service" as part of the former Eastern culture. An ECWiSo explained the former East system was one where individuals were not ever fired nor were they offered incentive to work more or harder. He/she said,

I mean what I would say is that East in that respect that they come from a traditional, an organization where they had influence of people. So of course they had to... well if you want to, if I put it a little sarcastically, they had to somehow, have them to do something, ja. And so a lot of the processes are very slow and also sometimes the attitude as well, ja you know, a service attitude is different. And you sometimes have the feeling that they don't even have a clue of what you're talking about if you talk about a service attitude.

One ECNatSci stated, "But because University of Potsdam is a new university but most of the administrative staff has been taken over from past pedagogical college, so there is a lot of old thinking still in the ranks." However, beyond frustrations from professors in ordering equipment and additional paperwork, interviewees generally felt that the former East influence at Uni Potsdam was something that belonged in history and is not necessarily a huge influence in their reality today.
Uni Potsdam Today

Uni Potsdam currently has a student body of 20,999 students, over 200 professors, and in 2011 the university obtained €44 million in external research funding (Statistics of the University, 2013). Uni Potsdam is an actively engaged research university distinctive in its history. The state of Brandenburg in which the university is located receives the lowest allocation to higher education of any state in Germany and thus Uni Potsdam must often do more with less and also find ways to secure revenue outside its state funding without charging tuition. As such, Drittmittel (external research funding) accounts for a significant portion of the revenue for the university's operation, organization, and budgeting. The Uni Potsdam history brochure “Einst und Jetzt” (Then and Now) posited that,

In times of competition among universities for state funds, excellent research is more and more often dependent on successful acquisition of third-party funds.

One look at the budget of the University of Potsdam shows just how trend setting this can be (Einst und Jetzt, 2011).

As a means of supporting university efforts and further elevating research productivity, the University of Potsdam today collaborates with many local research institutes beyond just the Max Planck Institutes mentioned in Golm. These research institutes play an important role in the university through providing (a) students research opportunities and (b) providing Institute researchers with teaching and student recruitment opportunities on campus. For this dissertation, quite a few professors who held joint appointments
between an institute and Uni Potsdam were interviewed. Some of the joint research institutes included:

**Uni Potsdam Partnering Research Institutes**

- *Deutsches GeoForschungsZentrum* (GFZ): German Geo Research Center
- *Leibnitz-Institute for Astrophysik* (AIP): Leibnitz Institute for Astrophysics
- *Alfred-Wegener-Institute for Polar- and Meeresforschung* (AWI): Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Science
- *Potsdam-Institute für Klimafolgenforschung* (PIK): Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research
- *Abraham Geiger Kolleg gGmbH*—Abraham Geiger College, academic seminary for Rabbis
- *Akademie für Psychotherapie und Interventionsforschung GmbH*—Academy for Psychotherapy and Interventions Research
- *Evangelisches Institut für Kirchenrecht e.V.*—Evangelical Institute for Canon Law
- *Hasso-Plattner-Institut für Softwaresystemtechnik GmbH*—Hasso Plattner Institute for Software system technology
- *Institut für angewandte Familien-, Kindheits- und Jugendforschung e. V.*—Institute for applied family, children, and youth research
- *Kanonistisches Institut e.V.*—Canon Institute
- *Moses Mendelssohn Zentrum für europäisch-jüdische Studien e. V.*—Moses Mendelssohn center for European Jewish Studies
- **Verein Weiterqualifizierung im Bildungsbereich (WiB) e.V.—Team Skills Development in Education**

- **Johannes-Overath-Institut e. V.—Johannes Overath Institute**

One LCNatSci stated, “We are probably the science faculty in Germany with the most extra-university institutes and jointly-appointed professors per capita.” Another LCNatSci explained,

> Ok, the University of Potsdam in some areas is unique because it’s a young university but that’s not the main point. We have a very, very good link with external research institutes so here in Golm. This link between all these external institutes means that we have more subjects we offer than are visible from a number of professors. So we only have about 210 professors here in the university but the number of externals is also very large. So this faculty has 77 professors and there’s about 200 people total that have this professorial level, most of them being externals and these other institutes.

The University of Potsdam therefore utilizes its location in the state of Brandenburg and the proximity to Berlin to offer professors collaborative opportunities beyond just the walls of the university through many of research institutes and to offer researchers from research institutes opportunities inside the university. It is a scientific hub for this region and one in which professors are very proud to be a part.

**What is unique about Uni Potsdam?**

During professorial interviews, each participant was asked what they thought to be the most unique attributes of Uni Potsdam. In setting the stage for understanding how
professors experience their work and have weathered the reforms over the years, it is important to understand the context in which they work and why they feel it is special. Professors shared the top three most unique things about Uni Potsdam are: (1) collaborations with research institutes (as described in the previous section), (2) proximity to Berlin, and (3) its unique internal institutional characteristics.

Proximity to Berlin. Uni Potsdam is only about 23 miles by train or car from Berlin, the capital city of Germany. Many professors and even students live in Berlin and commute to the university. One LCNatSci explained that this close proximity to the larger city was a positive feature of the university. He/she stated,

Maybe it’s location. I mean, we have the advantage, we are a new university, one of the East German universities with all the problems that implies in terms of funding, in terms of attractiveness normally and to others and so on and so forth. But we have the great advantage that we’re very close to Berlin, which makes it much easier for us to recruit senior personnel because it’s a very attractive city to live. Many of them commute; many of them commute in an East German university. They don’t want to live there because usually it’s somewhat provincial even if it might be a pretty town. And so we have the advantage that Berlin has an international attraction so I think on average when we advertise post where they get paid more than anywhere else. Perhaps even worse paid; we get good applicants. And the same goes for our students. We wouldn’t get the number or quality of students if it wasn’t for our physical proximity to Berlin. If we were 50 km away from here we would have huge problems. But you know the
ones that are a bit thrusting and enterprising; they want to be in a bigger town where something is happening, which Potsdam isn’t. It’s very quiet in the evening. So I think it’s lucky in its location and we are lucky in of course through the Berlin universities, through the concentration of research capacity in Berlin, also in Brandenburg in the natural sciences. So this is a huge advantage for us and maybe not one in which we make quite as much as we should, but it’s a huge advantage which other East German universities simply don’t have.

Many professors across departments agreed with this statement and cited this close proximity as a true advantage and one is a great benefit to Uni Potsdam as a whole. As a point of reference, the city of Potsdam has a population of only 159,000 people (City of Potsdam Statistics, 2013), while Berlin has a population of over 3 million (World Atlas, 2013). An LCWiSo stated that what they found special was the location of the university in the small town of Potsdam. He/she said, “What is special? Well, maybe that one is in a beautiful small town on the outskirts of a big city, so that is really nice to look at.”

The city is also a very popular tourist attraction with the Schloss Sanssouci and the historical downtown area. Potsdam is a quaint small town with a rich history and provides a special place for Uni Potsdam to reside. Its close proximity to Berlin offers the best of both worlds.

**Internal University Characteristics.** Uni Potsdam as a very young university has made quite a bit of progress towards establishing itself in a German research realm. One LCNatSci shared that over time Uni Potsdam’s reputation has developed and that

---

17 Translated from German to English by author.
"We have now a very good record. We have world-recognized individual scientists and we have an impact all over Germany in some fields and even worldwide." An ECNatSci supported this notion, "I think what is unique about Uni Potsdam is I think there is hardly another university in Germany where so many serious efforts have been made to improve the quality of the courses and of the entire university."

In the university, though it seems like a large institution, professors still enjoy a close-knit community where they feel they can be familiar with the Chancellor and President. In fact, one LCNatSci explained that he/she had been very pleased with the choice to be at Uni Potsdam. He/she elaborated, "finally maybe, I never regretted coming here and I'm really glad that in addition to my science work which is really fantastic that I can work in this university so it's really for me a top place. So I have been at good universities but here it's really good."

Conclusion

The University of Potsdam as a case study is like no other university in Germany. It provides a unique landscape within which to analyze the impact of the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms on professorial work. This study was conducted during the winter term 2011-12 during the 20th anniversary of the university. It was a time of reflection for the leadership, professors, and staff to discuss where they have been and where they strive to be. It is in this distinctive context that the following chapters offer insight into the impact of policy reforms on professorial role definition and work at the University of Potsdam.
The changes across German higher education over the past 12 years while connected with the Bologna Process are quite distinctive in their own right. While there are multitude of reforms to explore, this chapter focuses on two main changes within the German higher education system specific to professorial work—the new junior professors (JP) and the increased role of competition in professorial work—have impacted the lives of professors. These two areas are framed in the context of the University of Potsdam in the winter term 2011-2012 and based on my analysis of the perceptions of the participants involved. These substantial higher education alterations have changed not only the operations of the university to varying degrees but also the professional work of its constituents.

**Junior Professorship**

As a means of improving the career path to a professorship, the junior professorship was first introduced in 2002 as part of the Fifth Amendment of Higher Education Federal Framework Act.\(^{18}\) The Amendment *required* institutions to create positions for junior professors (Welsh, 2009). Interestingly, after opposition by three German states, the German Federal Constitutional Court two years later ruled this action to be outside the jurisdiction of federal lawmakers and declared the act to create a junior professorship null and void. Because many institutions already had created some junior faculty positions between 2002 and 2004, the Federal Government passed a “repair act”...
on December 31, 2004, suggesting the creation of junior professor positions within German universities rather than requiring them. The final result was that officially, since 2007, “the junior professor has been embraced legally by all German federal states” (Welsh, 2009, p. 6). Thus, the existing and long-term professorial hierarchy had a new structure imposed on it.

In practice, the creation and implementation of the new JP established a new role that catalyzed varying reactions to its place in the academy as well as formal and informal roles associated with it. Within this context, the following section outlines the creation and subsequent reactions to the JP by older professors, the construction of formal rules associated with the JPs both at Uni Potsdam and in the state of Brandenburg,19 and finally the informal rules that have been socially constructed within the institutional and departmental contexts. Each of these sections provides a framework for understanding the impact of this significant higher education reform on professorial work at Uni Potsdam.

Creation of the Junior Professorship at Uni Potsdam

At the University of Potsdam, the first JPs were established either in 2005 or 2006. However, the formal adoption of the new status of the JP versus its implementation and cultural acceptance occurred at different times. As with all public higher education institutions in Germany, Uni Potsdam is a state-governed entity and directly accountable to state law. In this case, the state of Brandenburg’s accountability includes the creation

19 The state of Brandenburg includes three universities and six Fachhochschulen (universities of applied science). Potsdam is the capital of Brandenburg and Uni Potsdam is the largest institution of higher education in the state with over 20,000 students. All other institutions of HE in the state enroll under 6,500 students (City of Potsdam, 2013).
of the JP. In the *Brandenburgerischer Hochschulgesetz* (State of Brandenburg Higher Education Act) written in 2004 and revised in 2007, the Junior Professorship position was designated as a six-year teaching and research position at the university under certain conditions.\(^{20}\)

In order to be appointed as a Junior Professor, individuals are required to possess three key elements: (1) a university degree (PhD), (2) a teaching ability, and (3) an aptitude for academic work usually due to the outstanding quality of a doctorate.\(^{21}\) Once appointed, a JP understands that after the six-year fixed term, he/she must leave the current institution to find another position, ideally a full professorship, at another university.

After the JPs have succeeded through their three-year evaluation period, they receive a *Habilitation equivalent* and they are then eligible to begin applying for full professorships outside their institution. As such, many of these JPs have gained leverage at Potsdam by seeking and receiving offers from other universities, thus pushing the department to make exceptions if it did not want to lose the asset. It is not against to law to offer a permanent position, but generally speaking the policy sets the JP tenure as a six-year term that coincides with the allocation of funding. For institutions, a chair position must become available around the same time as the offer is to be made. At Uni Potsdam, the permanent appointments for JPs only have occurred within the natural sciences. The social science departments do not appear to have the same resources to

\(^{20}\) A JP is given a three-year probation period in which to prove themselves and are evaluated on their scholarship and teaching after that period. If successful, they are awarded a *Habilitation Equivalent* and can be appointed for an additional three years for a fixed nonrenewable six-year total term (Brandenburgerischer Hochschulgesetz, 2007).

\(^{21}\) Translated from German to English by the author.
appoint JPs permanently. These formal and informal rules differing between departments will be discussed in greater depth in later sections.

**Early Reactions to the Junior Professorship**

For the most part, the professors feel that imposition of the new status of JP caused two main concerns: (a) the JP was merely the nation and state’s way of reducing costs and (b) the creation of the JP was a way to eliminate the Habilitation—a rite of passage for the professorate in German higher education. Interestingly both of these concerns hold truth but additional positions exist as well. First, the state does provide incentive funding to universities for appointing junior professors and the universities have been able to hire these teaching personnel at a much lower salary than new Professors. Thus, professors feel a reduction of opportunities for additional full-time positions in exchange for cheaper labor. One ECNatSci Professor (non-JP) stated that his/her initial reaction to the JP was that it was “absolute nonsense. There is absolutely no point and the only idea to hire people who have a certain amount of teaching to do to reduce the number of positions for associate and full professors level.” Yet this individual completely changed his/her opinion after working with an exceptional JP in his/her department.

The creation of the JP also has heightened seasoned professors’ concerns for JPs and their need to qualify. Creating this new position meant that JPs occupy a new role in the academic hierarchy. Earning a *Habilitation equivalent*\(^{22}\) via JP rather than the
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\(^{22}\) *Habilitation equivalent* is not awarded to JPs in every German state. It is, however, the option for JPs in the State of Brandenburg.
traditional route poses an unknown risk for JPs that could create challenges for them in future job markets. The Junior Professor’s **Habilitation equivalent** is still a newer concept. Therefore, it is important that during their JP term, they spend their six years publishing and obtaining external research funding to fully qualify in the job market no matter their unique **Habilitation** designation. These requirements also mean that that the time demands on JPs are often a challenge with the teaching, research, and service demands. From a traditional standpoint, older professors feel that the JP can be a more challenging position for young scientists to qualify than the traditional career path due to these high demands on JPs’ time.

Finally, the state and institutional investment in one individual trouble many professors when there is not a long term return. One LCNatSci professor said with these incentives the “Junior professorship, I think, is a nice idea for the government side, complete waste of time for us.” To remedy this, older professors are now trying to create a tenure-track JP status beginning **at the hiring point** in a hope to remedy the lack of foresight.

Our faculty has thought of it a different way. We’re thinking of having all professors start as tenure track. So there, if we...apart from really top positions where the people have to lead big groups...the other positions we want to start them off as a junior professor and then if they flourish through that time, then they can go automatically from W1 to W2. ...So, when the W2 position is going to be vacant in the future, then we would then often now think in our faculty as starting
it at a W1 with the option to tenure-track later. That’s been done in three or four cases now.\footnote{W1 refers to a Junior Professor, the lowest level of the professorial classification. W1 is equivalent to an Assistant Professor in the US. W2 is an appointed tenured professor that is equivalent to an Associate Professor in the US. W3 is the highest designation and is equivalent to a Professor in the US.} (LCNatSci)

In these instances, the LCNatSci professor feels that the JP tenure track option would provide financial incentives for the university and state that invest in these positions through the long term returns from JPs’ external research funding and from Professors’ training time and the efforts required to socialize a new faculty member to the institution.

The second major concern of the professors is that the JP was created to eliminate the \textit{Habilitation}. When the federal government first introduced the JP in 2002, one argument for its benefit to the professorial career path was that the elimination of the \textit{Habilitation} would offer a more expedient path for young scholars to reach Professor. But after the controversy with the states taking back the ownership of higher education decisions, this act was ruled unconstitutional for the federal government to eliminate the \textit{Habilitation}. In many cases, professors at Uni Potsdam indicated their strong belief that the \textit{Habilitation} would continue to exist for many years to come. Yet, a majority of LCNatSci and LCWiSo professors feel that over time the \textit{Habilitation} might eventually fade away in Germany. About 1/3 of participants believe that this old tradition is no longer necessary in the international context of academia.

Nevertheless, regardless of their stance on the future of the Habilitation, most indicated affection for their personal path to the professorate that honored the tradition of
preparing for the professorate by working under a *Doktorvater*\(^{24}\) for many years to hone one's research skills. In many instances they felt fortunate to have had an excellent mentor in their *Doktorvater* and as such, were able to publish extensively and finalize their Habilitation with expert support. Although some were concerned with the goal to eliminate the Habilitation, all of the professors interviewed stated that when hiring new professors, the Habilitation equivalent, the cumulative Habilitation, and the monographic Habilitation are considered equal now and no preference was given to one over the other. Yet, they are not certain if this same consideration is true across all German universities.

On the more positive side, older professors interviewed also perceive many advantages of the JP for young scholars. Professors generally agreed that it offers a new career path and with it presents three main advantages: (a) greater independence for scholars at a younger age, (b) an increase in the number of women in the professorate, and (c) an opportunity to reduce the Brain Drain in Germany. Traditionally, the average age of a newly appointed professor has been between 38 and 40 years old. A core goal of the JP is to offer an earlier entry point to the professorate for young scholars so that they may become independent at a much earlier time in their lives. As such, it provides opportunities not only for the individual and their career aspirations but also for the scientific community in terms of nurturing new, creative, innovative ideas generated through a new cohort of engaged JPs. These opportunities mean JPs publish independently earlier rather than merely co-authoring with their Habilitation chair.\(^{25}\)

\(^{24}\) *Doktorvater*, literally translated is Doctor Father and refers to one's mentor, PhD chair, and/or Habilitation Chair.

\(^{25}\) A long-standing cultural tradition in Germany has been typically to share all publications with Habi chairs as co-authors.
Further, JPs also may apply for external research funding, such as large Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) grants and EU grants, at a much earlier stage.

The German government from the beginning sought to increase the number of women in the professorate through the JP route. This policy intention aligns with the social dimension of the Bologna Process that “aims at equity and equality of opportunity, including gender in higher education, making these goals for universities throughout Europe” (Pritchard, 2010, p. 47). Historically women have not been well represented in the German professorate. In 2006, women only made up 11% of the highest-level professors (C4 in the old system; W3 in the new\(^{26}\)) with an increase from 1993 to 2004 of only about 0.5% per year (Pritchard, 2010). One of the goals of the establishment of the JP was to encourage female scholars to continue beyond their PhD and find a qualifying route that could be conducive to professional fulfillment in conjunction with family responsibilities. Historically, “women complete the Habilitation even later than men and encounter serious difficulties reconciling family responsibilities with their professional life—one of the reasons why there are so few female professors” (Enders, 2001, p. 15).

Many of the senior professors’ first reaction to the JP status were that the status would give women “a chance” in the academy that was traditionally male dominated. One LCNatSci professor has been impressed by the JP in his department; as a JP, she had been highly productive publishing in top-tier journals every year, teaching at a very high level, and even giving birth to two children. Although not an advocate at the status’

\(^{26}\) The shift in the German professor classification system from C1-C4 system to W1-W3 is explained in greater depth in the next section of this Chapter.
inception, his positive experiences with his JPs has changed his attitude. He now fully supports this career path for young scholars including exceptional women.

The Brain Drain, an outflow of the best and brightest scholars and students to other countries lured away with more attractive offers, has been a real concern in Germany (Federal Ministry of Education and Research, 2008). In the late 1990s, Everts (2008) explained that many young scholars felt that the Habilitation caused the Brain Drain from Germany due to its cumbersome nature in the advancement process. A non-German ECNatSci JP explained “I think that the big problem, and I base this on just what I think, is that the German academic system was bleeding people. So lots of people were leaving and those that were left behind were not the best.” Many young German scholars sought positions in the UK and the US after completing their PhD in order to begin a tenured professorial career path without the need for a Habilitation. Without the Habilitation requirement to enter into a teaching position, the opportunity for young scientists to remain in Germany with a paid position and the possibility for a competitive professorship after a six-year term has become more attractive with the JP. The need to prevent the Brain Drain is important not only in Germany but across Europe. Through two European policies, the Bologna Process and the Lisbon Strategy\textsuperscript{27}, the European Union sought to create the most competitive knowledge economy in the world. As such, the idea of creating opportunities that incentivize young scholars to remain in their home country or within Europe is not only a goal on the institutional and German level, but European wide (Bologna Process, 2010; Lisbon Strategy, 2000).

\textsuperscript{27} The Lisbon Strategy is now well known for not fulfilling its original policy intent to make Europe the most dynamic, competitive knowledge economy by 2010.
The creation of a new role in the German professorial hierarchy produced a variety of opinions both from the traditional professors who had long held their positions and new scholars who aspired to them. During the winter semester 2011-12 however, the majority of professors and JPs interviewed felt positively about the junior professorship despite initial reservations. No matter the diversification of avenues to the professorate (JP, cumulative Habilitation, monograph Habilitation), participants posited again and again that the German culture would always require the second level of qualification after the PhD as a prerequisite for promotion to Professor. However, in the future many expect the criteria will move towards valuing a publication compendium that exhibits an impact on the field rather over the traditional 400-page book-length monographic Habilitation.

**Formal Rules of the Junior Professorship**

The formal rules for the junior professorship at Uni Potsdam are summarized in two primary policies on the state and institutional level: The *Brandenburg Hochschulgesetz* (State of Brandenburg Higher Education Act) as well as the *ber die Feststellung der Bewährung von Juniorprofessorinnen und Juniorprofessoren an der Universität Potsdam* (University of Potsdam Statute of the Establishment of Probation of Junior Professors). The state of Brandenburg is responsible for: the general qualifications by which a JP may be hired, their initial appointment period of three years with the addition of three more years after a successful evaluation, as well as the fact that the JPs evaluation must be coordinated by the Dean of a JP’s department with the approval of the *Fachbereichsrats* (Faculty Council). In addition, the state higher
education act clarifies the role of the JP as a fixed appointment Civil Servant in contrast to a Professor who is employed as a Civil Servant for life. Once an individual is appointed permanently, the individual is subject to the professorial statutes not outlined in the JP section of this act (Brandenburg Hochschulgesetz, 2007).

The Uni Potsdam statute for junior professors provides much more detail for the JP evaluation process than the Brandenburg statute. This statute includes: the assessment procedures, the convening of the evaluation process, the duties of the review commission, the self-report of the JP, the review of the research and external reports, the evaluation of teaching performance, the opinion of faculty council, the decision to parole, the timeframe of the evaluation, and the entry date of enforcement for this statute. The legal document explains that the Dean is responsible for initiating the evaluation of the JP through prompting a self-report and then the Dean must establish a Review Commission of departmental colleagues. In the event that a JP has a joint appointment with the University of Potsdam and a non-university institute (which is the case with many JPs at Uni Potsdam), the institute leader (Director or top Professor in that particular section) establishes a Review Commission of scientists within their particular field or discipline.

After the evaluation of the Review Commission, the Faculty Council must evaluate the final report and write an official opinion of the JP evaluation with a decision of retention or not. The final report that serves as the evaluation document is based on a JP’s achievements in research and teaching and includes three parts: (1) a self-report from the JP that demonstrates the quality and quantity of their teaching, research and service, (2) at least two external reports from external reviewers commissioned by the

28 Translated from German to English by the author.
faculty evaluating the JP’s research activity in their first three years, and (3) student evaluations of their teaching. If the JP is approved for their additional three years, the Dean then notifies the JP, the Faculty Council, and the Rector immediately of the Review Commission’s decision. If a JP is not approved, then he or she is given a one-year opportunity for reconsideration. All of these decisions have to be made prior to four weeks before the end of the three-year employment term.39

Beyond the specified requirements in state and university policies for JPs, the participants feel a lack of specified structure around their position. Each JP and Professor indicated that JPs’ teaching requirements are always four hours per week as mandated by the state. Participants also described the importance of JPs to qualify during their first three years but clear expectations beyond the amount of teaching time are not always shared with JPs. In fact, no guidelines specify the quantity and quality of articles that a JP must publish during this probation period, the amount of external research funding they should obtain, the number of grants they should seek, the quality of teaching required, or an amount of service to the university and their field necessary to be successful for their evaluation. Instead JPs tend to work within the context of their scientific community and peers, from the lessons learned from their Doktorvater at another university, or their observations of departmental operations. They indicated that they are guided more by their intrinsic motivation to be an excellent scientist than by written requirements steering their actions. The lack of formal institutional evaluation criteria for JPs leads to the question—how are they evaluated if there is no formal institutional policy? The professor’s feel that criteria must remain subjectively tied to the

39 Translated and paraphrased from German to English by the author.
discipline and based in the context of one’s field and therefore not generalized across disciplines. They believe that the evaluation criteria should depend on the individual department. As such, the ways in which JPs qualify at this institution is more constructed within the context of the German scientific and disciplinary culture than by the university formal structure.

**Informal Rules of the Junior Professorship**

Informal rules are created within each role that an individual or group occupies in society. A newly created position such as the JP is not surprisingly full of informal rules that are being socially constructed along the way. The participants shared five most common informal rules of the JP: (a) research is the most important function of their position; (b) counteroffers from other universities are the best way to leverage negotiation; (c) permanent position offers to JPs differ greatly between natural sciences and social sciences; (d) JPs enjoy formal independence but informally each JP constructs what that means both positively and negatively; and (e) the JP’s informal hierarchical role may differ from the formal.

**Research is most important.** The role expectations of a JP when they begin at the university is to occupy a certain space on campus (office, lab), to be available to colleagues and students, teach classes, participate in some service, and conduct research. Among these expectations, JPs indicate that they try to protect themselves most from service requirements due to time demands and lack of incentives to participate. One ECWiSo JP stated, “you try to avoid everything that is extra work.” The most incentivized role expectations are research productivity and acquiring third party funding
for research. Successful research is most important as it significantly benefits JPs in their evaluation process, the job market, and their standing in the scientific community. Teaching, while important, does not hold the same status as research. However, many JPs feel very passionate about their teaching and educating strong students in their field. Therefore though not incentivized directly, JPs prioritized their students’ education. Some other JPs described teaching as a sacrifice they have to make to be a professor. This feeling is not unique to JPs however; quite a few Professors also elevate research over teaching. Many scientists whether they like to teach or not, perceive themselves as scientists first and foremost and relegate all other roles as secondary or tertiary.

The University of Potsdam, however, is dedicated to improving the outlook on teaching as well as its quality. In fact, Uni Potsdam won a national Excellence in Teaching award in 2009 and now has established graduate school workshops for post-docs, Habilitanten, and JPs to improve their teaching methods. The hope is to continue to improve not only the quality of teaching but also the incentives for professors and JPs to improve their teaching. One problem is that the system does not incentivize teaching through compensation the same way it does for research due in part to the funding culture of universities and the current economic situation. However, teaching excellence is nonetheless a stated focus of the university.

**Counteroffers.** The JPs’ fixed six-year term is quite common but at Uni Potsdam some JPs have been fortunate to be appointed a permanent position in the natural sciences. An informal rule for both German professors and Junior Professors is that when one receives an offer from another university, the faculty member is then able to
leverage a negotiation with the university for a reward—a permanent position in the case of the JPs or a promotion and/or pay raise for Professors. In some instances, when a JP/Professor receives another offer, the university may send them on their way and wish them well if it does not wish to keep them. In many cases, the university has decided to retain the JP/Professor with a counteroffer. In these cases JPs have been offered full-time appointments as a Professor, which carries a permanent Civil Servant status. One ECNatSci shared that one of the greatest disadvantages of the JP is that it carries “no stable long-term perspective.” Therefore, a full-time appointment is an ideal situation for a JP not only professionally but also personally in terms of their family life. This permanency is especially important for dual academic couples.

Differences in Departments. The ability to negotiate a permanent appointment is very different between natural scientists and social scientists. Social science JPs interviewed explained that absolutely no funding is available to continue their employment at the university and after six years without question they must leave. Some LCWiSo professors rationalize their situation as being legitimate due to the policy of the higher education act. Informally, however, the natural sciences and social sciences departments play by different rules. Both early and later career natural scientists are seeking avenues to change the system to create a tenure track for JPs; they also hope to keep excellent JPs over the long run. The social sciences appear not to have the same degree of leverage.

As a point of contextual understanding, in 2009, the Wirtschaft- und Sozialwissenschaft department at Uni Potsdam brought in €2.791 million of external
research funds to the university while the *Mathematik und Naturwissenschaft* secured €27,068 million (Statistics of the University, 2011). The natural scientists also make up almost half of all Professors at the university. Thus, the natural scientists enjoy more positional power at Uni Potsdam, based in part on research funding but also in mere quantity, than social scientists. Consequently, it appears this positional power also carries weight in the retention and promotion of JPs to professorships.

**Formal independence holds different meaning for different people.** Other informal rules include the fact JPs are formally independent entities, but not necessarily always equipped for that status. The goal of the JP independence within the context of a newly established position holds both positives and negatives for JPs. Currently, the independence holds informal positional rules that are continually being constructed. On the positive side, this JP independence provides the opportunity to manage their own research, publish as a single author, teach classes alone, and organize their professional world in their own way. As a downside, they have very little, if any, mentoring by older professors, they are often separate physically from other professors and staff, and receive little guidance. Some JPs are reticent to ask questions of senior professors but then often feel isolated. Some go to other research institutes or to their former universities to talk about research or to collaborate with colleagues, because they do not feel collegiality in their current situation. Not all JPs feel isolated though. Some enjoy the freedom and feel well prepared to take on the independence at this stage.

**JP’s hierarchical role.** The constitutional academic freedom of a Professor is applicable to the JP as a formal rule, but the independence at this earlier stage in one’s
career is not as fully established as that of a Professor in terms of their age and their place in the hierarchy. Most academics as Habilitanten would be working directly under a Professor and receive guidance every step of the way at the same age of the current JPs. In the past, some complained about this dependence that continued well into one's 30s and 40s. Now, some JPs appreciate this freedom while others would prefer just a little bit of guidance.

The last common informal rule of the JPs is their role in the faculty hierarchy. Formally the JP enjoys academic freedom, independence, and management of their work but informally many feel that they are still viewed as "less than" and not necessarily considered a bona fide colleague to Professors. Specifically, both ECNatSci and ECWiSo JPs stated that they feel they are not taken seriously by older Professors, do not feel fully integrated into their department, are believed to have taken an easier path, and are not fully respected. The hierarchy in Germany is very important and one professor explained that to say "colleague" in Germany carries a very specific meaning. A colleague is not merely a department member; it is an equal. Therefore a Professor's colleague is only another Professor. Generally speaking, most participants interviewed both in natural sciences and social sciences feel that integration will occur in time. As the JP is a new position and one that is still being fully established, its role in the professorial hierarchy no doubt will be legitimatized over time. In addition, participants feel that as older professors retire over the next few years, the change in mindset will also likely evolve.
The new junior professorship in Germany and at Uni Potsdam has been met with both resistance and incorporation. With the creation of a new role, the parameters of that role are being established over time and this certainly is reflected at Uni Potsdam. As time moves forward the reaction to the JP as well as its formal and informal rules will continue to develop and become systematized to meet the needs of the individuals, the workforce, the university, and the scientific community as a whole. As a major German higher education reform, the JP is a new career path for an aspiring German professor and situates itself amid both challenges and triumphs for progress in the German higher education system.

**Increased Competition**

Participants at Uni Potsdam have experienced a marked increase in competition in their work that impacts their professorial life. The following section presents an analysis of how competition has evolved in professorial work over Germany’s history from the 19th century to the present; its role in faculty work at Uni Potsdam in terms of (a) academic prestige, (b) personal motivation towards competition; and finally (c) participants’ view competition as playing a role in the German higher education structures as a whole through the Excellence Initiative.

**History of Competition in Germany**

Wolter (2004) explains the changes in Germany over the last six decades have been more than just reforms; they are a transformation of the German higher education system moving from state control to a differentiated competitive system. The first major transformation of German higher education occurred in the 19th century, in large part as a
competition for excellent professors. As described in Chapter 2, the Humboldtian age of
the German university in the 19th century has been memorialized as an ideal in German
history. It was a time when professors and students co-constructed a community of
scholars that learned from one another and advanced science with a thirst for knowledge.
It was also a time that the many structures of a traditional German university were
established including the Chair structure and disciplinary norms. In terms of competition,
“the German-speaking universities formed a market system (though paid for by state
funds) and that free-market competition among them for the best and brightest professors
was what spurred Germany to its scientific greatness” (Nyhart, 2005, p. 14). Institutional
competition was established in terms of where the best professors chose to conduct their
research, which established differentiation by respect and reputation. Conversely,
German universities were differentiated by status or divided by tiers.

In the 20th century, Germany underwent a great deal of turmoil in two World
Wars, dictatorship, division, reunification, and rekindling a national identity. Since World
War II, the German federal government has focused on the higher education system to
prepare employees for the labor market and industrialization, recognizing the need for
more practical education (Mayer & Ziegele, 2009). Competition slowly grew throughout
this century while enrollment grew rapidly. Wolter (2004) posits the 20th century
transformations of the German universities occurred in reaction to the massification of
higher education and the differentiation of the system that included Fachhochschulen
(institutions of applied science) and Technische Hochschulen (technical universities that
became part of the traditional university structure). The new stratification of the system
brought recognition of difference between universities and a sense of competition for position. Previously, the universities were considered the same. Now with new different types of universities, there was difference. This differentiation and the introduction of institutional competition was not initially accepted, however, as natural to the German system. Mayer and Ziegele (2009) posit that this gradual shift to greater competition across Europe started in the 1980s during the Reagan and Thatcher era; at first, however, the competition was rejected in Germany (Mayer & Ziegele, 2009). Between 1960 and 1980, 30 new universities sprouted in Germany along with 100 Fachhochschulen—all to meet the needs of a growing number of students. The creation of Fachhochschulen during this 20-year period created a new two-tier system. “This binary structure has characterized the German higher education system since the early 1970s” (Wolter, 2004, p. 79). Therefore the 1960s to 1980s introduced a new level of competition in German higher education to include competition both for the best professors and an institution’s place in the new stratified higher education structure.

In the 1990s, German higher education experienced another wave of change with many areas of great debate: “(1) state power versus institutional autonomy, (2) self-governance, (3) diversity and differentiation, (4) competition, (5) innovation, (6) quality assessment, (7) internationalization, and (8) stagnation of resources” (Wolter, 2004, p. 82-86). In terms of competition, Wolter (2004) describes Germany as coming late to the game. He wrote, “Standardization and weak differentiation imply that competition may be under-developed in German higher education” (p. 84). The main areas of competition remained for the recruitment of professors by institutions. But with the wave of interest
in competition, he added, meant that "Expert commentators believe the introduction of competition and market-orientation principles would raise the quality, effectiveness, and international attractiveness of German higher education" (p. 84). This concept positioned Germany for the 21st century initiatives as the EHEA builds momentum.

At the turn of the century, the EU's Bologna Process (1999) sought to increase internationalization, mobility, and to improve Europe's position in the global knowledge economy. As such, the increase in competition across Europe and in Germany was a policy goal as well as something implemented on each level of education—federal, state, institutional, and within the lives of professors. The growing momentum of competition is very much situated in a global context in which Germany competes with other European countries, the United States, China, and Japan for not only educational excellence but also advancement in innovative research and development. The increase in competition for professorial work, therefore, must be understood in terms of its history in the German system, the German professorate, and the introduction of new forces seeking to improve quality, competitiveness, and international standing.

**Competition's Role in Professorial Work at Uni Potsdam**

Today competition plays a clear role in German professorial work. Uni Potsdam Professors and JPs described its presence in three main areas: (a) academic prestige, b) personal motivation, and (c) perceptions of the Excellence Initiative. Each of these areas of competition provides the landscape for understanding the degree and depth by which competition plays a role in professorial work at Uni Potsdam.
**Academic Prestige**

Academic prestige plays an important role in how an individual judges oneself and colleagues in relation their contributions to their field. One’s academic prestige therefore is one’s status in their scientific field, discipline, and academic community. Professors at Uni Potsdam often referred to the professors who were the best in their field and working at a particular university. One LCNatSci stated, “We know pretty well where we stand.” At Uni Potsdam, professorial participants indicate a strong interest in being successful in the academic competition. Although the quest seems not to target a certain place in the prestige line, it is a driving force to achieve their “place” in the scientific community. They shared how they see prestige as a result of building relationships, networking, publishing quality work, and obtaining prestigious external research funding. One LCNatSci shared

Most of us need to talk, to discuss, and to play with concepts and so on.

Otherwise you cannot develop, and this is—there is of course, some kind of sports-like competition, who is the fastest to come up with the right idea or who is best to do some difficult experiment, things like that, or whoever finds the right equation. But that's really like in a sports environment; they do not compete for the title but just playfully. This is how it should be and this kind of competition is positive. The stress connected with it is a positive stress that helps everybody.

Professors suggested both directly and indirectly that their personal academic prestige matters to their sense of self. Furthermore, their work is much more situated within the context of a larger scientific community than within the institution or department. What
matters most to them is to have the validity of their work recognized as making a contribution to their field and to science as a whole.

The role of academic prestige has always played a significant part in professorial work in Germany and even with increased competition within the system; academic prestige is not a new concept. Instead it has remained characteristic of professorial work from the beginning. It frames the context of professorial life and is a driving force in which individual professors and the academy flourish. Today the mechanisms that lead to a prestigious status, however, have evolved into new iterations: more individuals competing for finite funds and more competition in the publication process. However, the quest for prestige remains a steady pursuit.

Professors shared the importance of academic prestige as a type of competition central to their work in the (a) attainment of research funds through the greatest competition in the DFG and (to a lesser degree) institutional funds, (b) publishing, and (c) building the best network of collaborators as analyzed below.

Research Funding Structures

Much of the competition in German professorial life is imbedded in the funding structures for research. Funding not only provides professors with the ability to support and expand their research projects and to add additional staff, it also conveys prestige and career elevation. It is also highly incentivized, both at the national and institutional levels.

DFG Competition. The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) is the central funding system for scientific grants in Germany. One ECNatSci noted that competition has always existed for DFG research money and thus, is not a new contest. However,
what has changed is that “there is always less money around than the year before and that's where the real competition is.” In actuality, it is an increase in the number of applicants competing each year and therefore the finite amount of funds appears to be less. One ECWiSo explained that a major reason for the increase in competition for the DFG funds is tied in part to the Excellence Initiative. Hundreds of research groups submitted proposals for the Excellence Initiative and very few were funded in the two rounds of competition—2006 and 2007. As such, those unfunded projects remaining in the pipeline were resubmitted for the general DFG funding. Now there are many more strong scientific projects in the applicant pool for DFG funding as a roll over from the German competition. However, this domino effect is only one portion of the national-level competition. Each year more professors and junior professors seek funding to remain competitive in their field. As the DFG is considered the highest level of competition in German academia, the incentive to compete is weighty. So with its prominence in professorial work, the competition is vast yet still finite.

Many professors interviewed were frustrated by the fact the DFG funding appears to favor more collaborative projects today than in the past. One LCNatSci shared “So, big programs get the money and there is virtually no money left for good individual projects.” One ECWiSo explained he had excellent individual ideas and did not necessarily want to share them with other researchers merely for the purpose of creating collaboration. He said that collaborations are excellent when they have a point, but just

---

20 DFG funds a multitude of grant types: large Excellence Initiative winners (Excellence Clusters, Graduate Schools, Future Concept Universities), DFG research centers, collaborative research centers, research training groups, priority programs, research units and clinical research units (German Science Foundation, 2013).
to create collaboration for the sake of funding was not his goal. He prefers applying for funding individually for many of his projects. Another ECWiSo explained that the purpose of increased competition in Germany was to improve scientific knowledge, but that it adds pressure to professors. An adverse effect is that competition for limited funds cuts the scope of the research questions being asked. According to faculty members, it creates more middle-of-the-road questions and less innovative, creative ideas. The ECWiSo explained,

I believe that sometimes the knowledge you get out of the mainstream research questions, it’s cut away. Small faculties, small disciplines, or a small topic within one discipline... the German research foundation would say “Well that’s interesting but it’s not worth being funded with €500,000 because it’s so small. Who wants to know that? The society? No.” So this [change] is a really bad development.

This shift in orientation also aligns with the EU’s funding agenda and favors more collaborative, multination research projects that are looking at “big science” questions to improve internationalization and the European knowledge transfer that will benefit Europe as a whole. Thus this shift is a strategy for many scientific funders to redirect as well as stretch the funding.

For another ECWiSo competiveness is not only having many research projects funded but also earning large numbers of Euros for the grants awarded. Fewer Euros available to distribute and more competitors obviously increase the competition for these funds. While research funds have always been encouraged for professors, the
competition for research funds is not only greater today but also more of a central focus in evaluating a successful professor. One ECWiSo explained that 10 years ago a professor in his/her field could be an excellent professor who published very strong papers but never obtained external research funding. The professorate did not require publishing and obtaining grants then as it requires now. So the cultural shift requiring a greater emphasis on research funding also increases the competition for its more prominent role and significance in the lives of professors. DFG funding especially is, as illustrated here, the area in which professors have seen the greatest increase in competition through the growth in the number of applicants, the change in scope of funded research questions, and the favoring of more collaboration.

DFG is not the only area of funding in which Uni Potsdam’s professors compete, but Professors describe it as a coveted funding stream for any German professor. Other funding competitions include (but are not limited to): German Ministry of Research (BMBF), Brandenburg Ministry of Science, Research, and Culture (MWFK), Deutsche Telekom, European Union (EU), Exxon, Friedrich Ebert Foundation, German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), Humboldt Foundation, Konrad Adenauer Foundation, Max Planck Society, Siemens, Swiss National Science Foundation, US National Science Foundation (NSF), and Volkswagen. On the institutional funding level, professors saw two areas of increased competition: the introduction of a merit salary system that decides annual salaries and a faculty point system tied to state funding that assigns point values to a Professor’s work.
Institutional Funding Structure. All German higher education institutions are state funded as prescribed by German law. Uni Potsdam, a state funded institution in the state of Brandenburg, has the lowest funding allocation to higher education of any state in Germany. Additionally, during the last decade, the institution has seen many budget cuts amid the global economic crisis. Not unique to Potsdam however is the shift for German institutions to move from an age-based professorial pay scale to a merit-based pay scale—C1-C4 system to the W1-W3 system. At Uni Potsdam, the professors' performance-based funding was implemented in two ways: the professor point system (instituted at Uni Potsdam, but differs by department) and the professorial salary system modification from the C-system to the W-Besoldung\textsuperscript{31} (a change Germany-wide).

Professor Point System. On the institutional level, Uni Potsdam’s professorial point system guides the amount of money each individual professor receives annually for his or her budgets. Interestingly not all professors interviewed were familiar with this point system while others understand it intimately. Each individual department decides the criteria in the point system. Essentially they can include the amount of external funding a professor brings in each year, the number of staff positions they have (post-docs, PhD, masters students), the publication record, the prestige of the journals, and the number of times a professor is cited in the literature (H-index\textsuperscript{32}). “Everybody is in the databases so you could see how much funding do I have compared to everybody else, how many papers, and how many papers do I have, how many citations do I have”

\textsuperscript{31} W-Besoldung translated means W-grade or W-classification.

\textsuperscript{32} H-Index is a calculation that includes the number of publications of a researcher and the number of the times they have been cited by other researchers. It ideally shows strength of impact in the field and the productivity of the individual researcher. However, some would argue that it only counts citations including one’s own citation of their work and therefore can often be inaccurate in gauging impact on the field.
explained one ECNatSci. Then the department distributes the funds from the university according to the number of points individual faculty have been awarded for their production. One ECNatSci elucidated

So every institute has a number x, y, z points and that's how the money is distributed. So that's quite important. And then once the money comes, the fraction of the money that gets through the faculty comes to the department, it's again split up according to your performance.

The money is distributed as professional funds for research rather than to their salaries. In WiSo, there are about six or seven indicators used to determine how many points that individual chairs are given to dispense. As each institute or department at the university determines its own indicators, the criteria differ across the university. In some WiSo departments, professors believed that publications play a smaller role in the decision process, yet in NatSci most professors indicated publication record as an important deciding factor. In both, however, the amount of Drittmittel or external research funding played a significant role in how much an individual chair is rewarded.

**Professor Salary and Classification System.** In terms of the professorial salary structure, Professors appointed after 2005 were no longer eligible for the C1-C4 classification system and instead were automatically placed in the W1-W3 system. All professors appointed before 2005 and thus classified under the C-system were given the choice to change to W system or remain in C. All of the pre-2005 professors interviewed decided to remain in the C system, which was not based on merit. In the C system

[^3]: At Uni Potsdam, many of the natural science departments are known as Institutes while the social sciences and economics departments are divided into the four disciplinary subjects. One ECWiSo described it as "We have no institutes here, we have 23 professors and they are individuals; Kingdoms within itself."
professors' pay annually is based solely on their age, years in the professorate, and their marital status and number of children. Thus, under the C system, “this competitive mechanism is limited because the personal allocation of funds is irreversible as long as the position or chair is held by that individual and cannot be reduced if a professor's performance declines” (Enders et al., 2002, p. 112). To remedy a lack of incentive in the age-based pay scale, the new W system was introduced with a much smaller base salary plus a variable amount that increases or decreases by the degree of research productivity and teaching quality. An ECNatSci explained:

This means you have a certain sort of flat rate; it’s irrespective of how old you are. You always get the same amount of money, which is about 25% less than it was in C. And you have the opportunity to earn additional money depending on how much work you do. So how much you actually achieve.

The new faculty salary system is a clear form of institutional competition as it is designed to provide incentive for individuals to compete for additional salary through performing their professional tasks at an optimal level. Not a direct competition from professor to professor, the system establishes an impetus for a professor to want to excel personally. However, professors found the incentives at times to be unattainable. One ECNatSci, “It’s a great idea but it’s unfortunately not working because the criteria—I once applied for getting additional money. And the criteria are so tough that it is actually impossible to meet them.”
The pot of money for raises, of course, is not bottomless and naturally pits faculty positions in the ranking against each other. One LCNatSci explains the greatest fallacy with the new system as

The problem with that is the money and the basic idea is that the better person gets somehow a financial bonus. The problem with that is the state provides the money to the university and that money is fixed. That means what the university can do is within that fixed amount of money that is available, it can give more money to some but that works only if there are weaker people that get less money. For me, that is really nonsense because the average is the same as before, of course. And that means having an improvement of the quality by this system doesn’t work. For every one that is a little bit better, you need another one who is a little bit weaker. Otherwise you can’t finance that, you see.

The professorial salary and classification system Germany-wide was created to improve incentive structure and subsequently increase the pressure on professors to perform in their lifelong positions at a high level. Of course, though money may be an incentive, it is not everything. In fact, one LCNatSci professor pointed out, "If someone works as a professor in order to make as much money as possible, I think they are in the wrong place." Competition plays a much more significant role in the professors’ lives within the new W classification system as it requires that a professor engage in comparing their work against a certain measure that then leads to how a portion of their salaries is allocated. This issue spans many areas of the professorate as it impacts the way
a professor looks at their work and offers incentives for certain academic actions both directly and indirectly.

Publishing

Publishing—sharing significant research with the academic community—has always been an important aspect of professorial work. Publishing in Germany is similar to the US and other countries in the way that professors seek to publish in the most prestigious journals in their field. One ECNatSci said “You want to be the first in order to be able to—the first thing to find something out and to publish something, to be able to publish in the most respected journals.” Another ECNatSci explained:

I mean the competition is that you want to publish. You want to publish good papers and of course you are keeping an eye on people that are around you in the same field that might compete for a position that you are interested in so you try to be good and make your best. That’s not real direct competition so far I would say.

The level of journal a professor publishes is also taken into account in the faculty point system, in the degree it contributes to a professor’s overall academic prestige, and when publishing in top tier, contributes to an individual’s sense of authority in that particular niche. One ECNatSci explained, “For instance, I very often look at the science citation index. I am of course interested in how many people all over the world cite my work. How many citations do I earn? What’s my H index?”
The publication process ties closely to the professorial incentive structure. One ECWiSo professor sees an increased competition over the last five years with more and more people sending papers to the top journals. An LCNatSci shared

There are [many] more scientists worldwide, you know, and so it is more difficult to get your papers published, because there are many more people in China and all other parts of the world who are doing good research and need to have their papers published in high rank journals, due to their science policies at home as well. So it is getting more and more difficult.

As a clearly incentivized competition, publishing in the top journals in one's field is an area that while not new to German academic fluctuates with the number of professors seeking publication in relation to the number of top journals in existence.

**Competing for the best network of collaborators**

Across Uni Potsdam, many JPs and professors believe in the importance of collaboration in their research not only as a means to advance scientific contributions but also to build fruitful networks in their field. "So, you know, a successful academic is not the one who competes successfully, but the one who collaborates successfully," said one LCWiSo. Further, another LCWiSo argued,

I mean the marker of distinction is not who your competitors are, but who your collaborators are. What are your networks? How are these networks perceived in terms of you know, the professional distinction of those who participate in it? And are you seen as a key player in the main networks in your field?
Both the European Union and Germany have established goals to promote collaboration in scientific inquiry and have designed programs to support multinational/multi-institutional research teams and publishing with co-authorship. Therefore in considering the role of competition in professorial work, professors consider not only their individual actions but also those in concert with fellow scholars towards common goals.

**Personal Motivation in Competition**

While external and internal competition can be a catalyst for personal action, professors discussed how the mechanisms in place substantiated their own competitive spirit. In most instances competitive spirit translates to the degree to which one chooses to engage in competition or not. Professorial participants posited that motivation to compete lessens over the course of one's career. Backes-Gellner and Schlinghoff (2010) confirm this point, “the literature indicates research productivity is not constant over a researcher’s lifetime, but instead fluctuates substantially” (p. 28). Many older professors interviewed designated competition as a concern for younger professors and as playing very little role in their work. The three main reasons for less competition in the lives of older professors include, their merit pay is not tied to productivity; no incentives push them to compete at this stage in their career; and they are no longer in need to qualify for promotion. Thus, more seasoned professors elected to remain in the C classification as they are paid regardless of their output; salary is based on their age. As one LCWiSo pointed out
I'm an older professor who still gets a fixed salary. The others have a fixed part and a variable part.\textsuperscript{34} [With the new system] there are management by objectives where you are rewarded when [you] solicit money or write a nice article. There are some discussions whether this destroys intrinsic motivation or not. This has been trend over the last few years and maybe it remains. Performance must be rewarded somehow, but it's difficult.\textsuperscript{35}

The increase in competition appears to have touched the LCWiSo professors the least of any other group. For both the later career scientist groups, they explained that while competition exists in professorial work, at the later stage in their career they are much less motivated to engage in competition. For many, their scientific quest was less about competing for status and instead more about answering scientific questions and contributing to future generations. It is interesting, therefore to consider how competitive spirit was incentivized in the former C-system beyond science for knowledge's sake. Technically there appears to be no formal means of encouraging competition in the former system beyond one's own intrinsic desire.

But, for the ECNatSci and ECWiSo interviewed, their own competitive spirit still plays an important role in their work. It is a motivating factor and an enjoyable part of their work. Many ECNatSci define competition as "healthy," "doable," and "a good thing." One ECWiSo feels that the competition should be encouraged and he/she enjoyed its role in their work.

\textsuperscript{34} Referring to the W1-W3 professorial classification.
\textsuperscript{35} Translated from German to English.
However, despite the intentions of the *W-Besoldung*, the incentive structure within the W system does not necessarily require a high level of performance for an individual who does not aspire to gain the additional bonus funds. One ECNatSci offered a hypothetical scenario in which a non-motivated future W professor could operate. A non-motivated professor *could say,*

I'm happy if I only get 80% of the core funding and I'd lose the 20% that are performance-related on top, and I'm happy with the salary I have. I'm happy with the number of positions I have, so from now on I'll just do the minimum that is legally required of me. I will not break my back too hard to try to publish in high-ranking journals. I will not run after a third party funding so I just relax and take it easy—nothing would happen.

This nonchalant view of professorial work, of course, was neither a participant’s view of himself or herself, nor a part of the intent in the new W system’s merit scale. Many of the younger professors who are in the W system are still in the stages of qualifying and emerging in their fields, so such a scenario would be years before it might emerge. It is, however, illustrative of a possible scenario that fits within legal requirements of a professor’s permanent civil servant status.

An individual’s level of competitive spirit is a very personal choice. One ECNatSci, described competition as not necessarily central to his/her motivation. “It’s also a personal thing. I like to do my job. I like to be good at my job and I don’t like to think I’m much better than this guy sitting next door.” Another ECWiSo stated, “If I wouldn’t be enjoying it and competition comes too fierce, I would quit; I’d immediately
quit because it wouldn’t be good for me. So for me I have a healthy understanding what my life is worth for me and what it’s not worth.”

An LCNatSci explained this personal motivation to be related to scholarly validation. He/she shared that the professorial culture contributes greatly to the competitive spirit of individuals.

And between each other we also used to just function, to do the job and that's it. You don't tell a colleague usually, “Oh, this was very nice how you did that.” Or, “You did a very good job there.” That's quite unusual. And because of this, people—I think people want to get positive feedback indirectly, and this is one way to be able to say, “I have done this better than the other one.” Or, “I have a higher H Index.” or “I have more publications.” “I brought in more money, and so on.” So this competition I think is not only something in itself but it comes from this [professorial] culture of being kind of detached.

Thus, professors’ competitive spirit is inspired by their own personal orientation to their work, stage in life, external mechanisms, and then finally their own need for professional validation in a collegial culture that does not naturally offer one.

The Excellence Initiative

Professors shared how the Excellence Initiative has impacted the competitive structures of German higher education. Germany’s Excellence Initiative implemented by both the DFG and the Wissenschaftsrat (German Science Foundation) in collaboration with the German state and federal governments has proven to be an impactful competition with both manifest and latent functions in the German higher education
system. The Excellence Initiative established a nationwide university competition to recognize, rank, and fund significantly the top German institutions in three categories: graduate schools, excellence clusters, and top Excellence universities. The competition occurred in two rounds—one in 2006 and the last in 2007 (Excellence Initiative, 2010; Fallon, 2008; Mayer & Ziegele, 2009). The purpose of this competition was to improve research productivity and quality nationwide, achieve a stronger international presence in research, and allocate funding specifically for new, creative, and innovative initiatives (Fallon, 2008; Mayer & Ziegele, 2009). Unmistakably, professors in Germany play an enormous role in the success of this initiative on the institutional level.

Uni Potsdam was not a winner in the Excellence Initiative but it is a secondary and tertiary research affiliate to three winning projects with local Berlin universities. Uni Potsdam professors and JPs shared their mixed reactions to the competition’s value to the system. Many professors have strong feelings about the Excellence Initiative’s purpose and the effect its outcomes will make over the long term. Professors’ attitudes toward the national competition focus on three issues: the Excellence Initiative’s validity in identifying excellence, the resulting stratification of the national higher education system, and the career ramifications for non-winners over time as a result of the competition.

**Identifying excellence.** In terms of identifying excellence, many professors believe that the metrics used in the competition neither measure scientific excellence nor demonstrate designations worthy of “excellence.” An LCNatSci points to the inappropriate measures used to designate excellent institutions. The professor stated:
But it has nothing to do with excellence. This is the crazy thing about Excellence Initiative. It has nothing to do about excellence because they are not measuring scientific excellence. What they're measuring is money. And they are using money for a proxy of scientific excellence. So where you have the most money, that is excellent, per this new definition.

He or she is pointing to an evaluative system that is rewarding those institutions that have already been successful in funding science. The Excellence Initiative advertises proudly that it “shook up the German science system” and will continue to promote its goal to “organize a competition to sustainably strengthen research at Germany’s universities and to raise the visibility of German science and research vis-à-vis our international competitors” (Excellence Initiative, 2013, para. 2). Thus, the “competition” appears to be an example of the Matthew Effect (Merton, 1968), whereas a cumulative advantage continues to reward successful initiatives.

Interestingly, many professors across groups believe that despite the Excellence Initiative being a new concept, an informal ranking of universities was always present, determined by the productivity of certain professors. People knew where the best scientists were and which universities were very strong. The competition merely solidified or further perpetuated a ranking system and provided a high level of funding for winners. For students who are deciding where to apply, this new ranking system has had an impact. Institutions with the higher designation have been able to recruit top students. One LCNatSci commented, “if you are a student, would you go to a university that is highly ranked or would you go to another?”
Stratification of German higher education system. The stratification of the German higher education system, professors feel, naturally has helped some and hurt others. One ECWiSo believes that the Excellence Initiative is merely “a structural decision by the government to stratify the upper end of universities.” One LCWiSo believes that the Excellence Initiative hurts the non-winners by creating more inequalities and weakening certain departments. Similarly, an ECNatSci feels that the program leads to many more inequalities in the system in the long run as more funding goes to the elite institutions and the remainder receives less and less. Thus, the Matthew Effect is in operation. In the context of institutional competition, the Matthew Effect is expressed in the principle of cumulative advantage that operates in many systems of social stratification to produce the same result: the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. Thus, centers of demonstrated scientific excellence are allocated far larger resources for investigation than centers that have yet to make their mark. These social processes of social selection that deepen the concentration of top scientific talent create extreme difficulties for any efforts to counteract the institutional consequences of the Matthew principle in order to produce new centers of scientific excellence (Merton, 1968, p. 62).

This new system of initiatives is creating a self-perpetuating cycle of reinforcing very strong institutions with expanded resources and improving their attractiveness to prospective students and professors. At the same time, other institutions may never be able to catch up and thus do not enjoy the same level of prestige. The shift in the system
has created not only a formal stratification as its manifest function but latently has established new challenges for non-winning institutions.

**Long-term effects on non-winning institutions.** In line with the conceptual nature of the Matthew Effect, many participants worried about the future of non-winning institutions in terms of sustainable programs—the poor getting poorer. Some ECNatSci and LCNatSci expounded that the non-winning institutions might need to close particular programs or modernize their programs in order to save money and to remain relevant for new students and professors. Other LCWiSo professors point out that the size of school affects an institution’s ability to compete and its capability of managing very large grants. One LCNatSci believes that the Excellence Initiative favors only older, larger universities and that the smaller, younger ones that have not demonstrated a long history of success are at a disadvantage.

Moreover, in addition to Potsdam being a relatively young institution compared with some of its competitors, it is also located in a lower socio-economic section of Germany. Still hampered by its recent history of Soviet domination, the East German universities were placed in a deficit position as a result of the national policies driving the initiative. The Excellence Initiative requires each German state to pay half of the funds that are awarded to the recipient university. The former East German states do not have the available funding to do so, as pointed out by one LCNatSci. Although many of these anticipated negative effects of the Excellence Initiative for non-winning institutions are quite possible, the competition and its effect on German higher education is still at its early stages and the overall impact will not be played out for many more years.
Conclusion

The German higher education reforms over the past 12 years have created a new age for the educational system and the lives of professors. This chapter analyzes the distinctive effects of the German higher education reforms in two main areas: the junior professorship and the growing significance of competition in professorial work. It is clear that both of the shifts to professorial work have forced professors from Uni Potsdam to adapt and find ways to navigate the new system. Many of these German higher education reforms are still new however, and the continuing impact on professorial work will remain of interest over the long term. This chapter outlines the significance of reforms in the daily lives of professors and offers a new complexity to the way that they experience their work and define their roles in the professorate.
Chapter 6

The Bologna Process at Uni Potsdam: Impact on Professorial Work

The European Bologna Process has created immense waves of change throughout the German higher education system as well as the 46 other countries involved. The Bologna Process (1999), as a structural policy initiative, supports the concept of the EHEA by promoting aligned degree structures (Bachelor’s, Master’s, PhD), encouraging student mobility, and seeking to internationalize the European higher education area (Bologna Process, 2010). The Bologna Process’ implementation in so many different cultural contexts has been complex and plays a significant role in the daily lives of professors as individuals who must adapt and effectively educate students within these new structures. This chapter analyzes how the Bologna Process was implemented at Uni Potsdam, the reactions of professors to Bologna in terms of their work, and the reactions of professors to their new relationships with students.

The new Bachelor, Master, and PhD Model

The new structure of Bachelor’s/Master’s/PhD model was implemented in Germany on a variety of levels and at different stages. The transition first to the Bologna system in Germany began as early as 1998 with the introduction of the new two-cycle Bachelor’s/Master’s degrees intended initially to parallel the traditional one-cycle Diplom/Magister\textsuperscript{36} degrees. But to help guide EU member countries’ implementation into

\textsuperscript{36} Definition of the Diplom and Magister: “An integrated study programme is either mono-disciplinary (Diplom degrees, most programmes completed by a fung [state exam]) or comprises a combination of either two major or one major and two minor fields (Magister Artium). The first stage (1.5 to 2 years) focuses on broad orientations and foundations of the field(s) of study. An Intermediate Examination (Diplom-fung [preliminary exam] fung or credit requirements for the Magister Artium) is prerequisite to enter the second stage of advanced studies and specializations.
the full new two-cycle degrees, the EHEA created first a qualification framework called the *Bologna Process Qualifications Framework in the EHEA* in 2005 and then later encouraged each member country also to create their own National Qualifications Framework by 2010. When written, the national frameworks were required to fully comply with the EHEA framework but also to offer greater detail into each unique cultural context. The Bologna Process Qualifications Framework in the EHEA was produced to serve as a guidebook for each member country and institution to understand what the Bachelor’s/Master’s/PhD degrees really necessitated. It outlines, “what a learner knows, understands, and is able to do on the basis of a given qualification” (*Bologna Process Qualifications Framework in the EHEA*, 2010, para. 2). Broadly, on the European level, the EHEA defined the student learning outcomes essential for the successful completion of each degree and the number of ECTS points comprising the degree cycles across all EHEA participating countries. On the member-country level, each country must adopt all of the EHEA framework but have some room for interpretation within each of their own national qualifications frameworks.

Germany constructed its National Qualifications Framework to include what it expects of students to learn (i.e., learning outcomes) but also details the various

---

fung. The level of qualification is equivalent to the Master level.

fung). The Diplom degree is awarded in engineering disciplines, the natural sciences as well as economics and business. In the humanities, the corresponding degree is usually the Magister Artium (M.A.). In the social sciences, the practice varies as a matter of institutional traditions. Studies preparing for the legal, medical, pharmaceutical and teaching professions are completed by a Sta fung. fung) are academically equivalent. They qualify to apply for admission to doctoral studies” (*BMBF & KMK*, 2008, p. 35-36).

37 The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) points are credit points that comprise each academic course that then add up to equal a full degree. They are similar to the credit point in the US. Points are only used for the Bachelor’s and Master’s; the PhD typically does not have course work.
components of the German Bachelor’s, Master’s, and Doctoral degrees. The Framework specifies that Bachelor’s degrees are awarded after three, three and half, or four years of coursework, require a thesis, and vary in official designation by discipline.\textsuperscript{38} The Master’s degrees are awarded after one or two years of coursework, also require a thesis, must be designated by the institution as “more practice-oriented” or “more research-oriented,” and also vary in nomenclature by discipline (BMBF & KMK, 2008, p. 35).\textsuperscript{39} For the doctoral degree, the German framework defines the general learning outcomes of research excellence and mastering of a field but permits each institution to decide the number of years, the content, and the more detailed learning outcomes for each program. Admission to a doctoral degree program in Germany legally requires that a student already have a Master’s, Magister, Diplom, Staatsprüfung (state exam), or foreign equivalent to be eligible. Beyond these criteria, the doctoral degree has no structural requirements in the framework (BMBF & KMK, 2008, p. 35).

To accomplish the learning outcomes of each degree cycle, the Bologna working groups and subsequent conferences provided talks, papers, and guidance for how to create modules, which would help institutions align their efforts to meet the EHEA learning outcomes. Learning outcomes have always been important as part of the Bologna Process as they were mentioned in each of the successive meetings: the Berlin

\textsuperscript{38} Bachelor’s degrees include: Bachelor of Arts (BA), Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.), Bachelor of Engineering (B.Eng.), Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.), Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA), Bachelor of Music (B.Mus.), and Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.).

\textsuperscript{39} Masters degrees include: Master of Arts (MA), Master of Science (M.Sc.), Master of Engineering (M.Eng.), Master of Law (LL.M.), Master of Fine Arts (MFA), Master of Music (M.Mus.), Master of Education (M.Ed.) and for professional master’s programs not necessarily connected in content to the Bachelor studies, other masters are awarded such as the Master in Business Administration (MBA). (BMBF & KMK, 2008, p. 35). NOTE: BMBF stands for the Federal Ministry of Education and Research and KMK stands for the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder of the Federal Republic of Germany.
Communiqué in 2003, the Bergen Communiqué in 2005, and the London Communiqué in 2007. Interestingly, however, the London Communiqué in 2007 was the first time that learning outcomes began to play a much more significant role in the implementation of the Bologna Process (Adams, 2008). "The humble learning outcome has moved from being a peripheral tool to a central device to achieve radical educational reform of European higher education" (Adams, 2008, p.5). For example, at the London Communiqué, the EHEA representatives emphasized the role of modules in building synergy between both the learning outcomes and the ECTS points designated for each course. Modules are the technical structures that professors teach that construct overall majors. In some cases a module is an entire course. In other cases, multiple modules are taught within one course. The definition of a module depends on the discipline, the professor, and the needs of the student for that particular major. Therefore, the relationship among learning outcomes, ECTS points, and modules is very important to understand how Bologna connects to a country, institution, and professor in the creation of new courses aligned with the new degree structure.

Thus, the Bologna Process curricular changes at Uni Potsdam are guided by three different sources each with their own agendas: the EHEA mandates for learning outcomes, the German qualification framework for learning outcomes, and the inevitable nuances that professors exercise to organize and prepare courses around learning outcomes. The construction of the new Bologna system within the German cultural context may only be understood by first explaining Germany's former system (Diplom/Magister/Doctorate). Professors have cited many structural and functional
challenges to the shift. They include helping students to plan their course of study, their own initial resistance to the change, and oftentimes the constraints students faced from moving to shorter degree cycles. The following sections analyze two facets of the Bologna implementation: The implementation of the Bachelor’s/Master’s from the Diplom at Uni Potsdam with attention to professors’ reactions of the new degree structure as it relates to their work and professors’ reactions to the impact of policy reforms on their interactions with students.

The Shift from Diplom/Magister to Bachelor’s/Master’s

The University of Potsdam endured three informal phases of Bologna implementation beginning in 2005. The first phase can be characterized as the resistance phase that, given its developments, was not successful. The faculty changed the names of the degrees to Bachelor’s and Master’s, but not the content or the approach. Instead, the overall instruction and academic organization remained the same as they had been under the Diplom and Magister, but carried the new Bachelor’s or Master’s label. One ECWiSo described it as

The majority of professors here in this faculty were not so enthusiastic about Bologna at the beginning. And there I was not involved in all these things but I know this from a lot of discussions. So their strategy was to ignore it because at the beginning you could open new studies on the base of Bologna, a new master’s

---

40 Because of the independence and less structured nature of the PhD as compared to the Bachelor/Master, professors spoke only of the changes to the Bachelor/Master and not to the doctorate. In Germany, PhDs do not typically have coursework and instead conduct both independent and joint research with their Doktorvater. Therefore from here forward, the main discussion will exclude the PhD.
and bachelor's program but you should not. There was no fixed date. In this faculty, they ignored it and they [wanted] to postpone as long as possible.

The second or implementation phase was much more successful and lasted for three to four years prior to 2009. The implementation phase was more focused on learning outcomes, program content, responsibility on the part of both students and professors, employability, increased accountability, and an increased number of student assessments (Prüfungen) each year. The current acceptance phase started in 2009 or 2010 and has included greater tolerance, organization, and understanding of what is required and needed to make it successful. An LCWiSo explained that the faculty is now “evaluating the programs and then we find that we must reorganize them. We must make them more innovative and that is the phase we are now in.”

Despite the improved degrees of implementation, Diplom and Magister students remain in the Uni Potsdam system. Many of the Diplom students take a very long time to graduate and generally began their studies before Bologna implementation. Some professors indicated that the length of time to degree was in part due to students taking courses that interested them without a specific structure to their course of study. Students were not really formally held responsible for their time to degree. One ECNatSci explained,

What I see with Diplom students is that they take forever to finish. So you have a period of taking classes and then you have to do a project and that project can take you ages. So you have these students that are like, “Oh I'll do my project next year.” So you can essentially be a student forever.
Thus their procrastination often led to a very long-term degree cycle. A non-German ECNatSci exclaimed

    Because once you had...if you were a student for seven years, you had the flexibility to study whatever you wanted. Then you wake up after seven years and say, “What am I doing here? I’m not employable.” So that’s one thing. It’s beautiful but it’s not really practical, if you really think about it.

Students therefore have remained in the system for many, many years and their long-term plans remained ambiguous. The system never faulted them for this either.

    From an organizational standpoint, the Diplom/Magister students are still studying alongside Bachelors/Masters students in their courses creating a convergence of distinctly different systems in teaching and learning. One LCWiSo explained, “The problem for us was that we had a parallel Diplom, Master’s and Bachelor’s degree programs and therefore to some extent the impression perhaps appeared as if we have the same events for all three things. The conversion was done so gradually.”41 The professor also noted that almost 600-700 Diplom students in the economics and social sciences alone are continuing to study at Uni Potsdam over multiple cohorts. Natural scientists also indicated many Diplom students remain in the pipeline taking classes alongside Bachelor’s and Master’s students.

    Some professors would argue that retaining students in the Diplom degree system is not negative, merely because of the value intrinsic within the Diplom itself. Many professors interviewed felt very strongly that the Diplom gamers great prestige in

41 Translated from German to English by the author.
Germany and that a Diplom graduate is regarded as a well-educated, knowledgeable individual with a breadth and depth of knowledge in their particular area of study. One LCWiSo added “And many thought that [the] German Diplom is recognized as best in the world.” An ECNatSci stated, “What my impression is that people here are very proud of what they had.”

Through the various curricular iterations, professors have gained valuable knowledge into structuring their instructional work to meet both the legal requirements and the needs of their students as they move closer and closer to the pure Bachelor’s and Master’s system. Inevitably both challenges and successes accrue from the complex transition and have had both a positive and negative effect on professorial work.

Reaction to the New Degree Structure as it Relates to Professorial Work

Professorial work entails the three core responsibilities of research, teaching, and service. Professorial participants reacted to two main areas of Bologna reforms that impact their work directly: increased instructional requirements and less defined processes for curriculum reform. Both have led to confusion and disagreement within the faculty. These two areas of analysis shed light on the ways in which Bologna has required a restructuring of the current context within which professors must work and the ways that they experience their roles.

Increased instructional requirements. The Bologna Process certainly has increased the instructional requirements for professors in comparison to the Diplom. The key change does not affect the structure of teaching (i.e., class size, student to teacher ratio, and hours per week required to teach) but instead has increased the faculty’s
attention to detail in the core formats of instruction: Vorlesung (lectures) and Seminare (smaller discussion groups). In addition, the natural science professors also supervise laboratory courses that include demonstrations and student experiments.

Lecture courses at Uni Potsdam typically enroll 100-300 students per class. Seminars normally have 30 students and focus on more specialized topics in a field or discipline. Uni Potsdam currently has a student-to-teacher ratio of approximately 100:1. The teaching load for each Professor at Uni Potsdam is eight hours per week and four hours per week for each Junior Professor. Professors and JPs are able to allocate these hours at will. Flexibility also remains with professors as to how they choose to deliver their instruction based on their academic freedom.

A professor and junior professor’s academic freedom, provided by the fifth amendment of the German constitution, allows them to teach the content they desire and choose their research topics without interference from government or other imposing entities. Therefore although more exams and more policy surround a professor’s teaching today, the academic freedom of professors reigns supreme in their everyday professional life and is held in the highest regard not only by the professors themselves but also by the university leadership that works with them. In terms of teaching, this means that professors construct courses of study independently, compose students’ learning outcomes, and choose the classes necessary within each major. Thus they must balance the EHEA and German framework legal requirements while maintaining their intellectual inventiveness. Professors must spend thoughtful, additional time to meet both needs.
Within the new Bachelor’s/Master’s system, professors also spend a great deal more time preparing for instruction by: (a) composing learning outcomes for each module; (b) creating the multitude of exams modules based on the learning outcomes; (c) planning their teaching at more targeted levels for the Bachelor’s and Master’s students; and (d) delivering high quality teaching.

**Composing learning outcomes.** The implemented qualifications framework structure requires professors to create very clear learning outcomes for each and every course. This process is very time consuming and necessitates that professors not only describe what they expect their students to learn but also requires extensive documentation of how they will help students to reach these outcomes. One LCWiSo explained this further, “Now the focus is again on the content, but I have [used] an insane amount of paper, on course description and learning objectives and module handbooks and all that stuff.”\(^4\)\(^2\) An ECWiSo added,

And we also have to say what within this module and the courses within each module, we have to define what the worth of the course, and then we have to say, “Ok, what is the overarching theme of the module?” Yeah? So one consequence out of this thought is that … each professor cannot do what he likes to do. I think that is the biggest influence of Bologna.

Professors were used to the former system in which they could really deliver instruction in the manner they saw most fitting as it had no component that was externally

\(^{42}\) Translated from German to English by author.
coordinated. The composition of more outcomes now means that professors feel that they have lost some autonomy to the amplified parameters of Bologna.

**Writing and grading examinations.** In the former Diplom system, professors administered only a few examinations that required students to demonstrate a synthesized knowledge of their subject at specific points over the course of their study. Students took one very large exam known as the *Vordiplom or Diplom Vorpriifung*43 after completion of about 1.5 to 2 years. This exam, often both oral and written, was an examination on the collection of a student’s knowledge from the first few years of their study. Then at the end of their studies, the final project for students was a specialized thesis in their field of study accompanied by oral and written exams, cumulative of their entire Diplom coursework (BMBF & KMK, 2008). Professors must now spend significantly more time in the new Bachelor’s/Master’s system creating routine examinations after every module and then, thoughtfully grading each of them. Every exam grade counts towards a student’s final marks; a concept that did not exist in the Diplom. As such, this new requirement has revamped the responsibilities for professors’ work. The exams require much more preparation to write and conceptualize than the former oral exams and professors must be more purposeful in how they grade as each mark matters to the student’s overall academic progress. An LCNatSci elucidated,

> Of course people complain that they spend more time grading exams because you don’t just look it over and say it’s sufficient because you have to give it a 1.3 or a

---

43 In English, Preliminary Diplom Exam
1.7 or whatever. So you need to look at these things much more thoroughly.

Takes more time.

Any new responsibility creates a time constraint on professors. This additional demand takes time away from their other top priorities like the need to acquire third party funding, publish in top journals, teach, conduct high quality research with excellent research teams, serve on committees, and advise students.

**Teaching to certain degree levels.** In the past Diplom and Magister systems, professors minimally differentiated the content of their lectures between a first year Diplom or Magister student versus a final year student. Therefore, one of the big changes with Bologna has been to differentiate the course content and instructional methods for the Bachelor's versus the Master's courses. ECWiSo’s and LCNatSci’s shared that they must now focus their courses in more specific ways than in the past. An ECWiSo expounded, “you have to be more precise at the kind of levels you teach. The Bachelor’s level is much more simpler than the Master’s level. The old...the student studies...Magister, Diploma, um, it was not so clear[ly] split up.” Today, however, an ECWiSo elaborated, that the Bachelor student must learn “what is the basic concept and how can you transform the concept to a special research question. That's it, point, stop. Go out. Go to your profession. Do practice work out of the university and then please go” and for the master's student, “If you would like to come back and see more sophisticated developments and theory, let’s say more advanced theories, the newest theory of the year of 2010 compared to the old theory. Come back as a master’s student.”

One non-German LCNatSci commented that not all professors were fully prepared for
this new type of teaching and that in fact it is not just the two levels of Bachelor and Master, but in fact three levels, two at the Bachelor’s level and another at Master’s. He/she said the professors

Don’t even understand that a Bachelor/Master’s in a two tier system that a Bachelor has all the subjects in it which should go up to from basically Mickey Mouse level, basically fundamentals, a little bit deeper and for people who need a specialization at Master level, there’s a third level. So you have three levels of teaching. That means that you need to be organized and you need to talk to each other and professors talking to each other is not a German strength. The department structure is such that the professor is a God in his own realm and if he doesn’t want to talk to the others, he doesn’t have to.

To change the level of instruction requires that professors carefully plan each course with the academic level in mind.

An ECWiSo explained that this targeted instruction also means professors need to repeat the same courses every year so that students who are progressing through the degree have the same knowledge base as those ahead of them. “Every student each year has the same experience or a similar experience. So what we create is, what we created is more concrete. It’s much more concrete.” The repetition in courses is intended to instill in students a similar skill set and knowledge in their subject. Though the Diplom curriculum intended a shared knowledge base for students in the same field of study, the Bachelor’s/Master’s system is much more purposeful in requiring alignment across courses of study. The professors indicated that they invest significant effort and time
while revising their former Diplom or Magister curriculum into the new format.

Although they initially resisted, they now are focusing their pedagogical efforts at the various degree levels with greater acceptance.

**Valuing good teaching.** As mentioned in Chapter 5, Uni Potsdam won an Excellence in Teaching award in 2009 and has embraced a strong emphasis on teacher development. Bologna also emphasizes excellent teaching as a means of quality assurance. Not all professors agree that teaching is highly valued yet, however, at least in terms of incentive structures to support it. In some instances, professors feel that teaching is really just a sacrifice that they have to make to be a researcher and their incentives support this mentality. In comparison to research, teaching is not really financially rewarded at the university. A professor therefore must be intrinsically motivated to teach at a high level without many institutional incentives. But for many, opportunities to co-teach with other professors, to share ideas for new teaching methods, and the few university incentives for some are positive attributes of the changed system.

One ECWiSo described in detail,

> The university would like to have more modern ways of teaching, using online lectures, other modern forms of seminars. Co-teaching with another professor. I did it one time and it was very interesting for me. It’s not so easy when two professors are working together but in this case it was wonderful because we read the same texts but there was no specific preparation between us. So we wouldn’t say, “You say that and I’ll say that.” But it was in the discussions that were so beautiful to see how we could cooperate and that was very fine. And that’s a good
modern idea of new teaching methods. So I would say at the moment the pressure of the university is more on the methods to increase the quality of education in this field.

Thus the university has found ways to incentivize teaching by enabling professors to get excited about new pedagogical opportunities when funding incentives are not available. Some professors described further additional university efforts to improve teaching. An ECNatSci said,

Has that been the biggest change? I think what you have to acknowledge as well is that there is at least a push to make—to put some more value on good teaching, which also before I don’t think there really was that much student evaluations, but I think are becoming a bit more important at least and, yeah, there are prizes for doing good teaching or awards and so on.

An LCWiSo finds the new push for quality teaching especially valuable in his/her work. He/she enjoy infusing new methods and trying new ways of educating his/her students. “There are some lecture exercises that we can use for the Bachelor’s study now and we also have to try to incorporate new things into our teaching that we find good.” The university very clearly wants to incentivize teaching for professors and improve it across the institution. Financial incentives for teaching are limited, however. So as the professors have illustrated, the university seeks ways to incentivize good teaching in other ways—co-teaching opportunities, faculty recognition, and workshops offering new tips for pedagogy—all avenues currently in place.
To say that the greater emphasis on teaching is only as a result of Bologna implementation would be short sighted. Strong teaching has been a national initiative as well as now part of the junior professorship evaluation, professors’ annual evaluations, and the University’s excellence in teaching professional development opportunities. Therefore while an emphasis on teaching is connected to Bologna, it is also significantly intertwined with many areas of the professorial work and something that has risen to the forefront of reform efforts for many years.

**Lack of defined process in curriculum reform.** As standardized and structured as the Bologna Process is with qualification frameworks and learning outcomes, Uni Potsdam left the process of modifying the curriculum to fit into the two-degree system to the professors and the departments as whole. Many professors explain that there could definitely be more communication within departments. In Germany, the norm has been that each Professor or Chair supervises his/her own staff (doctoral students, postdocs, masters students) and does not typically need to collaborate with other professors. Given the existing practice, many professors suggested that the implementation of the new curriculum could have benefited from more definitive lines of communication. Instead, some confusion and frustration has plagued the processes of reform. Not surprisingly, some professors have acted autonomously in the absence of defined curricular structures, criteria for the equivalency and consistency of modules, or the number of points for each course.

As professors began adjusting to the new modular system and constructing their courses, each professor had the choice of how many ECTS points to assign to their
particular courses based on the factors they felt most valuable. Adelman (2008) points out that the distinct difference in the standardized U.S. credit point system and the ECTS one is the focal point of the hours. U.S. credit points are based on "faculty contact hours" while ECTS are "students as the primary reference point" in terms of "how many hours a student must spend to accomplish the various tasks in a course module and [then that is] convert[ed] that into credit points" (p. 12). ECTS therefore requires that each professor allot time to each activity that a student may have related to their course. No criteria for time allotment has been standardized across Europe though (Adelman, 2008). So, as Uni Potsdam professors have portrayed, there is confusion and differentiation between each professor's allocation of ECTS points and the methods they use to accomplish this task. When courses are comprised of multiple modules, the assignation becomes all the more important. In certain cases professors have underestimated or overestimated their courses' worth. One ECWiSo explained, "You construct for example the ECTS points are too small for each course. That was one typical fault that you made. Then we didn't have any idea what's a module." These inconsistencies caused a great deal of conflict among the faculty in some disciplinary areas. An ECWiSo witnessed a huge conflict over the worth of courses.

Another problem was what actually means module. What is a module of course...? When I came here some colleagues had the idea well actually we are doing the same as we always did. We just take our lecture courses and declare them as a module. So a lecture course was no longer a lecture course but it was a module—a module consisting of one lecture course two hours per week, which is
obviously nonsense. Then we were forced to make bigger modules and that started a lot of conflicts because every colleague has a certain ego and everybody wants to see his teaching, he wants to have his teaching considered as much as possible. So people started to fight for credit points, which is obviously nonsense but this is what they did. And then it was actually my first impression of Bologna, colleagues starting to fight for credit points. Overcoming these conflicts were very, very hard.

With the responsibility on the faculty, professors equated the value of courses with the worth of instruction, content, and the professors' contribution to the course of study as whole. As one LCNatSci explained it caused heightened emotions at times.

Then you are fighting with the colleagues who say my teaching is much more important. What I used to have is so many hours of teaching and that means that we have so many credits. Nine credits, 7.5, 14 or 15 or 17. Then you have to try to piece together where things are a completely different size. And if a student fails, then it could be that a really big chunk fails or it can be so important that the module is only 2 credits but it's compulsory and if they fail it three times, they're out.

This confusion obviously has ramifications for students in deciding which courses to take across their curriculum and further substantiates the value of each exam within these heavier weighted courses.

The other side of the complexity of each module and course having different credit points is that no matter what, a Bachelor's and Master's degree must equal a finite
number of ECTS credit points. The German qualification framework cites: the Bachelor’s degree, depending on the course of study and the type of degree, is “three, three and a half, or four years full-time study resp[ectively] [with] 180, 210 or 240 ECTS credits” and the Master’s degree is “one, one and a half or two years resp[ectively] [with] 60, 90 or 120 ECTS credits” (BMBF & KMK, 2008, p. 16 and 19). At Uni Potsdam the most common adoption was the three-year Bachelor with 180 ECTS points and the two-year Master with 120 ECTS. Therefore, the number of credit points must be a minimum of either 180 or 120 for each student. However, the act of ensuring dissimilar valued courses fit into the puzzle to equal a certain number of total ECTS points causes confusion not only the professors but also the students.

One LCWiSo did share that there had been a quality manager hired in many departments to support Bologna efforts and prepare the institution for accreditation. Although the majority of professors did not discuss hiring a staff member in their department to support with much of the described Bologna confusion, supposedly one should have been hired in each and every department. At the time of the interviews, the confusion still remained and as such, this particular role and the university’s efforts to centralize Bologna had not yet been fully implemented or utilized by all professors.

The New Degrees and Student-Professor Relationships

The Bologna Process has altered the ways in which professors now must interact with their students. The policy reform has modified the academic culture at Uni Potsdam by providing a new context within which students operate and professors lead resulting in greater pressure on both sides. The contextual change resulted in a transformation of the
student-professor relationship in the two distinctive ways. First, Bologna has shifted the academic paradigm from one that was focused on students being responsible for their own learning to one that is now more focused on professors teaching. Second, professors now play a more significant role in the lives of students as their advisors and teachers and the relationship between professors and students has now changed as a result. Each of these professor-student interactions—teaching/learning and advising—have transformed the professorial experience at Uni Potsdam as a result of Bologna as analyzed in the following section.

**Learning Culture to Teaching Culture.** Formerly, the Diplom/Magister learning culture was such that the responsibility belonged to students to attend lectures and seminars, take notes, read their materials, synthesize their knowledge, and prepare for large examinations at important points in their educational path. Professors’ responsibilities were to construct and deliver the lectures, and ultimately test students on their synthesized knowledge later in their academic career. The responsibility rested on the shoulders of students to learn and prepare; much less emphasis fell on the shoulders of professors to teach at certain levels and ensure that each student reached certain points of knowledge. Today the pressure for both sides to perform is much greater. However, the agency is being shifted to the professors to ensure that students are engaged and learning what is necessary. Professors shared that the shift in the culture is from one of learning for learning’s sake to one that is much more regimented and focused on teaching, outcomes, grades, and assessment. This shift for both parties has been nothing short of dramatic.
Diplom exams versus bachelor’s exams. With the more exams in the new system than in the Diplom, the pressure on students has increased as they have an exam after each module within each course, which requires them to study, retain, and at times memorize very specific material at multiple points within each class. This shift has increased the pressure on professors to construct each exam, tying them directly to the course’s learning outcomes. Professors are sensitive to the change for students. An ECWiSo, “Ja, really. I feel sorry for them. Because I understand for them it is really hard to study in such programs.” Another ECWiSo explained the major difference, now, what you just now have is that from the first of the semester to the end of the whole studies, each course with scores counts for the final Diplom or for the final Bachelor’s degree. From the first semester on, each course counts for the last number. That’s a big difference…so there’s much more pressure on the students.

The value of each small exam now adds up the value of the few larger exams in the former system therefore creating incremental pressure throughout the course of study rather than a few times in the whole degree. On the other hand, one LCNatSci perceives an advantage to the increased pressure on students and the new examination structure, students complain about the fact that there are too many tests. But I think in the past it was so that the students up to the intermediate examination had little feedback on their true performance and here I see that is, by a sensible system [of] well-arranged tests that you can always get a reflection of where you are currently, [what] are your strengths, and what are your weaknesses.
The exams provide more gradual feedback to the students and allow for more open communication between the professor and the student on a student’s progress. It can help students who are not working at the level they should to reassess and make corrections along the way. Given both sides, the large majority of professors, both early career and later career, natural and social sciences, agreed that the Bologna Process has significantly increased the demands on students’ time and in the way that they approach their work. More examinations and the emphasis on grades did not exist before in the German system. Therefore professors have also been forced to adapt.

More expectations on professors. For Professors, Bologna’s shift in German culture from students’ learning paradigm to a professor’s teaching paradigm has resulted in transferring the responsibility to professors to teach at specific levels, provide points of accountability, and ensure that students are meeting learning outcomes at every turn. In fact, one LCWiSo stated that it has resulted in greater expectations by students from the professors. “The students expect from us even more [now] that they are carried through the semester, mastered the subjects.”

Interestingly, as professors assume agency in what students learn, students have become partners in the process by holding professors accountable to the outlined learning outcomes throughout the semester. However, professors indicate that students feel justified in learning nothing more and nothing less. The pressure on professors is coming from above with the implementation of the new structures and below with the expectations of students. The squeeze from the top on students has resulted in the compartmentalization of student’s knowledge for the sake of achieving within the
parameters. The value is therefore now on the targeted teaching and the outcomes of exams and not on learning for learning's sake.

Curiosity. With so many additional parameters, it also can be a challenge for professors to get students excited about their work because they are more focused on the outcomes than the journey to get there. One LCNatSci explained that he/she has also seem less curiosity because of the increased pressure.

You have to have all these exams at the end of each course. And they are very much stressed out. And it is also frustrating because with some courses you really put your heart in it, and you try to tell them, look this is great and this is so interesting. And you would like them to be fascinated by your subject. But in the end they just ask is this relevant for the exam? So it's like going back to school.

Some professors are disappointed by the lack of intellectual curiosity overall as students appear to care more about the exam than gaining new knowledge. Many professors shared, however, that they still have some students who are always very curious and demonstrate a passion for their subject. The passion appears less with their average student.

Learning in boxes. The most prevalent statement from professors on the challenges of Bologna are that students now are compartmentalizing their learning rather than synthesizing their knowledge across coursework. For example, an ECNatSci explained that when talking to one student about the course content a semester after the course was over,
He came a bit later and then I started talking to him, and then he said, "Well, now I'm all just thinking about"—whatever the module he was taking at the time, and "I have no idea about [your class] anymore." It's this way of thinking inside little boxes and you also notice this.

Another ECNatSci said,

You could argue that that has always been the case, simply because we teach these things as separate subjects. But I think there's modularization and especially the fact that you have to do an exam at the end of each module, it contributes to this. I think—and somewhat it leads to is a fragmentation of the student's view of [my discipline]. When you give lectures like this introduction to [course] lecture, when you give lectures and you refer to something that they should have or that they have heard before or in a lecture parallel about, let's say, [a different course]. You just look into blank faces or at least from 90% of them. It's so boxed in the knowledge, there is no concept that ultimately, it all hangs together and so what you learn in [the different course] has relevance for what I tried to teach them in [this course] and they are connected.

The issue of students learning in boxes was a very common theme across all groups of professors. They are concerned that the students are no longer able to synthesize their knowledge due to Bologna. Professors explain that the ability to synthesize material helps students in their future endeavors whether in graduate work or the workforce. Most of all the professors are frustrated that at the start of courses they have to begin again to ensure that everyone has the same knowledge base. In the former degree system, they
felt that students were able to build levels of knowledge with each course. With the fragmentation of the modules and examinations, they feel that students are significantly less able to synthesize today. Remediation and frustration merely adds additional burdens to the professorial role.

The compartmentalization of knowledge is oftentimes purposeful on the part of the student within the new structure in order to achieve on the exams. Interestingly, this compartmentalization of knowledge actually began as an issue in the early 1990s as described in Nugent’s (2004) work on the transformation of the student career and has only further developed in the Bologna system. Many professors felt the changes in student learning were most exacerbated today as a result of Bologna especially with the system incentivizing students to learn in boxes as part of the structure. An ECNatSci described this point,

Also the fact that each exam that you take contributes to the final mark, it fosters a certain attitude on the side of the students which is to really only be concerned about what do I have to do to get the best possible mark in this exam. For example after giving a lecture, probably the most frequent question you get is not something related to the contents of the lecture, some problem that they stumble across or something but the most frequent question is which bits of these are relevant for the exam?

An LCNatSci said his students will tell him “We have studied this, but now we have forgotten it.” This change in attitude affects the entire learning culture for students and professors. Professors shared their excitement for interested students and what a joy it
was to teach those that had a thirst for their field of study. But with the changes from Bologna, one LCNatSci explained, "Yes, it has made it less fun since we have the Bologna Process." Therefore the compartmentalization of learning has actually lessened some of the engagement between the faculty and students.

**Changing relationship between Professor and Student.** Advising students also plays a more significant role in professorial life today as professors must help students navigate the new system. First, professors' role requires that they support students in the new Bologna system to complete their degree in the time expected. Second, with a core initiative of the Bologna process to increase student's mobility, professors must advise students on study abroad options, transferring modules ECTS points properly, and helping students fit their travels into their shorter degree cycle. Third, with Bologna and the slow cultural shift in Germany to begin recognizing Bachelor's as the first degree, professors are needing to advise students on ways to prepare for post-graduation in a changing labor market. And finally, because of the increased role of a professor in a student's life, an informality is forming between the student and professor, arising from the former.

**Navigating Bologna Changes.** The new structure of degrees requires greater guidance for students from professors. Guidance is necessary because professors and administrators are still formulating courses of study and make tweaks along the way. The policies that guide the curriculum appear to change from year-to-year as the university refines its processes. For a professor, the ever-changing new policies increase the amount of time they must spend, first, to know the details of what a student should need.
to know in terms of their degree requirements and coursework options and then to communicate and advise students on these matters. Unlike in some US colleges, no office of academic advising is available to students to support in these efforts; it is solely the role of the professor to advise as well as the responsibility of the student to learn about it independently online or in course catalogues.

**Student Mobility.** The Bologna Agreement envisioned European student mobility through the transferability of credit points, recognition of degrees, and shared European-wide cultural knowledge to harmonize the EHEA. Mobility includes both baccalaureate degree recognition within and across European countries as preparation for graduate study and international study for a semester or more. In advising students, professors find three areas of challenge: (a) German modules and credit points are not necessarily equivalent or compatible between different countries, (b) a semester away from Potsdam jeopardizes students' timely completion of their degree, and (c) students have become more averse to studying abroad as a result of less time and more regulation.

**Equivalency of credits.** For study abroad students, their faculty advisor must determine the transferability of available courses at another institution. In the ideal this determination occurs prior to departure, but not always. Often though, although courses at other universities may appear to meet requirements, i.e., the number of credit points, the academic content, and the equivalency of modules, they in fact do not; this recognition often occurs only after a student returns. Given the numbers who wish to study outside of Germany, the sheer magnitude of the needed and appropriate advising can create problems for students. One ECNatSci explained, “So if you look at all these
students, it's not so easy to always really fulfill this promise of mobility, that there are still lots of issues with recognizing certain modules that someone takes somewhere else as equivalent from modules here."

**Missed courses while away from Potsdam.** Another issue is not only the courses that a student takes while abroad but also the courses they miss while not at Uni Potsdam. With the established curriculum in each course of study necessary for a degree, it is important that the student is able to choose a comparable course abroad to meet the UP requirements. An ECNatSci expounded,

The problem is that I think the university tries to force us to ignore requirements of our curricula so certain subjects are absolutely essential for a [science] student. If we teach these subjects in the 5th semester and a student chooses to go abroad in the 5th semester, and he comes back and he has missed this essential subject. Because it's a [country or institution] that this subject wasn't taught in the 5th semester, we think there is a problem. And right now the university is not going to accept this. So we have some fighting to do.

The equivalency of courses therefore can be a challenge and in some instances Uni Potsdam will not accept dissimilar transferrable credit if a student misses a specific course while abroad. In addition, every country has different semester start and end dates so for students wanting to study abroad and not miss semesters on either the front end or tail end of their experience face additional challenges.

**Fewer students studying abroad.** Perhaps surprisingly the numbers of students who study abroad have decreased after Bologna at Uni Potsdam. One LCWiSo explains
this phenomenon, “I mean what we see in the faculty is some of the problematic consequences of Bologna. The number of students that have gone on student exchanges has actually gone down rather than up because we have three-year degrees.” In the social sciences especially fewer students are applying for exchange and study abroad programs. One LCWiSo shared, “But there are fewer applicants than in the past. And so, this is one of the problematic consequences. Clearly, that reform which was supposed to aid in internationalization has actually had the opposite effect.” The structure of the shorter Bachelor’s degree and the confusion with transferrable credits has created many of these challenges. An ECWiSo described this issue,

I think we encourage students to go abroad which of course is a problem in all these Bologna schemes. When we design new Bachelor’s degree programs it’s always a question, it’s a bigger debate in Germany, if you whether want an eight semester BA and of course this is exactly the trade...if you had a six semester BA it’s very difficult to have an internship, which is very important for [this field] just to get to learn something about the job market and maybe do a semester abroad. It’s not always easy to fit it into six semesters.

Thus the desire for greater mobility in Bologna contradicts its shorter degree cycle in Germany means that not all disciplines can meet the full experiential learning for its students in only six semesters. Some disciplines or fields necessitate practical experience, extensive course work, and still seek an option for students to study abroad. These challenges in addition to the administrative confusion with transferrable credits results recently in less students choosing to study abroad.
The Value of the Bachelor’s. Three out of four groups of professors agreed that the Diplom is still a more highly regarded degree than the Bachelors in Germany. Graduates with a Diplom are considered well-educated, holding both depth and breadth of knowledge in their subject, and thus, for now, are perceived as more marketable in the workforce. However, as the Bachelor is a newer concept in Germany and a shorter course of study, often employers expect students to continue to their master’s before seeking employment. The Bachelor’s degree is not yet considered fully legitimate in the workforce. An ECNatSci explained,

If they wanted someone to head a group then they would hire at least a master’s, someone with a master’s degree or someone who had a PhD. And so what could you do as Bachelor? And I think this is also the problem. So yes, so really to have chance of doing something useful was something rewarding as a job, you have to do a take master’s degree anyway.

In fact, some professors believed that even with a Bachelor’s and Master’s degree, the student’s knowledge base is still not equivalent to the Diplom. An LCNatSci posited, "My opinion that [my field] taking a traditional Diplom as much better educated, had a much broader knowledge than someone who is now finishing his master." From an educational standpoint, the real issue is to what degree professor are teaching students the necessary materials in which the new bachelor’s and master’s degrees demonstrate that they are ready for the workforce when finished. An ECWiSo explained,

Bologna from a German context is the BA should ideally lead to something, should be your first degree for which you should be able to go out into the job
market, right, which is always a big issue in the internal debates. You know, how can we do this, can we do this or is it just sort of clear that everyone will do the master’s afterwards. So is it just sort of an intermediate step that doesn’t really change the logic of the system.

Professors hope that it will be only a matter of time before the Bachelor’s degree gains more legitimacy. Otherwise students will have to earn both the Bachelor’s and Master’s before being able to enter the labor market, making enrollment in the Master’s degree programs larger and less selective and the two degree cycle misaligned with its original intent. It is therefore important that professors are rethinking the quality of teaching for their bachelor’s students in preparing them for the needs of the labor market.

Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees are, however, internationally recognized. Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees outside the EU are recognized in North America and the United Kingdom as well as in Africa, Asia, South America, and Australia. One LCWiSo justified this point by saying,

We have already noticed in the past when you go abroad, that in many countries of the world there is the Bachelor-Master system. On the other hand, we were always very proud of our Diplom system in Germany. That goes for the engineers, but it also applies in business administration for the Master of Business and economics for the economist. For a while we have mourned the loss of the Diplom qualifications, but we eventually realized that we could adapt well,
because in other countries there are also these programs, like in Europe, USA, and Asia.\textsuperscript{44}

As a result, many professors advise their students to look locally and globally when considering further study and future job prospects. Professors shared that for their students to continue to be internationally mobile and for their degrees to be recognized and understood in other regions of the world, the change to a Bachelor's and Master's degree is an appropriate alignment across nations. International recognition can aid graduates in a global labor market and allow for greater mobility in further study.

\textit{Change in the formality of student-professor relationship.} The former German system was very hierarchical in nature requiring a high level of formality between the student and professor. Although the social distance rules have not changed in theory, the context within which professors and students must operate requires a different relationship between students and professors—one of greater support to be able to achieve their mutual goals. However, with the shift to a more central role of professor's in student learning amid the increased pressure on students to perform it has led students to change the way they address professors in certain context. One LCNatSci shared a story of students sending one line emails without their name on it and asking to make up missed work. The professor could not identify the student from their personal email account and was unimpressed with the informality of the way they were addressing him/her. Another LCNatSci discussed some other informalities of students.

\textsuperscript{44} Translated from German to English by author.
The students today, they are at the university much more like a school, and they expect so much for granted here, you know. I mean, if they have a small problem they just said...well, it is also due to the new technology, of course, which we didn't have 10 or 20 years ago. So they just send an email to each professor with small questions instead of asking their peers. Small things, not thinking what it means for us if we have to answer hundreds of student questions about passwords and all these things, which you in a lecture say, this is the password to get to my files. And then you just expect then but they come to the lecture and see that.

One ECWiSO dealt with students disagreeing with the final exam construction and together building anger against the professor as a group on a Facebook thread. The group of students eventually sent the professor a very nasty email and started a line of negative interactions. It resulted in a great deal of stress for the professor. Although technology plays a role in these interactions, the German professor-student relationship never permitted such informality in the past. Now faculty members are having to negotiate the new student attitude without precedent or experience.

Students are also more likely to argue over grades now and show resistance to professional judgment. The increased pressure leads students to argue with professors over their grades to the decimal point and they always want to know exactly what will

---

45 "The grading scheme in Germany usually comprises five levels with numerical equivalents; intermediate grades may be given): "Sehr Gut" (1) = Very Good; "Gut" (2) = Good; "Befriedigend" (3) = Satisfactory; "Ausreichend" (4) = Sufficient; "Nicht ausreichend" (5) = Non-Sufficient/Fail. The minimum passing grade is "Ausreichend" (4)."

Some institutions in Germany have already started using the ECTS grading system: "A (best 10 %), B (next 25 %), C (next 30 %), D (next 25 %), and E (next 10 %)” (BMBF & KMK, 2008, p. 36). However, Uni Potsdam still uses the traditional German grading scale of five-point scale.
be on every exam. Professors’ show great frustration with this change in mindset. An
ECNatSci communicated,

Also the fact that each exam that you take contributes to the final mark, it fosters
a certain attitude on the side of the students which is to really only be concerned
about what do I have to do to get the best possible mark in this exam. For
example after giving a lecture, probably the most frequent question you get is not
something related to the contents of the lecture, some problem that they stumble
across or something but the most frequent question is which bits of these are
relevant for the exam?

Though the focus on exams and grades may be a familiar student attitude in some
cultures such as the United States, it is an unfamiliar concept in German universities.
Therefore the increased emphasis and subsequent informality creates a level of
annoyance on the part of the professors who are dealing with this changed relationship.

Conclusion

The impact of the Bologna Process on professorial work at the University of
Potsdam in terms of degree implementation and Bologna’s impact on professorial work
and the professor-student relationships is complex. The effect has been extensive,
changing the way that professors experience their work and communicate with their
students through teaching and advising. The macro-level goal of Bologna to improve
internationalization, increase mobility, meet standard learning outcomes, and improve the
transferability of degrees between systems has resulted in many positive, but also
problematic outcomes. Uni Potsdam has clearly made great progress from its original
iteration (and irritation) in early 2005. However, professors shared across all groups that more modifications are necessary. Adaptation is slow and resistance to change is lessening. It takes time for these macro reforms to culturally infuse into the Uni Potsdam system and professors will continue to be lead drivers in refining, implementing, and reiterating the teaching and learning experience for themselves and for students.
Chapter 7

Discussion

As this dissertation demonstrates, the impact of the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms on professorial work and role definition at Uni Potsdam has been substantial. The analyses of the perceptions of these reforms reveal the ways professors have experienced the multitude of changes over the past decade. The goals of this chapter are to analyze further the main findings of the dissertation, to situate the findings in the literature, to show its complementary nature to the existing research, and to provide recommendations for both practice and future research.

This study utilizes two theoretical lenses: structuralism and symbolic interactionism. Structuralism aided in compartmentalizing the many structural relations to professorial work, defining relationships between structures, and unveiling the underlying meaning within Uni Potsdam structures. Structuralism fit this study particularly well as a means of illuminating the structures in place, the ways that these new structures take on newly defined parameters and the roles that professors occupy within the various structures. In terms of this study’s results, the structuralist lens analyzes the professorial hierarchy, the role of competition in professorial work, and the ramifications of the shift in degree structures.

In addition, symbolic interactionism provides a complementary lens to structuralism as one that offers contextual understanding to professors’ exchanges with one another and their students. Symbolic interactionism seeks to define symbolic meaning in otherwise every day social interactions. In this context, the interactions were those of professors with one another and with students under the conditions of Bologna
and higher education reforms. In terms of results, symbolic interaction was well suited for analyzing the reactions of professors to the new junior professorship as well as the changing interactions between student and professor.

**Major Findings**

This study enhances our understanding of professorial work at Uni Potsdam through the following major conclusions drawn from the data: (a) professors are very adaptable creatures; (b) Bologna has in many ways threatened the Humboldtian ideal of the German university and therefore created a paradox between control and freedom; (c) the system is designed in such a way that the increased demands on professorial work contradict one another; and (d) without further harmonization of Bologna reforms, professorial confusion will ensue.

**Professors are adaptable creatures**

Over the past decade, professors have undergone dramatic changes to their work—increased competition, a new pay scale, introduction of the junior professorship, increased demands in teaching and research, changing mentality of students in their learning, increased enrollments, and a greater authoritative management of their professorial roles. These reforms have meant a significant shift in professorial life at Uni Potsdam. Professors illustrate throughout this study, however, their resilience and adaptability to change. Their adaptability comes both from necessity (i.e., legal regulations and guidelines) and their recognized benefit of the privileged role they play in society. Essentially the benefit of their academic freedom, time with talented students, and their contribution to knowledge outweighs the costs of bureaucracy and increased
demands. Despite the pushes and pulls to their work, professors demonstrate the importance of upholding their academic freedom by engaging in the reform efforts rather than merely resisting them. They seek to have their voices heard—to be agents in the process—rather than merely complain from the sidelines. This study offers a clear example of professors who have sought to find ways to make the Bologna Process and German higher education reforms work in their academic life. They are not yet satisfied, however. Instead, they continue to contribute to the larger reform conversation and strive for a sense of equilibrium. Their adaptability to change will be the key to any university reforms effort’s future success.

Bologna shifts Humboldtian Ideal

Bologna threatens the Humboldtian ideal of the university by taking away some of the agency of professors in their professional roles of teaching, research, and service and overly regulating a historically unregulated system. The Bologna reforms externally imposed changes that directly affect professorial work with more teaching responsibilities, additional administrative tasks, and the need for more student advising. In turn, these demands have resulted in less time for professors to accomplish their core task at hand—research. In the past the allocation of time to these activities were the decision of each individual professor and never imposed by an external entity. These shifts have therefore created a paradox between external control and academic freedom, a conflict that appears unresolvable in the current iteration of the reform efforts.

The university structure built by a community of scholars as a freethinking organization is unwelcoming to the newly imposed external demands of Bologna. It is
essential to the social norms of German culture that those guiding the implementation of the European reform efforts in Germany take into account the Humboldtian ideal of a German university and to remain true to the principles of Lehrlfreiheit, Lernfreiheit, Wissenschaft, and Bildung in their harmonization of the European system. For professors, these academic freedoms are non-negotiable and in fact a constitutional right. The interaction between the reforms and professorial work is couched in the need for a more tightly structured measure of the quality of higher education—a social structure that provides the catalyst for the advancement of society.

Quality assurance is at the core of Bologna efforts. The Bologna Process’ goal to harmonize degrees and not necessarily standardize (Michelsen, 2010) has meant great confusion for the professors at Uni Potsdam who are caught between external control and professional freedom. This paradox means, for example, that a professor’s efforts to interpret the reforms, coordinate ECTS points, decide on the departmental learning outcomes, and create aligned approaches to a regulated system are misaligned in autonomous acts. As illustrated in this study, historically professors acted as autonomous entities and manage their chairs as individual structures disconnected from one another. Each professor has maintained that autonomous acts are justified by their academic freedom. But various acts result in differentiation and a lack of cohesion across the system.

Bologna’s major reforms have shifted the foundational principles of the Humboldtian ideal (Lehrlfreiheit, Lernfreiheit, Bildung, and Wissenschaft). In fact the true Humboldtian ideal of the German university is defined as:
The professors must be free to teach truth and knowledge as they see it and the students must be free to learn independently and grow without being spoon-fed (verschult) or constantly tested. Allegiance to the Humboldtian concept of freedom underlies the academic conventions of allowing students to take their examinations when they feel free to do so (rather than at times set by the university), and of being reluctant to present them with fixed course length, content, and timetables. (Pritchard, 2004, p. 510)

A professor's Lehrfreiheit still means that they have the freedom to teach what they choose, but now are accountable to ensure that students are actually learning. This accountability requires a time and energy commitment by professors to organize, assess, regulate, and maintain systematic evaluations of student progress. Teaching is now regulated for quality control and no longer under the individual purview of professors to decide its every nuance. A student's Lernfreiheit today means that they still maintain some freedom of choice in what classes they take but now are much more accountable to the system requirements to demonstrate success through regular modular testing and cumulative grades. They must follow the structure in order to succeed. They no longer have the freedom to skip lectures or to take courses without grades. The system requires regular accountability of students through the illustration of their learning in measurable forms. The university is no longer just a free space for intellectual thought; instead it is a place where professors and students must work together to meet the requirements of external demands all in the context of teaching and learning.
In terms of *Wissenschaft* and *Bildung*, Michelsen (2010) argues that Bologna has imposed change on the Humboldtian ideal. "*Bildung* is reduced to competence or human capital, *Wissenschaft* as a life form is reduced to the teaching of science, student self-development is translated into directed studies and rote learning" (p. 154). *Bildung*'s original purpose was to empower "personal development through education" (Pritchard, 2004, p. 510). Today, one’s educational experience has become less about a student’s personal development but instead more about students’ demonstration of the outlined competencies and skills within each module. As Michelsen posits, *Wissenschaft*’s role in universities where professors engage in the creation of new knowledge through science has shifted to professors managing the science brought in through their external research grants. Often this means they are teaching science as a manager of large research groups supported by these grants. As illustrated throughout this dissertation, it is the research funding that is often most incentivized for professors so the small, unfunded scientific inquiries for the purpose of advancing knowledge play a smaller role in the daily lives of professors today.

In these modifications, Bologna has transformed a system of intellectual freedom into a system of control. In addition, freedom under the Humboldtian values was not merely freedom of thought. "Freedom meant the relative political autonomy of the university from interference from the above (the state) and from below (social demands of the society at large)" (Baker & Lenhardt, 2008, p. 61). Accountability, quality, and assessment are all now mechanisms for control in professorial work and come from both above and below: above in terms of European and German impositions and below in
terms of society's need for accountability of state funds. This newly constructed paradox in the German university between control and freedom has resulted in professors' frustrations that are difficult to relieve. The Humboldtian concept remains an ideal, but the current state of Bologna, it cannot be a present reality.

**Professorial work demands contradict one another**

The current incentive structure system and professorial work demands contradict one another and cause excessive challenges to professorial work. Professors at Uni Potsdam very clearly thrive on their desire to create new knowledge, advance their academic prestige, engage future scholars, and contribute to science. Competition has become a more central role in their work but actually aligned with those areas in which they are most interested; competition is in fact often enjoyed by professors. Thus, the increase in competition is not an issue for professors as much as the additional demands in an increasingly structured and challenging system. The current incentive structure for UP professors requires them to produce high quality research, obtain external research funding, collaborate nationally and internationally with colleagues, and creatively contribute to society's understanding of big questions. These tasks require significant amounts of time and energy to accomplish. Professors shared their interest in these tasks and their enjoyment of the time to accomplish them. However, the increased competition involved with these tasks coupled with the increased demands on instructional preparation, high quality teaching, Bologna-related structural changes, and student needs that create a sense of internal conflict for professors. On one side professors are torn between meeting the demands of their professional aspirations, pay scale incentives, and
their own status and on the other hand, they need to meet the needs of their students and
the Bologna goals for a harmonized degree structure. The system at times contradicts
itself (Kehm, 2010) and professors are in the middle with finite time to allocate to each
task. Serrano-Velarde and Stensaker (2010) support this finding in their discussion of the
Bologna pressures on professorial work. They explained that the last decade of reforms
has meant “Germany’s higher education system has witnessed a growing pressure to
separate [teaching and research]” and in fact “academic performance is thus assessed on
different grounds, to different ends” (p. 220). If a system seeks to move professorial
work in a certain direction (i.e., towards higher quality of teaching and learning), the
incentives should match those goals. Although professors are intrinsically motivated and
are able to independently allocate their time, the tension between the policy system
message and the academy message are distinctly different.

At Uni Potsdam, efforts are being made to further incentivize teaching but the
current incentive structure rewards research funding and output over any other
professorial tasks. The structure and function are a result of the multiple demands on the
university to increase its own prestige and to financially maintain itself. However, these
competing demands challenge professors to find balance among them all.

Without further harmonization, confusion will ensue

Professors voiced their frustrations with the implementation of the Bologna
Process especially in terms of ECTS points, modular definitions, student requirements,
and a general lack of agreement across departments. Further harmonization of the
Bologna implementation by the departments at Uni Potsdam is essential. This adjustment
requires a greater level of agreement over the number of ECTS points per course.

Greater harmonization could actually relieve many of the frustrations among faculty as the pressure to specify the component parts of each degree and its modules would be completed, requiring only tinkering in the future. Collaboration within departments could determine criteria for the content of modules, points, and sequences. As illustrated in this study, collaboration is not a cultural norm in the German professorate; professors have enjoyed acting as autonomous entities in the university. Adelman (2006) and Baker and Lenhardt (2008) posit that the differentiation between professorial approaches to these tasks has created greater confusion and misalignment across ECTS point allocation resulting in unmet overarching goals. Therefore, although Bologna overtly states “harmonization” over standardization, the internal system of alignment requires further refinement within the departments at Uni Potsdam to both meet Bologna’s goals for greater harmonization and professors’ goals for a reduction in administrative and teaching tasks imposed from above.

The Added Value of this Study

This study shares a special story of one university during one specific period of time—November 2011 until March 2012—after navigating great change. The daily professional lives of professors in this context during the university’s 20th anniversary provided a rich description of a university reflective of it’s past and hopeful for its future. This study added value both in its context and design as described below.
Contribution of Context

The selection of Uni Potsdam as a case study for this dissertation is a unique context for its location and its 20-year-old age. Uni Potsdam is located in former East Germany and with that comes a distinct history that influences the university context of today. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the economic differences were dramatic between East and West and many of those challenges still remain today. Brandenburg falls in last place in terms of funding for higher education and many professors cited this position as a result of the area being former East Germany. Rarely do East German universities appear in the research literature around German higher education reforms and Bologna. Therefore this study contributes significantly to the literature by providing an in-depth analysis of the impact of these reforms in former East Germany.

An interesting feature of this study is the youth of the University of Potsdam in the context of German universities. Germany’s first university at Heidelberg was founded in 1386; many other German universities are celebrating quincentennial and sexcentennial anniversaries. Therefore to study a university that is only 20 years old provides a very different context within which to understand German professorial work. The socialization of professors has occurred only in a short time at the university. In many ways the age of the university offered an opportunity for me to consider the co-construction of the culture by the very professors who created it. Professor interviewed brought their experiences from their former universities where they studied, but together, they have and continue to fashion the University of Potsdam. The university illustrates
the new German higher education in a reunified context with both Western and Eastern influence.

**Contribution of Design**

In terms of the study's design, as a case study and a doctoral dissertation, I was able to delve deeply into the experiences of professors at Uni Potsdam rather than attempting a comparative analysis of many institutions across the country as many studies have done. In addition, most accounts of German higher education reforms have provided descriptions of the German system as a whole or used quantitative data to analyze patterns of Germany in comparison to other EU countries. As a qualitative study, this dissertation provides rich data on the personal experiences of 25 professors at Uni Potsdam and the ways that these macro-level reforms have affected their daily professional lives. It is an untold story and one that though applicable only to Uni Potsdam can provide insight into other German universities and some of the similar challenges they may be facing including the different experiences between natural and social scientists' experiences.

**Implications for Practice**

As a case study, this research offers important implications for the individuals at Uni Potsdam to better understand the ways that professors experience their work and define their roles amid so many changes. The implications for practice are presented here in two parts. First through the eyes of the professors themselves and the advice they offer to the university, state, country, and EU from their interviews responses. Second, I provide advice based on the study as a whole and offers ideas to next steps.
Advice from Professors

Participants were each asked to provide advice for the leadership of the University of Potsdam, Brandenburg higher education leaders, and the EU policy makers into ways that their decisions could better improve professorial work. Some professors felt very comfortable with this question and offered many pieces of advice; others were more apprehensive to answer and clearly stated that if there were something they wanted to change they would tell the leadership themselves. For those in the latter group, they emphasized professors’ role in university governance and that they play an important role in the reform efforts. As such, the advice they could provide would be more appropriately given within committees and in university forums and not necessary through an interview with an external person. For those in the former group, they openly shared their opinions in the following six areas: (1) Stop Reforming, (2) Improve processes for Professors, (3) Support Professors as Individuals, (4) Rethink the professorial incentive structure, (5) Build upon the university’s strengths, and (6) Reduce the administrative tasks on professors and improve incentives for excellence in administrative staff.

Stop Reforming. The most popular piece of advice from professors was requesting that the university stop reforming. Professors shared their frustration with reforms occurring every two years and the constant need to engage in the “next big thing.” One ECWiSo said the regular changes meant, “every time you do something and something new is coming up. And what you’ve done two weeks ago is obsolete and you have to do the next thing. And that is just ridiculous. It is so inefficient.” One LCNatSci explained, “I think people are fed up with reforms right now. [Laughs.] They want to be
left alone.” Professors feel that they have engaged in massive reforms for over a decade and it is time to assess the current state before making more changes.

Interestingly, aligned with the desire to stop reforming was the desire for the quality assurance movement to decelerate at Uni Potsdam. Quality assurance is now much more visible in German higher education and a driving force for many of these reforms. Professors articulated that they do not see a necessity for quality assurers in the system. An ECNatSci explained,

Push back the influence of these quality assurers and certifiers and whichever names they give themselves. Because I think this is one of the big—yeah, I think there’s a problem that there’s this whole caste of people becoming established who essentially want to tell us how to do things. I know, well these people, they talk and they talk—the politicians into coming up with or letting them come up with new ideas of how to change things all the time, and then in the end it distracts us from what we really should be doing. So yeah, just limit that. And of course, they have to justify their own existence, so every two years they want to tell us something different of how to do things and that all this creates is just a lot of unnecessary work for us, I think. Every two years you’re supposed to, I don’t know, accreditation is the word. Every two years you’re supposed to, I don’t know, reorganize the way that the teaching is done and fill out lots of—there are a lot forms, put a lot of print on paper, to no obvious purpose. It doesn’t make our research better. It doesn’t make our teaching better and it just kills time. And of course justifies the existence of the quality assurers and accreditors and so on.
The quality assurance movement throughout German higher education is something that, aligned with Bologna reforms, has evolved from the desire across Europe and Germany for more accountability of higher education institutions to state funding. As a whole, however, to the extent the university can control demands from above, professors ask the university to minimize reform efforts and provide a space for the already established reforms to have time to create the intended change.

Two professors articulated their desire for their fellow colleagues to be patient with the Bologna reforms and to recognize that it takes time for change to happen. One ECWiSo stated that he wanted his colleagues,

To be more scientific oriented and don’t be so skeptical against all the new processes, which have been brought in the last years like Bologna. And I would like to say well, let’s change our students and let’s change the student periods. Let’s have the Bachelor and Masters. Let’s go further on 10 years and see how they work and then evaluate these processes and then rechange [sic] it if it’s necessary.

The degree of change at Uni Potsdam has been significant over the past decade and as a result, Bologna fatigue (Hoell et al., 2009) is alive and well. Professors are tired of the many reform efforts and ask for less reform in the near future.

**Improve processes for Professors.** In their words, professors want the university leadership to leave science to the professors, trust people to do their jobs, hire more faculty members, improve the process of ordering equipment, and offer important paperwork in both German and English.
First, an LCWiSo advised, "it would be good for the university that is not to think that university administrations can improve science directly. They can create space where science can develop. And they should create this space, where people can make science." This professor felt that the need for external management in science activities was a misconception of university leadership; the more management by administration, the more frustrated the professors have become.

Another common theme was the exorbitant amount of paperwork required for university processes. An LCNatSci illustrated frustration and imagined a better world Where I don't have to fill out three forms for each pencil, which takes up my nerves and my time, and I could do better things than this. So just trust people more that they are not very stupid, and that they have come to this level because they are not very stupid, because they have worked hard and know their job. So, less administration, more freedom to deal with things, which does not mean that there should be no control, of course. But there are clever ways of controlling people and money spent and all this.

Quite a few professors spoke to this issue with their desire to have more autonomy in purchasing items and using less paperwork for each action. They see it as unnecessary time added to their already busy schedule.

Professors also would like to see more faculty members hired to meet the needs of growing student bodies. This frustration was voiced by professors towards both the institution and the state for incentivizing admitting more students but not adding more professors. An ECNatSci stated,
And so if the university is willing to accept more students, they should also be willing to enlarge the faculty or the faculty members. It has to do with the policies of the whole state. I think that definitely, the number of faculty members should be increased somehow; meaning that more money should be allocated to the university because the problem is that in the last—I think in the last three years—the number of students has increased quite a lot. And so on one hand, you’re faced with practical problems because you have overcrowded rooms. You have a lot of students in your courses and if you are teaching practical courses, you can’t take all the students in.

Growing enrollments across Germany without a proportionate growth in professors has been an issue for many years (Enders et al., 2002).

The process of ordering equipment is also a common theme across professorial interviews. The university policy is that one must obtain three bids for each piece of equipment and choose the best option based on the cost. This process however takes quite a bit of time and must be executed by the secretaries, not the professors. Professors were very frustrated that they could not just order equipment from companies that they know have exactly what they need. One ECWiSo explained:

I think it’s related again to the German problem. Because the university is of course forced to implement things that come from the state, from the national government. But if I could wish for, I would just do away with all these little forms, Dienstantrag, Beschaffungsantrag, just call the company and order the thing. Just get it done.
And finally, one professor in particular shared a frustration with important communications being written in German when the person has not yet learned the language. The professor explained that the language of science is English and with the increased internationalization at the university, it would be very helpful to have information in English.

**Support Professors as Individuals.** Professors shared two main concerns about institutional support. First, many professors are members of dual academic career families and would appreciate greater attention paid to this fact when considering long term plans for junior professors and other appointments. Currently, the University of Potsdam has employed a Coach for Newly Appointed Professors, who works closely with dual academic families to help the spouse of a newly appointed professor find work in the area. Yet, if a professor was hired before this service began in 2008, they are not eligible for its benefits. Quite a few professors would appreciate this support throughout the course of their time at Uni Potsdam.

The second issue is what one professor described as the people are what matter the most in the university, not the reforms or the structures. One LCNatSci elucidated, I think the main message that I want to give is that it's the people, the people, the people. And I think Clinton once said “It's the economy, stupid,” here for the university I will say “It's people, stupid.” It's not the system, it's not the regulations, it's the people, students, the people working here from the cleaning lady up to the president. Yeah. And they need to have the right spirit. They need
to feel at home. They need to be challenged a little bit by ever-growing tasks and new things. But we have to concentrate on the people.

Amid so many reform efforts, often the people are asked to adapt to structures and find ways to operate within the system for the outcomes desired. But professors want reformers and politicians to consider the human component in their decisions. Although the bottom line is important, but the humanity of a university makes it a truly unique social structure that advances society.

Rethink the Professorial Incentive Structure. Some professors feel that the incentive structure has gone too far to valuing research funds over all else. Professors offered advice on how to rethink the incentive structure to be more representative of the values of professorial work. One LCNatSci described,

Plus [do] not just have the bonus system based on the research level. Teaching of course there’s no pot of money there so even if you’re doing great you can’t really give them the bonus. So we’re thinking already in this faculty of having not bonus from teaching or bonus from research or bonus for something else let’s say outreach or administration but a [teaching] x b[research] x c[service]. That means if there is a zero there, the end result is zero. So that’s how we thought about it so that everyone takes parts at all levels. As opposed to just a few people taking part at each level. Some people [are] heavily involved in administration, heavily involved in doing good teaching and some people [are] heavily involved in getting research and doing research, so not doing the other things. And if the bonus only comes from the research and then of course people are doing it.
Some departments are trying to find ways to incentivize professors across professorial work, not just in one area over another. This particular professor offered a formula for each aspect of professorial work—teaching, research, and service—each required some effort in order for a professor to be rewarded. As he/she explained, if any one of these areas equaled zero, a professor would receive no bonus.

An ECWiSo offered additional advice,

I will suggest, I have done this in the past, both at the faculty level and at the university level, I think for example publications should be more, good quality publications should be relatively more important than research money.
That’s probably one of the most important things that I…and I think, yeah, another would be to sort of providing incentives to build sort of, more flexible incentives to build more collaborative structures in the fields you work in rather than having this big interdisciplinary, faculty by projects I think is also a better model.

The incentive structure very clearly values only one aspect of professorial work over others and professors who engage in many dimensions believe that each part that is valued should count in the evaluation.

**Build upon the university’s strengths.** Many participants suggest that given the already low allocations to higher education in Brandenburg as well as new budget cuts in discussion at the state level the future of the university could be best sustained with building upon those programs that are the strongest and eliminating those that are not. One ECWiSo explained that Uni Potsdam needed to “Build upon the university’s
strengths in science partnerships and its location in Berlin-Brandenburg.” Another ECWiSo stated that Uni Potsdam should,

Recognize and focus on your strength. Position yourself and then fund the remaining forces adequately. Good education, good teaching. Because I don’t think most of the colleagues are thinking about that.

Professors feel that an audit of the applicability of courses to the mission of the university, the cutting of programs and potentially departments, while difficult, would offer a way to maximize the assets of the university as a whole.

Reduce the administrative tasks on professors and improve incentives for excellence within administrative staff. A final piece of advice from professors was for the university administration to reallocate the administrative tasks (paperwork, administrative processes) to the administrative staff (secretaries) and let the professors focus their energy on science. They explained two sides of this issue. For one the administrative tasks take quite a bit of time away from the other demands of professorial work. One ECNatSci requested, “Well, just keep all the terrible, irrelevant, academic stuff off, away from us.” The administrative staff members are hired to accomplish many of these tasks. But, professors felt that secretaries were not incentivized to show high quality customer service to professors and students. The system offers positions with permanent status, but very little incentive to perform at a high level. An ECNatSci describes,

Most of them have a permanent position. That’s actually a problem. Again administration relies very much on the intrinsic motivation of individuals. And
here in Potsdam, so I would say at the other places where I worked before.... We had an average level of intrinsic motivation all over administrative people. Here in Potsdam it's a little bit different. Here in Potsdam, we have half the people who are really highly motivated, really, really great. And there is another half who has no intrinsic motivation at all and tries to block certain processes whenever it's possible.

As outlined throughout this study, professors feel that the demands on their time are great and with these additional administrative tasks, they grow frustrated and desire for more efficiency in the university processes. With each part of the university working together to accomplish tasks, it can run more efficiently and effectively.

**Advice from this Dissertation**

As a US scholars studying German higher education as an outsider looking in, I frame my advice in the context of an Anglo-American orientation towards higher education but with an extensive knowledge of and respect for the German culture and system. The core pieces of advice I can offer therefore are the following:

1. Further utilize the quality manager in each department or hire a coordinator of the Bologna implementation to align ECTS across courses within each department
2. Create a timeline for accomplishing ECTS alignment
3. Offer incentives for teaching, research, and service as a means of distributing the value of the system into the reward structure
4. Consider a tenure-track option for all JPs with a trial period of six years before appointment
• Create mandatory first-year student orientation to explain the degree structures and the system as a whole, which would provide them with all the necessary tools to be successful in their three years as a Bachelor's student or two years as a Master's student.

• Audit the university programs in terms of the number of graduates in the majors, the number of professors, and reallocate resources across the university by perhaps cutting or reducing unnecessary programs.

• Leverage further the Berlin-Brandenburg research connection and utilize those connections to become a larger and more significant player in the German scientific community. Excellence is present on campus, allow for the external constituents to understand that quality on a national scale through further engagement in collaborative research and externally highlighting major collaborative research endeavors.

• Create a mentoring program between JP and Professors. Mentoring must arise from the Professors themselves and not coordinated by the university. Change the culture to one that further supports young scientists.

• Host a professorial workshop designed to construct learning outcomes and build synergy across departments. Discuss how a student compartmentalizing their knowledge is actually creating more work over time and that integration and synthesis across programs will benefit both student and professor. Have professors lead and encourage collaboration.
• After the audit of degree programs and potential reduction of programs, hire more administrative staff to support professor’s efforts.

Implications for Future Research

This study focuses only on one German university in former East Germany. Future research on the impact of Bologna Process and German higher education on professorial work and role definition could be expanded to include additional universities in Germany in different states. Such a study could be framed either qualitatively or through a quantitative lens to establish patterns across institutions. A comparison across German universities would be very interesting and add a great deal to the body of literature on German higher education.

In addition, I would recommend more future research studies on the impact of Bologna specifically on professorial work. Much of the research has focused on Bologna’s impact on the student experience, which is also important. But as professors are the researchers and teachers within German universities, their role is quite significant and one that necessitates deeper inquiry. In addition, more studies of German junior professors at multiple universities, their job satisfaction, and experience with professorial work would be of interest to the professional JP organizations as well the federal ministry of education. It also would provide an account of the changing informal and formal rules of the newly established position.

At the European level, the impact of the Bologna process on professorial work across systems has already been explored in some instances in Italy, Russia, Spain and many other regions (Aittola et al., 2009; Fernández Díaz et al., 2010; Gaenzle et al.,
However, one study that compares professorial work could provide a greater depth of understanding into the connection between the degree changes and the dramatic shift in teaching responsibilities and approaches.

Finally, a study focused on the universities in former East Germany would fill an enormous gap in the literature that is dominated by many wealthy universities in former West Germany. The East/West divide is an important part of German history and looking at the economic and social impacts throughout higher education now even 20 years later is an area that needs further exploration.

Conclusion of Dissertation

This case study offers Uni Potsdam a more in-depth look at the perceptions of their professors in the natural sciences and economics/social sciences and illustrates their perceived impact of Bologna and German higher education reforms on their work and role definition. Interestingly, professors often realized through the interviews that they have not been asked many of these questions in the past. Thus, the interview provided them a time to reflect on how their work has changed. This study sought to offer the space for professors and the results for the university to continue their efforts towards refining and advancing their 21st century "jung, modern, und forschungorientiert" university.

Translated into English as "Young, modern, and research-oriented"
Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,

hiermit möchte Sie um Unterstützung bei meinem Promotionsvorhaben „Impact of German Higher Education Reforms on Professorial Role Definition and Career Path at the University of Potsdam“ bitten. Ich bin Doktorandin im Fachbereich Bildungspolitik, Bildungsplanung und Führung in Hochschulbildung auf dem College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia, USA und wohne bis zum 1. März 2012 in Potsdam, um eine qualitative Untersuchung im Rahmen meiner Doktorarbeit durchführen zu können.


Abschließend möchte ich Sie noch darauf hinweisen, dass jedes Interview aufgezeichnet und bei der Transkription anonymisiert wird.

Über eine positive Rückmeldung würde ich mich sehr freuen.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen,

Christen Cullum Hairston
Universität Potsdam
Campus Golm
Karl-Liebknecht-Str. 24-25/ Zimmer: 1.65
14476 Potsdam
hairston@uni-potsdam.de
APPENDIX B

INITIAL SURVEY TO PROFESSORS IN GERMAN

Administered via www.surveymonkey.de

Übersicht über den Teilnehmer

1. Name, Vorname:
2. Akademischer Titel (Professor, Juniorprofessor, oder ein anderer):
3. Fakultät, Fachrichtung, Forschungsbereich:
4. Auf welchem Campus arbeiten Sie? In welchem Haus befindet sich Ihr Büro und welche ist Ihre Büro-Nummer?
5. Wie viele Jahre sind Sie schon forschend und/oder lehrend an einer Universität tätig? Und bei Universität Potsdam?
6. Wären Sie bereit, ein 90-minütiges Interview über Ihre Arbeit an der Universität Potsdam mit mir zu führen? Das Interview kann in englischer oder deutscher Sprache geführt werden. Welche Sprache würden Sie bevorzugen? (Ich spreche zwar beide Sprachen, sofern Sie das Interview aber auf Englisch führen würden, wäre ich Ihnen sehr dankbar.)
7. Diese Studie konzentriert sich auf die Auswirkungen der deutschen Hochschulreformen auf Professoren/innen und Juniorprofessoren/innen an der Universität Potsdam. Wären Sie bereit, offen Ihre Meinung über diese Reformen zu äußern?
8. Um meine Arbeit zu erleichtern, würde ich Sie herzlich bitten, mir Ihren Lebenslauf (CV) zuzusenden. Sie könnten diesen in das Feld unten kopieren oder aber per E-Mail an mich senden (hairston@uni-potsdam.de).
9. Bitte wählen Sie einen möglichen Zeitpunkt für das Interview (Tag und Uhrzeit). Wenn Sie an mehreren Tagen Zeit für mich haben, geben Sie das bitte ebenfalls an:

Montag, 12 Dezember 2011 Morgen oder Nachmittag
Dienstag, 13 Dezember 2011 Morgen oder Nachmittag
Mittwoch, 14 Dezember 2011 Morgen oder Nachmittag
Donnerstag, 15 Dezember 2011 Morgen oder Nachmittag
Freitag, 16 Dezember 2011 Morgen oder Nachmittag

Montag, 9 Januar 2012 Morgen oder Nachmittag
Dienstag, 10 Januar 2012 Morgen oder Nachmittag
Mittwoch, 11 Januar 2012 Morgen oder Nachmittag
Donnerstag, 12 Januar 2012 Morgen oder Nachmittag
Freitag, 13 Januar 2012 Morgen oder Nachmittag

Montag, 16 Januar 2012 Morgen oder Nachmittag
Dienstag, 17 Januar 2012 Morgen oder Nachmittag
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag der Woche</th>
<th>Datum 1</th>
<th>Datum 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mittwoch</td>
<td>18 Januar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnerstag</td>
<td>19 Januar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freitag</td>
<td>20 Januar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dienstag</td>
<td>24 Januar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittwoch</td>
<td>25 Januar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnerstag</td>
<td>26 Januar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freitag</td>
<td>27 Januar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montag</td>
<td>30 Januar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dienstag</td>
<td>31 Januar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittwoch</td>
<td>1 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnerstag</td>
<td>2 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freitag</td>
<td>3 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montag</td>
<td>6 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dienstag</td>
<td>7 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittwoch</td>
<td>8 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnerstag</td>
<td>9 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freitag</td>
<td>10 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montag</td>
<td>13 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dienstag</td>
<td>14 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittwoch</td>
<td>15 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnerstag</td>
<td>16 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freitag</td>
<td>17 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montag</td>
<td>20 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dienstag</td>
<td>21 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittwoch</td>
<td>22 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnerstag</td>
<td>23 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freitag</td>
<td>24 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montag</td>
<td>27 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dienstag</td>
<td>28 Februar 2012</td>
<td>Morgen oder Nachmittag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR INSTITUTIONAL LEADERS

Auf Deutsch:

   a. Als Führung
   b. Mit Professoren und Juniorprofessoren
   c. Mit dem Staat
   d. Mit Finanzierungsempfindungen

2. Was glauben Sie, waren die wesentlichsten Veränderungen an der Universität Potsdam in den letzten 10 Jahren?
   a. Wie gehen diese Veränderungen an der Universität Potsdam?
   b. Was sind die Vorteil und Nachteil?

3. Was meinen Sie über die Bologna-Prozess?

4. Was halten Sie von dem Wettbewerb für Deutschland im Allgemeinen?
   a. Für Professoren/Juniorprofessoren
   b. Für Uni Potsdam
   c. Gibt es Veränderungen in dem Wettbewerb in Deutschland oder an der Uni Potsdam in den letzten 10 Jahren?

5. Was halten Sie von der European Higher Education Area (EHEA)?
   a. Was sind die Vorteile eines gemeinsamen Systems?
   b. Welche Herausforderungen sehen Sie?
   c. Was könnte besser gemacht werden?

6. Haben Sie das Gefühl, daß die Autorität und die Macht der Universität, der Leitung und der Verwaltung hat sich im letzten Jahrzehnt verstärkt? Wie so nicht oder wie?

7. Wie wurde die Juniorprofessur an der Universität Potsdam umgesetzt?
   a. Wie war die allgemeine Wahrnehmung der Professoren? Wie ist sie jetzt?
   b. Was ist das Ergebnis der Einführung der Juniorprofessur?
   c. Wie glauben Sie, hat und wird sich weiterhin die Juniorprofessur auf die deutsche Professorenschaft als Ganzes auswirken?

8. Akademische Freiheit ist in der deutschen Verfassung. Als Führung der Universität, was bedeutet das akademische Freiheit der Professoren für Sie?

9. In welcher Weise glauben Sie, dass sich der DDR-historische Kontext von Potsdam auf die Ideologie, Philosophie, Wirtschaft, Struktur und Kultur der Universität Potsdam auswirkt?

10. Was ist speziell über Uni Potsdam?

11. Welche Stärken und Visionen für die Zukunft würden Sie gerne einem breiteren akademischen Publikum mitteilen?

In English:

1. Please tell me about your role at the University of Potsdam.
   a. Leadership
b. Interaction with Professors and Junior Professors
c. Interaction with the state
d. Funding decisions

2. What have you seen to be the most substantial changes to University of Potsdam over the past decade?
   a. How has University of Potsdam adapted to those changes?
   b. What do you see as the great successes? Greatest challenges?

3. What is your opinion of the Bologna Process?
   a. What have these changes meant for the University of Potsdam?

4. What are your thoughts of the role of competition in Germany today?
   a. For the University of Potsdam
   b. For Professors/Junior Professors
   c. Have you seen a change in competition over time?

5. From a leadership perspective, how do you feel about the European Higher Education Area?
   a. What are the benefits of a shared system?
   b. What are some of the challenges you have seen?

6. Do you feel that the authority and power of the university, the leadership, and the administration has strengthened over the past decade? How so or how not?

7. How do you think the implementation of the junior professorship has been at Uni Potsdam?
   a. What do you see as advantages and disadvantages of this new role in the German system?

8. The academic freedom of a Professor in Germany is very important as outlined in Article 5 of the German constitution. What does this article and this freedom mean to you as a university leader?

9. In your opinion, what is the role of a Professor in this university?

10. In what ways (if at all) do you believe that the former East German historical context of Potsdam affect Uni Potsdam still today?

11. What is most unique about Uni Potsdam?

12. What would you like the larger academic world to know about Uni Potsdam, its strengths, and its vision for the future?
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR PROFESSORS AND JPS

90-minute interviews

Each participant will be asked to provide a copy of his or her Curriculum Vitae (CV) for this interview.

This study seeks to understand the way that Professors and Junior Professors at the University of Potsdam define their professional roles as well as how they experience their career path over time. Specifically I am interested in understanding how (if at all) the Bologna Process and German-specific higher education reforms have impacted faculty work at the University of Potsdam. So throughout this interview, please help me to understand how your work is structured and in what ways you have seen changes over the course of your career. I appreciate your thoughtful responses.

1. Tell me about your background and your path to becoming a Professor.
   a. What motivated you to become a Professor?
   b. Why did you choose the University of Potsdam?

2. Tell me about the structure of your work.
   a. Teaching: in terms of time, content, students, preparation, class size
   b. Research: in terms of time, focus, commitment, publications, pressure
   c. Service: What type of service do you do? For example, committees, university governance, professional organizations, other?

3. Describe to me how competition/comparison plays a role in your work.
   a. With whom do you compete?
   b. What do you compete for?
   c. How much or how little does it motivate your actions?

4. As you know over the past 12 years, German higher education has significantly changed as a result of both the Bologna Process as well as German-specific higher education reforms.
   a. How have these changes affected your interaction with your work? In terms of:
      i. Interactions with students
      ii. Interactions with colleagues
      iii. Interactions with administration

5. The academic freedom of a Professor in Germany is very important as outlined in Article 5 of the German constitution. What does this article and this freedom mean to you?
   a. Has this meaning changed over the course of your career? If so, how and if not, please explain.
b. What do you think it means to be a professor across Germany today? How has that changed?

6. What does it mean to you to be a professor in Germany today?

7. What role does the university administration play at the University of Potsdam and in your work?

8. What is your opinion of the Junior Professorship in Germany?
   a. What do you think about an opportunity for young scholars to obtain a tenure-track position without a Habilitation requirement?
   b. What is your opinion of the Habilitation?

9. The University of Potsdam context is interestingly in former East Germany.
   a. Do you feel the East German context still impacts the university context of today? Please explain.
   b. In your opinion, how is the University of Potsdam unique?

10. This interview is an opportunity for you to share your insight into how the many changes in German higher education have impacted your work.
    a. What would you like to share in terms of things you would like to see changed and things that you wish to remain the same?
    b. What advice would you give to the Uni Potsdam administration, Brandenburg higher education leaders, and EU policy makers in an effort to improve your work and higher education as a whole?
# APPENDIX E

## EXCERPT FROM CODING CHARTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>JUNIOR PROFESSORSHIP EXCERPT</th>
<th>FOR POSTER</th>
<th>Original Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECNatSci1</td>
<td>All the junior professorships. The reason I always say Assistant Professor is because no one in Great Britain or in Canada or in North America is going to understand what a junior professor is. It is sounds like, ok, you’re a normal person. And that’s why on my business cards I always have Assistant, now Associate Professor even though Germans W2, but…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor=Junior Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>JP General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECNatSci1</td>
<td>Assistant Professor. I had one of those Juniorprofessoren positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>JP General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECNatSci1</td>
<td>do have the impression that now an Assistant Professor/Junior Professor really is in most places, there are always exceptions but in most places, I think he/she is a full member of the department. Which officially on paper and at the meetings you are but up here, you know, you’re not always.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP Full member of the department on paper but not always in practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impression of JP by older faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECNatSci1</td>
<td>After 3 years you just start writing the first manuscript. Or the first big grant. But then your midterm evaluation is up so this is totally duped. So tenure track is one thing but it needs to be sort of supported by the understanding that you need things to go with the tenure track. Right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midterm evaluation—coincides with first big manuscript, first big grant writing or winning, need support to go along with all of these qualifications at once.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECNatSci1</td>
<td>&quot;And I guess the other thing, which is changing at the moment, needs to change at least is historically lots of the established professors didn’t really take the junior professors seriously. That is changing though.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP not taken seriously</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impression of JP by older faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F
FULL LIST OF CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Code</th>
<th>Child Code</th>
<th>Sub-child code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bologna General</td>
<td>BA/MA/PhD Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ Structures to Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Reaction to Bologna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diplom/Magister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Curiosity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment after Graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of Bologna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesized Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECTS Credit Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treat Students as Adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Course Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transferrable Credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Calendar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course of Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Necessary Courses offered at certain times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant Reform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing competition between EU countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency or Intransparency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Path</td>
<td>Spent time in the US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD in Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year starting at Uni Potsdam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professorships at other universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evento</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent time in the UK</td>
<td>UK Universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early years in another European Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying to/Getting an offer from another university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former East Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apl. Prof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>FT/PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Process from their side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra time with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Hours of Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Sizes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive to be a good teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting future scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bearing or not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>Artikel 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Point System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drittmittel</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Quality</td>
<td>Possibility for Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Effort</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to Fire</td>
<td>Must leave institution after 6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Professorship</td>
<td>Going into job market following jp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 year term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of JP</td>
<td>Competitiveness of Job Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impression of JP by older faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habilitation</td>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not necessary for international scholars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future of Habilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Hiring Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial Job Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What it means to be a Prof in Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial Peer comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Expectations</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Collaboration</td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical Nature of Work</td>
<td>Being on committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for the Professorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room for Intellectual Thought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to working in industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Applicants for Professorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (i.e., have kids, sig other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant for Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielvereinbauung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Divide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to HE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massification of HE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Budget Cuts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to Richer Southern Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni Potsdam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni Potsdam History</td>
<td>Motivation for Professors from Uni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborations with Research Institutes</td>
<td>East Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of University</td>
<td>New University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Influence</td>
<td>New President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New University</td>
<td>Unique about Uni Potsdam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness of Leadership</td>
<td>Feeling about working at Uni Potsdam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking of University among Peers</td>
<td>Reason for coming to Uni Potsdam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Leadership of University</td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>Openly discuss issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openly discuss issues</td>
<td>Group decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group decision making</td>
<td>Charismatic Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic Leadership</td>
<td>Professorial Reward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial Reward</td>
<td>Excessive Paperwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Paperwork</td>
<td>Campus Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Life</td>
<td>Proximity to Berlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Berlin</td>
<td>Job Negotiations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Negotiations</td>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td>Professorium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorium</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Low Performing Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Performing Programs</td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>New Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Initiatives</td>
<td>University Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Governance</td>
<td>Clerks/Wissenschaftsmanager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks/Wissenschaftsmanager</td>
<td>Welcome Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Center</td>
<td>Graduate School Teaching Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School Teaching Workshops</td>
<td>Coaching for Newly Appt Profs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching for Newly Appt Profs</td>
<td>Support for Professors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Professors</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Family Friendly Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Friendly Environment</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>Excellence Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence Initiative</td>
<td>Hierarchy of Universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Administrative Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitting students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD/Masters Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirroring Anglo-American System without the same cultural context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German history</td>
<td>East/West Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WWII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nazi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970s and 1980s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students in History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DDR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prussian History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stasi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being Non-German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Drain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective vs. Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>ERA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Collaborative Research Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EHEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instance there in an interruption during the interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Habilitant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Institutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Guard vs Young Guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wissenschaftler Mitarbeiter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External PhD Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>New PhD School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Institutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration of four groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

RESEARCHER AS AN INSTRUMENT STATEMENT

Written November 10, 2011 (10 days after arriving in Germany)

As a researcher, I am the sole instrument in this qualitative study and therefore my biases are important to uncover at an early stage so that I am able to account for them in my data. I am a Ph.D. student from the College of William & Mary with a very U.S. centered higher education knowledge base and focus. Therefore doing an international study I undoubtedly bring forth my biases. However, I also majored in German in college, have traveled to Germany now three times, and highly respect the language, culture, and organization of the country as a whole.

Experiences: As I said I have traveled to Germany three times now for various reasons. In high school, I did a German-American exchange program where a German exchange student came and lived with me in my home for a month. I then lived with her in Forchheim for a month. I was able to use my German language skills from high school, travel outside the US for the first time in my life, and experience another culture. I attended the Gymnasium in Forchheim and was able to experience the differences in our educational systems.

In college I double majored in German and History. I went on an entire semester study abroad program to Bonn Germany where I took three courses (German language, literature, and architecture). I lived independently with a host family and I took the bus every day, visited friends, and traveled throughout Europe. I was able to advance my language skills, travel more (than in high school), and gain deeper meaning into what it means to be German. Also I took a 10-day tour where I went to 11 German cities in 10 days. It was very intense but we experienced everything from a concentration camp to some of the most beautiful cathedrals in Germany. We were also able to see the many differences among the various states in Germany. Each one has a very unique identity—obviously similar to the US in that regard. Things I remember the most are the beautiful cathedrals throughout Germany, Lebkuchen, the concentration camp (which literally physically made me ill), and Checkpoint Charlie. Obviously most of the history that is often highlighted in Germany is WWII, which now at my older age I see as tragic. It was a horrible time in German history and it is so sensationalized. It was a time of tragedy, pain, and horrific outcomes. After visiting the concentration camp, I actually stopped wanting to study WWII. I felt that I had seen enough.

Now, as a 32-year-old researcher, it is very interesting to me to be here in Germany, especially in former East Germany. You can see the cultural implications of the Eastern influence, Russian immigrants, language, and the difference in “haves” and “have-nots” between East and West.
Beliefs: I am studying professors for my dissertation and my only other experience interviewing and studying faculty was in my Qualitative Class my first year in my PhD program. I studied the social construction of the culture of the School of Education faculty for my project. My beliefs that I hold about professors are that they are highly intelligent, have a special desire for to contribute to scientific knowledge and/or to help students advance. I also believe that faculty members have a certain arrogance about them that comes from working so many years refining their trade. They are arrogant because they are at the top of their game in their particular field and have worked very hard to get there. So I guess one could classify that as pride or ego but others may not portray such characteristics. One thing is sure; faculty members are each very different. There is not a prescription for what one looks like, acts like, sounds like, etc. But together, they share similar roles and are often held within the same parameters of an institution.

For Germany, specifically, I believe faculty members to be of a very high social standing. That comes from my own research and my experience thus far. I think the only major hurdle for me is my U.S. expectation and perception of professors that I am certain will change as I become well acquainted with the professorate here. In terms of my personal beliefs about university work . . . I believe it to be an honor to work in a university. That comes from my own life experiences and my belief that I have the greatest job in the world. It would therefore probably be difficult for me to learn that faculty hate their jobs or despise students. But I can’t imagine that is what I will find.

What I hope to find/not hope to find: I hope that I find that the Bologna Process and Lisbon Strategy have in some way impacted faculty work because without any impact my study is kind of pointless. I hope that faculty members are willing to openly discuss their opinions with me and that language is not a hurdle for our communication. I am hopeful that faculty will feel very comfortable speaking with me and that they are as interested in the results as I am. I worry somewhat communicating with natural scientists as that is not my field and there are times that no matter the culture, the language is totally different. So, I hope that I am able to relate to them and they are able to feel comfortable talking to me. I am not willing to find out that all professors here hate the US and disagree with me doing this study. That would make my work very difficult. Thus far I have had nothing but a warm welcoming so I find that to be highly unlikely. For me at this point, I do not have specific things that I expect to find. Instead I just have a big question mark for what I want to know. I have lots of questions and I am hopeful that after the first 3-5 interviews, I will be able to really refine exactly what it is I am trying to find. Overall I think this experience will be an eye-opening one in terms of how the professorate differs between cultures but also what it means to be a German professor, what it means to strive to become a German professor, and finally what it means for young professors and their hopefulness for the future.
APPENDIX H

INFORMED CONSENT FORM IN ENGLISH

I, ____________________________, agree to participate in this qualitative study that seeks to understand how faculty members experience their work at the University of Potsdam. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to analyze the enduring impact of the Bologna Process in addition to the numerous German higher education reforms on the ways that faculty define their professional roles and experience their career path at one German institution. This study is part of the requirement for degree completion towards a Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Policy, Planning, and Leadership at the College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, United States.

I understand that I will be expected to participate in one interview (lasting approximately 90 minutes). During the interview, I will be asked questions regarding my experiences as a faculty member. I understand that the honesty and accuracy of my responses is crucial for this study. I also understand that I am not required to answer any question that I do not want to answer and that I may end the interview at any time. In addition, I understand that following the interview, I will be sent a summary of our interview via email and I agree to review the summary for content accuracy and return an edited summary to the researcher.

I understand that the interview will be audio recorded in digital format and transcribed verbatim. I understand that the information obtained in this study will be recorded with a pseudonym that will allow the researcher alone to determine my identity. At the conclusion of this study, the key linking me to the pseudonym and all audio recordings will be destroyed and will no longer be available for use. All efforts will be made to conceal my identity in the study’s report of results and to keep my personal information confidential under all circumstances. I understand that as a participant, I will receive a final summary of the report.

I understand that there will be minimal psychological discomfort directly involved with this research. I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in this study at any time by notifying the researcher, Christen Cullum Hairston (christenhairston@gmail.com).

If I have any questions that arise in connection with my participation in this study, I should contact Dorothy Finnegan, Ph.D., the dissertation chair, at 001.757.221.2346 or definn@wm.edu. I understand that I may report any problems or dissatisfaction to Thomas Ward, Ph.D., Chair of the School of Education Internal Review Committee at 001.757.221.2358 or tjward@wm.edu or Michael Deschenes, Ph.D., chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William and Mary at 001.757.221.2778 or mrdesc@wm.edu.
My signature below signifies that I am at least 18 years of age, that I have received a copy of this consent form, and that I consent to allowing the researcher to record my interview as a part of this study.

Date ________________    Participant ________________________________

Date ________________    Investigator ________________________________

A Required Disclaimer from the College of William & Mary's Research Internal Review Board: THIS PROJECT WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2011-11-01 AND EXPIRES ON 2012-11-01.
APPENDIX I

INFORMED CONSENT FORM IN GERMAN

Erklärung zur Teilnahme an einer wissenschaftlichen Studie

Hiermit erkläre ich, ___________________________________________________________________, meine Bereitschaft zur Teilnahme an einer qualitativen Studie, die zum Gegenstand hat, zu untersuchen welche Erfahrungen Fakultätsmitglieder bei ihrer Arbeit an der Universität Potsdam machen. Spezifisch soll die Studie die Auswirkung auf die Arbeit durch verschiedene europäische und deutsche Bildungsreformen untersuchen und wie Fakultätsmitglieder dadurch ihre professionelle Rolle definieren und ihre Karrieren an der Universität erleben. Diese Studie ist Teil meiner Doktorarbeit und eine Voraussetzung, um meinen Abschluß als Doktor der Philosophic im Fachbereich Bildungspolitik, Bildungsplanung und Führung in Hochschulbildung auf dem „College of William and Mary“ in Williamsburg, Virginia, USA.


Ich kann darüber hinaus jederzeit meine Teilnahme an der Gesamtstudie widerrufen, in dem ich die Doktorandin, Frau Christen Cullum Hairston (christenhairston@gmail.com or hairston@uni-potsdam.de) kontaktiere.

Sollte ich Fragen im Rahmen der Studie und meiner Teilnahme daran haben, kann ich Frau Dorothy Finnegan, Ph.D., betreuende Professorin, unter der Telefonnummer +1-757-221-2346 oder per Email definn@wm.edu kontaktieren. Sollte ich unzufrieden mit dem Interview oder dem Interviewer sein, kann ich mich jederzeit an Thomas Ward, Ph.D., Leiter der Fakultät Bildung Interner Prüfung unter der Telefonnummer +1-757-221-2358 oder per Email tjward@wm.edu beziehungsweise an Michael Deschenes, Ph.D., Leiter des Komitees zur Einhaltung der persönlichen Rechte an der College of William and Mary unter der Telefonnummer +1-757-221-2778 oder per Email mrdesc@wm.edu wenden.
Mit meiner Unterschrift bestätige ich, daß ich mindestens 18 Jahre alt bin, daß ich eine Kopie dieses Genehmigungsformular erhalten habe und daß ich die Erlaubnis dem Interviewer (Frau Hairston) erteile, das Interview schriftlich niederzuschreiben.

Datum____________________Teilnehmer________________________________________

Datum____________________ Interviewer_______________________________________

A Required Disclaimer from the College of William & Mary Research Internal Review Board: THIS PROJECT WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone +1-757-221-3966) ON NOVEMBER 1st, 2011 AND EXPIRES ON NOVEMBER 1st, 2012.
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