Changes in Academic Work and the Chair Regime: The Case of German Business Administration Academics

Michael Muller-Camen and Stefan Salzgeber

Michael Muller-Camen
International University in Germany

Stefan Salzgeber
University of Innsbruck, Austria

Abstract

Today universities around the world are becoming subject to audits and evaluations that not only open them to outside scrutiny, but also force them to compete with each other for students, staff and funding. This development is supposed to lead to radical changes to academic work in business schools. Whereas there is an intensive debate about this issue in the UK, much less is known about changes in higher education in other European countries. This paper will show through the example of German business administration academics that similar pressures might not lead to similar outcomes. In the German system, hierarchy will remain more important than the market for academic work. Although role conflicts seem to increase for academics at all hierarchical levels, the traditional regime is likely to resist any far-reaching changes.

Keywords: academic work, academic careers, German business administration, German universities, research evaluation

Universities are under increasing change pressures. New forms of audit are being introduced to make universities more accountable. Whereas in the past the amount of state funding received by higher education institutions was often determined by the number of academic staff employed (block grants), today there is a tendency to link state subsidies to output. In the UK, for example, block grants have been abolished and the allocation of resources to individual universities has become directly linked to the number of students educated and the assessment of research output. Hence, not surprisingly, today the market plays a prominent role in debates about the management and change of universities (Gioia and Thomas 1996). Terms such as 'academic capitalism', 'competition', 'efficiency', 'new production of knowledge', 'performance', 'value for money', 'quality' and 'academic labour' dominate the discourse (Jary and Parker 1998; Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Smyth 1995; Willmott 1995).

It is widely assumed that the marketization of higher education has or will have a significant impact on the work of academics, i.e. how it is organized, how it is enacted, in whose interests and with what ultimate effects. Thus these matters 'go to the very heart of how knowledge is produced, construed and conveyed' (Smyth 1995: 2). Of particular importance for the argument pursued here is that the forms and practices of organizing academic work not

Organization Studies
26(2): 271–290
ISSN 0170–8406

DOI: 10.1177/0170840605049802

only affect the quality of the products but also constitute the subjectivity of the producers. In other words, the practices produce those modes of thought, perception and action which are perceived to be rational within the system. Any regime of practices is also productive of the subjects necessary to make it work. As Foucault (1977: 27–8) put it: 'The subject who knows, the objects to be known and the modalities of knowledge must be regarded as so many effects of these fundamental implications of power-knowledge and their historical transformations.' The marketization of academia which introduces a series of more or less interconnected practices of organizing and evaluating academic work is productive not only of a new type of knowledge (Gibbons et al. 1994) but also of a new type of academic.

Over the last decade there has been an extensive debate about the competitiveness of German universities. The whole academic system is going through a transformation and the forms and practices of organizing academic work are changing. The aim of this paper is to analyse the transformation process in the German academic system, especially the impact on the subjectivity of the academic. By citing the case of the UK we can learn about the possible impact of these changes on academic work. However, we will show that the German case creates its own dynamic. In this sense we will challenge convergence thinking, which would suggest that similar change pressures will reduce differences between national systems.

The Marketization of Higher Education in the UK

Most research about the marketization of higher education has been conducted in the UK where this issue has been discussed intensively and controversially (see, for example, Henkel 2000; Jary and Parker 1998; Prichard and Willmott 1997; Smyth 1995). Since the beginning of the 1980s 'sophisticated systems of surveillance' (Parker and Jary 1995: 319) of academic work have been introduced in British universities. The system of higher education in the UK is not a homogenous one, and there are differences in the development towards marketization and its impact between different types of universities and in particular between old and new universities (Harley et al. 2004). This, nevertheless, will be largely ignored in this paper in favour of greater clarity.

The evaluation of research, the research assessment exercise (RAE), has had a strong impact on academic work in the UK. Every four years the quality of research output is assessed by a peer review system (for a more detailed description of this evaluation see Bessant et al. 2003), in which the medium of dissemination (e.g. referred journal, book chapter, conference paper) is the main indicator of quality (Willmott 1998). For UK academics it is now common to talk about 5 or 5* (highest grades in the assessment exercise) departments, journals or even researchers (Doyle and Arthurs 1995: 258). The RAE grading of a department according to its research output has had more and more influence on funding for research, on peer assessment, prospective students, industrial collaborators and job applicants and its capacity to attract research grants (Doyle and Arthurs 1995: 257). In this context, marketization refers to the linking of research output and funding. As a result the RAE creates an artificial market, in which the RAE grading stands for the prizes won.

There is evidence that the 'audit explosion' (Power 1994) at universities has had an impact on the way research is conducted, and the issues covered, as well as the quantity and quality of the research output (Harley and Lee 1997; Miller 1995: 44). The RAE exerts pressure to research issues that will be publishable in highly rated journals. Predictable but unexciting outcomes that can be published quickly (Prichard and Willmott 1997: 301) will be preferred. According to Parker and Jary (1995: 329), multiple authorship (for the RAE it does not make a difference whether a paper has one or more authors, as long as they are not in the same department), self-citation and the division of one paper into many have been responses to the RAE.

The general trend of intensifying the processes of auditing has also transformed the internal organization of universities. The need to compare and standardize research output has resulted in a McDonaldization of universities (Parker and Jary 1995). Members of a McUniversity 'relate less to each other as colleagues within a chartered corporation and more as "managers" and "managed"' (Prichard and Willmott 1997: 301). Considering the material and immaterial implications of the RAE grading, it is not surprising that the recruitment, pay, promotion and job security of academics increasingly depend on their measurable research output. In other words, in order to get higher funding in the institutional market, business schools exert pressure on their academic staff to produce the output needed by the system (Harley et al. 2002). In their review of the RAE, Cooper and Otley (1998: 81) make this obvious with their suggestion that 'by clearly attaching financial rewards to good performance ... the career benefits of achievement in research are now much more apparent than in the past.' The external ranking of universities thus leads to an internal ranking of academic labour (Willmott 1995) and an academic's research output has a direct impact on his or her 'market value'. As a result the exchange value of academic labour has become more important than its use value (Willmott 1998).

In addition to the RAE, the widespread introduction of performance measures fosters the emergence of a university management. According to Bryson (2000) and Parker and Jary (1995) this development has resulted in lower salaries, disempowerment, loss of autonomy, less job security and higher work pressures for academic staff. While there has been a differential impact between institutions and especially between the 'new' and the 'old' universities in the UK, the higher work pressure on academic staff redirects their efforts from 'good citizen' activities such as administration, committee work and teaching towards research.

Nevertheless, there are not only losers, but also winners. For the winners conflicts diminish. Academic staff are usually torn between administration, teaching and research. Whereas the employer has traditionally emphasized teaching and service, the discipline mainly rewards research (Clark 1983). Because research output has become crucial for the institution as well, it is in its interest to relieve its active research staff as much as possible from other duties. The body of 'research professors' in the new universities, appointed especially for their ability to boost RAE ratings, is a particular case in point. Hence one could argue that for a minority of staff the RAE fosters the traditional ideal of the scientific community. According to Whitley (1984: 52) this is achieved 'where employers' goals are identical, and subservient, to those of reputational groups'. In such a system recruitment and promotion decisions are directly influenced by academic reputation (Whitley 1984) and mobility is contested rather than sponsored (Cable and Murray 1999; Halsey 1992). Turner (1960: 857) compares contested mobility with 'a sporting event in which many compete for a few recognised prizes'. In contrast, a sponsored mobility system 'favours a controlled selection process.... The elite or their agents choose individuals for elite status when they have the appropriate qualities. Individuals do not win or seize elite status; mobility is rather a process of sponsored induction into the elite' (Turner 1960: 857).

The German Case

Today there is a widespread feeling that the changes in academic work which have already affected British academics will sooner or later also have an impact on those in other European countries (Engwall 1997). For example, Kieser (1998), who has been an external evaluator of business studies in Holland, has suggested that the increasing use of evaluations will lead to similar changes in other European countries, and publications in top-tier international journals will become the most important measure of academic output. Nevertheless, similar change pressures may not necessarily lead to a convergence of national systems of academic work. The marketization of higher education, which is changing academic work in the UK, may not have the same impact in other countries. In the past, comparative research has pointed to differences between systems of higher education (see, for example, Clark 1983; Galtung 1982; Koza and Thoenig 1995). The case of academic work in the field of management in Germany is a particularly good test for convergence thinking. In Germany, the lowest operating unit in universities is not the department, as in Anglo-Saxon countries, but the chair (*Lehrstuhl*). This difference in organizational structures could have a profound effect on change in academia. However, the German context is of interest for other reasons as well. There are more than 1000 full professors and other post-doctoral scholars in the field of business administration in Austria, Germany and the German-speaking part of Switzerland, forming one research community. Hence, researchers from German-speaking countries constitute one of the biggest communities in management studies worldwide. The increasing tendency towards international research collaborations makes it important to know how academic systems work. Furthermore, in Continental Europe several other university systems have a similar structure to the German, so that at least some of the analysis will apply to them as well. The issue of how academic work in Europe is or will be affected by changes in the higher education system is largely unexamined (Danieli and Thomas 1999; Enders

2001). This is particularly important at a time when academic systems around the world are under strong pressure to converge to Anglo-Saxon models.

Over the last decade, there has been an extensive debate about Germany as a business location and the relative weakness of the German economy. Deregulation, privatization and a reform of the public sector are widely perceived as necessary for national competitiveness in an increasingly global economy. As a result the function and operation of the cornerstones of German society such as the industrial relations system (Muller 1997) and the universities are being debated. It is increasingly questioned whether universities produce enough value for the state funding they receive. One example is a debate about 'lazy' professors, who do not take teaching seriously enough and are hardly around to see students. Across political parties a consensus emerged in the 1990s that the current higher education system cannot survive much longer and has to adapt to growing national as well as international competition (Glotz 1996; Kipping 1998; Melchior 1997; Reichwald 1998). Compared with the higher education debates in the 1960s and 1970s, democracy is hardly an issue. Instead, similar to the international discourse, terms such as 'competition', 'efficiency' and 'quality' dominate the discussion in Austria, Germany and Switzerland (Laske et al. 2000; Hanft 2000; Hödl and Zegelin 1999; Rusterholz and Liechti 1998; Titscher 2000). Modern management techniques should transform universities from public sector bureaucracies into efficient organizations for the production of knowledge (Bartölke and Grieger 2000; Melchior 1995). An important role in the transformation is played by the CHE, a think tank funded by a foundation of the German media corporation Bertelsmann (Müller-Böling 2000). With the introduction of strong management structures, more performance-related pay, the abolition of lifetime employment and the evaluation of teaching and research, universities should become more competitive and efficient.

Resembling the development in the UK, the above changes would lead to a development from the traditional system of collegial control towards a model of the university as corporate enterprise. Many German academics fear that the measures designed to transform universities will destroy the self-regulation system of German universities, undermine the freedom of academic research and teaching, and eventually make this profession much less attractive for young researchers. Not surprisingly, the marketization of higher education is opposed by most full professors (Reumann 2000). However, despite strong opposition from within universities, during its first term in office the Social Democratic Green government put forward legislation aimed at significantly transforming universities. For example, the Government introduced bonuses, which will eventually make professorial pay more performance-related, and changed the academic career system. In its second term in office, which started in autumn 2002, it aims to introduce more changes with regard to pay, to introduce a national ranking of higher education and to promote the appointment of women to professorial positions (Bulmahn 2002).

In the remainder of this paper we will analyse whether the similar rhetoric in Anglo-Saxon and Germanic countries extends as far as similarities in academic career and work. For this purpose it is necessary to examine the context in which German academics work. We will do this through using the example of the field of management studies along the three major hierarchical levels: the professor, the junior assistant and the senior assistant.

The Top of the Hierarchy: The Chair

In the German chair system, responsibility and power is concentrated in one person, the chair holder. This full professor is normally a civil servant with a tenured position. He or she leads a small department, which consists of assistants and a secretary. In contrast, the more collegial departmental organization spreads responsibility and power among several professors of similar rank (Clark 1983: 46). Chairs for business administration and economics are usually organized in one faculty, the nearest equivalent to Anglo-Saxon business schools. As with other European countries, the field of management studies has grown rapidly over the last decades (Brockhoff and Hauschildt 1993: 28). In 1998, there were 804 chairs of business administration at 92 universities in Austria, Germany and Switzerland (Oechsler 2000). Each of these specializes in a certain area such as accounting, finance, human resource management, marketing or organization studies. Usually there is only one chair for each function in a university (Homburg 1998: 388), so that it has the sole responsibility for teaching and research in this area. This system assures that most management functions are represented in a German business administration and economics faculty and that there is relatively little differentiation between German universities in terms of core subjects offered.

The doctrines of freedom in teaching and research, which in Germany are explicitly guaranteed by the constitution (Dorf 1999), help to maximize the individual discretion of the chair (Clark 1983: 111). This internal hierarchy has its origin in the medieval guild model (Clark 1983: 46–47). Another guild-like arrangement is that at the level of the faculty the individual professors come together as a group of equals in a largely self-regulated body. Hence they are at the same time autocrats and colleagues (Clark 1983: 113). Following Clark (1983), the academic oligarchy operates in combination with the state authority that tries to control chairs with bureaucratic guidelines and rules. In these arrangements the levels between the chair and the state, the faculty and the university, traditionally have little power. Deans and rectors, who are usually recruited from the ranks of full professors, are only amateur administrators on short appointment (Frese and Engels 1999). The system of self-regulation at the faculty level is characterized as ‘negative co-ordination’ by Laske and Zauner (2000: 455). Lengthy and sometimes adversarial decision-making processes provide the faculty with little power and leave the chairs with a large degree of autonomy to determine the contents of research and teaching (Reichwald 1998). Since the early 1970s, the system has changed somewhat in so far as junior faculty, students and non-academic personnel have broken up the monopoly of professors and state bureaucrats. These groups are now formally represented at the faculty and university level. But, in fact, this development has had little influence on the decision-making power of these bodies (Melchior 1995), and has had little effect at the chair level (Clark 1983; Jacobs 1993: 46; Reichwald 1998). German professors still operate within a reputational-based work organization (Whitley 1984), which is controlled from within its own rank and which resembles the traditional British system before the advent of managerialism and the increasing marketization of higher education in the UK. Chairs have a wide discretion as to how they fulfil their job and have full responsibility for research and teaching. Management is absent and there is almost complete autonomy from external, non-collegiate influence. Financial certainty and complete job security are guaranteed by the tenure system.

However, German professors of business administration are heavily involved in administration and teaching. Not only is self-governance highly time consuming, but also, more importantly, professors must teach and supervise a large number of students. The considerable expansion in student numbers since the early 1970s has been achieved despite a much smaller increase in academic staff. Today, each full professor of business administration has on average responsibility for more than 200 students (Brockhoff and Hauschildt 1993: 29). Reductions of the teaching and administration load in return for duties in the self-governance of the faculty or the discipline are usually not possible, yet the quality of teaching is, according to Locke (1996), superior to that in the US. Comparative assessments of research output in the field of business administration suggest that German scholars' productivity is not less than that of US professors (Backes-Gellner 1992; Macharzina 1993). This output is only possible as administration, teaching and research within the chair are hierarchically organized and the work is shared. The system relies on the loyal collaboration of junior and senior assistants. Current change initiatives of the German state and comparable developments in Austria and Switzerland challenge the position of full professors. Stronger management at the faculty and university level is likely to reduce the autonomy of chairs and collegiate control (Müller-Böling 2000).

So far, academic reputation in the international academic community is less important than in the national community. The number of publications in top German business journals has the biggest impact on professorial recruitment in German-speaking countries (Schlinghoff 2001). German management academics are, relative to their numbers, largely absent from international conferences. Engwall's (1998) analysis of authors writing in fifteen key management journals shows that German authors have a much smaller share than their Dutch, French or Scandinavian counterparts. Although the German business administration community is open to Anglo-Saxon managerial ideas (Muller 1999), it is not strongly communicating to the outside and, as Simon (1993) argued, is operating in a 'black hole'. This is in stark contrast to the early part of the 20th century when German business administration had a strong impact on other countries (Meyer 1998). Recently, German management scholars have become more critical about their discipline's weak international impact (Gmür 2002; Homburg 1998; Kieser 1998: 215; Meffert 1998: 719–720; Reber 1998).

Overall, German business administration academics do not have a clear stance towards the current transformation. They criticize it (e.g. von

Eckardstein et al. 2001), but at the same time also develop management instruments to facilitate current changes such as budgeting, controlling and evaluation systems (e.g. Albers 1999; Hansen et al. 2000; Küpper 2000). In contrast, professors of law and of English language and literature are strong opponents of current developments. The former point to legal aspects, which do not allow a marketization of higher education, and the latter suggest that the Anglo-Saxon role models have significant drawbacks. Nevertheless, despite these differences it appears that other groups of academic staff will be more affected by current changes than full professors who are civil servants with tenure. To consider these groups we will now examine junior assistants (doctoral level) and senior assistants (post-doctoral level).

Junior Assistants: The Bottom of the Hierarchy

Each chair usually has two or three junior assistants studying for their doctorates. Most of them have previously been student assistants for the chair. It is rather uncommon that anyone recruited for this job has graduated from another university. The average time it takes to get a degree in business administration in Germany is about six years and, as many students have done an initial vocational training in a company before they started at university, the junior assistants are in their mid- or late twenties when they become employed. Among the responsibilities of the assistants are administrative duties such as handling the computer equipment and organizing the library (Von Eckardstein et al. 1991). They work on their doctoral thesis and assist the professor in his or her teaching, research and consulting projects (Sinkovics and Schlegelmilch 2000).

In contrast to the UK and the US, the doctorate is usually not designed as a formal training with close supervision. There are often neither extensive doctoral courses nor regular tutorial sessions with the PhD supervisor. There are four possible explanations for this. First, in comparison to Anglo-Saxon countries there are relatively more PhD students in Germany. In addition to those working as assistants, some are external students who often study part-time. Most of the external doctoral students as well as the assistants do not intend to pursue an academic career. The doctorate is not simply a frequent prerequisite for top management positions in German industry, for it also improves career prospects and raises salaries significantly (Enders and Bornmann 2001). Second, unlike the UK, where every lecturer with a PhD can supervise doctoral students, in the German context this can normally only be done by full professors. Considering the higher throughput of students, the smaller number of potential supervisors and the extensive job duties of German professors, it is obvious that there is less time for doctorate supervision in the system. Third, at least in the social sciences, there is a widespread perception in German-speaking countries that an academic achievement is a single-person undertaking. However, as the shortcomings of this system become more widely recognized, many German universities are giving more structure to doctoral studies by offering taught courses on research methodology and strategies. Finally, the traditional German undergraduate degree, *Diplom*, is often more theoretical than the Anglo-Saxon 'Bachelor'. Therefore, German graduates may be better qualified to do scientific work.

So far, junior assistants are not well integrated in the discipline or profession (Enders and Bornmann 2001: 60). Even at professor level, collaboration on the basis of equality with scientists outside their 'hierarchically structured team' (Whitley 1984: 62) is very rare for German business administration academics, and research tends to be confined within the chair. Only relatively few doctoral students participate in conferences of the 'Association of University Professors of Management', the German academy of management. This means that junior assistants are more or less excluded from the main national conferences of the discipline. The chair usually fertilizes and defines the horizons of junior assistants and thus we can speak of the 'mini cosmology' of the chair (Berger and Heintel 1998). This is not only in a technical sense in research subjects and methods, but also in respect of socialization, of values and norms in day-to-day affairs and in the role of critique. At this point it is important to mention that the full professor is not only the supervisor, but also the first and most important examiner of the PhD thesis. There is usually no external examiner and the second examiner is often a professor from the same faculty, who is normally not a specialist in this area. Therefore a good relationship with the chair is a precondition for an academic career.

The professor has various means to punish or reward the assistant. As there is so far little pressure for a chair to produce research output (Frese and Engels 1999: 504), non-scientific objectives such as the fulfilment of administrative and teaching duties can be more important (Franck and Opitz 2000). The potential conflict between loyalty to the institution and to the academic discipline (Clark 1983) is often decided in favour of the institution. Therefore junior assistants are well advised to orient themselves internally towards the performance criteria of the chair. However, as very few of them will pursue an academic career, this is not necessarily a problem.

Senior Assistants: The Future Professors

The dependence on the chair hardly changes with the next career step. After four or five years the junior assistants have finished their doctoral thesis. If they want to pursue an academic career they have to get a senior assistant position and later a chair. Many German chairs have just one or no senior assistants at all and junior assistants usually leave the university at this point. Again, external recruitment for senior assistant positions from other chairs at the faculty or even from another university is uncommon and sponsored mobility is the norm. Although for legal reasons senior assistant positions have to be advertised, this is often just a formality. In the absence of alternative employment opportunities, promotion crucially depends on a good working relationship with the chair; in practice the chair decides who gets a vacant senior assistant post. The entrance age for this position is often in the early thirties.

Similar to the junior assistant, the senior assistant reports to the chair and not the dean. He or she has service and teaching functions for the chair while doing research for his or her *habilitation*. The *habilitation*, which is normally a single-authored monograph, is the most important academic qualification in the German system. First introduced in the 19th century, it is only since the 1920s that the *habilitation* has become common in its current form as an *opus magnum* going significantly beyond the doctorate (Bruch 2000). Together with the doctorate, this lengthy qualification process exerts social control and achieves a standardization of skills and the induction of shared academic values (Backes-Gellner 1992; Weber 1999). Considering the high degree of autonomy of German professors, this intensive socialization and indoctrination aims to substitute for the stricter external control and planning of academic work in Anglo-Saxon business schools, and in the professorial recruitment process provides useful information about the qualification of the applicant. Furthermore, as German professors have to represent a wide field and also have to teach the entire subject of business administration to first- and second-year students, they need a broad technical qualification. Therefore it is normally expected that the topic of the *habilitation* is in a different field from the doctorate. In addition, during the *habilitation* examination, the candidate has to prove his or her knowledge in a field of business administration other than his or her own, which further emphasizes the generalist nature of this qualification.

A new development is that some universities will accept a collection of articles, published in refereed journals, instead of a single-authored book as the *habilitation*. However, even in this case, the research contribution is examined by a committee of faculty members. There is again the strong dependence of the senior assistant on the chair, who has to put his or her political influence behind the candidate and without whose positive reference the application is unlikely to be successful. However, at this stage other faculty members are also included in the examination process. Therefore the senior assistant is usually not only well advised to be active in the various committees of the faculty, but also to meet the requirements of the faculty in terms of topics, methodology and writing style (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft 2000; Wissenschaftsrat 1997). Hence, particularly if the *habilitation* is a monograph, employers' goals and those of local reputational groups are more important than those of national and especially international research communities. Therefore it is difficult to directly compare the publication output of German-speaking and Anglo-American academics (Sinkovics and Schlegelmilch 2000). An international comparative study analysing the job satisfaction of academics found that German senior assistants were least satisfied, compared with German professors and junior assistants and their equivalents in Holland, Sweden, Japan, the UK and the US. In particular they were relatively dissatisfied about their career prospects, the opportunity to pursue their own interests and their overall situation (Teichler 1999).

The *habilitation* is usually awarded to assistants who are in their late thirties. Thus, in common with other continental European academics (Koza and Thoening 1995: 5), German scholars usually spend a lengthy part of their career in a non-tenured position in one institution. However, senior assistants, having achieved the *habilitation*, eventually have to find a position as a full professor. Those who are not successful have to pursue a career outside academia. At this stage mobility becomes contested, as there is no tenure track system. Instead there is an unwritten rule that a professorship has to be found at another university. In the past, competition for full professorships was not very strong. The growth of business administration faculties led to a ready supply of new positions and the number of *habilitations*, which can be controlled by the faculty, was limited. For example, between 1980 and 1995 there were on average only 0.8 (minimum) and 1.2 (maximum) applicants with a *habilitation*, but without a tenured position, for every vacant position in the system (Oechsler 2000). Although, at least in theory, there is the option to accept equivalent qualifications, German universities have so far generally insisted on the *habilitation*. This, combined with the requirement for fluency in the German language, has ensured that the academic market in German countries has been relatively closed to outsiders (Simon 1993). For this reason, studies examining the career prospects of senior assistants have been able to compare the number of people in the *habilitation* process with the number of full professors retiring (Borchert and Gülicher 2000; Oechsler 2000). Although it is often emphasized by German academics that, at the full professor level, mobility is contested and that research output is the most important recruitment criterion (Schlinghoff 2001), some observers suggest that sponsored mobility norms have an impact on professorial recruitment. Faculty politics, networks and relationships can sometimes be more important in the selection process than the contribution to the research discipline (Dilger 2000; Schmitt et al. 2004; Wendel 2004). Currently the pressure on senior assistants is increasing. The expansion of chairs in business administration, which in the past has led to a ready supply of new positions, seems to have come to a halt and the number of *habilitations* has substantially increased (Oechsler 2000). This will make it more and more difficult for senior assistants to find a vacant chair after their *habilitation*.

Current Changes

Currently there are two changes to the traditional career system at German universities, both of which may reduce the power of the chair. First, the German government is trying to abolish the *habilitation*. Second, the growing use of evaluations may lead to greater importance being placed on publishing in international journals.

In 2002 the German government introduced so-called ‘junior professors’ for young scholars with a PhD. These ‘mini-chair’ incumbents have professorial status, independence in research and teaching, their own budget and the right to supervise doctoral theses. However, unlike assistant professors in the US, they are normally not on the tenure track. The explicit aim was to provide academic independence earlier in the career. In addition it was planned to abolish the *habilitation* by 2010 and to establish the junior professor as the regular career path to full professorship. This change would have reduced the power of the chair and his or her faculty colleagues, as they would have had less control over the qualification process. However, in 2004 the German constitutional court ruled that the junior professor law is illegal; this has cast doubt on the future of this new academic qualification and, at least in the social sciences, the *habilitation* is to be retained.

The second and arguably more far-reaching challenge for academic work in German higher education is the growing importance of evaluations. Systematic evaluations of teaching and research are intended to open chairs to outside scrutiny and eventually aim to link pay and budgets to performance. According to Foucault, power 'is exercised by virtue of things being known and people being seen' (Foucault 1980: 154). A specific regime is constituted by rendering areas visible to the observing 'gaze' and by directing observations in specific directions. In the German system, the introduction of systems of evaluation, in the area of research output in particular, will shift the direction of gaze from the inside to the outside, from the mini-cosmology of the chair to the scientific community, from (inter)personal relations to abstract output measures (see also Townley 2002). These changes have become most obvious with regard to professorial recruitment and the *habilitation*. Here the importance of publications in refereed journals has grown. An issue that is particularly contested is whether publications in top Anglo-Saxon journals should count for more than those in top German journals (Köhler 2004). In this context it is worth noting that a recent ranking, based on a survey of German business administration academics, suggests that many Anglo-Saxon journals are more highly rated than the three major German business journals (Henning-Thurau et al. 2003). Kieser (1998) even predicts that publications in Anglo-Saxon journals will become the central measure of academic achievement. A variety of prestigious journals in the field of management can be distinguished according to acceptable topics, approaches and procedures (Whitley 1984). Nevertheless Anglo-Saxon research standards are prominent (for a similar observation see Bengtsson et al. 1997; Clegg et al. 2000; Colling et al. 1996; Engwall 1998; Koza and Thoenig 1995: 5), and include an emphasis on empirical research, a relative neglect of application-oriented knowledge, a certain style of writing and a preference for refereed journals as the main media of dissemination.

However, until now research output has had hardly any impact on budgets and headcounts. The German system of surveillance is only partly related to positive or negative sanctions. The disciplinary and normalizing effects (see Neuberger 1997) of evaluations are therefore not comparable with those in the Anglo-Saxon system. For this reason, university management is still weaker in Germany than in the UK and the system is dominated by the chairs. Nevertheless, compliance with the demands of international journals has and will become more important for German scholars. If German business administration academics start to compete seriously in the international publication game, this could have a profound impact on the research culture.

Over the last century, German business administration has developed in a unique way (Locke 1985). The German research tradition emphasizes conceptual theoretical contributions as well as normative work, which develops prescriptions for good practice (Muller 1999; Salzgeber 1998). There is relatively close co-operation with practitioners in consultancy, teaching and research. In the future this could result in a competitive advantage for German academics. They might be better equipped than their Anglo-Saxon colleagues to survive a transition in knowledge production from mode 1, which can be characterized as scientists' search for scientific truth, to mode 2, the production of knowledge for application (Gibbons et al. 1994) or a combination of both modes (Huff 2000). Nevertheless, today they are at a competitive disadvantage, as the conceptual, normative, non-empirical type of research prevalent in Germany is difficult to publish in international journals. Hence as Kieser (2002) has suggested, growing pressure to gain international academic reputation might force German scholars to change their research approach. Furthermore, whereas in Anglo-Saxon countries many researchers specialize in a relatively narrow field, German academics have to demonstrate broad knowledge leading towards a chair (Weber 1999: 329). Again this does not foster access to Anglo-Saxon journals, which require a more specialist type of research. Lastly, so far the German system has fostered a unity of teaching, research and administration. For example, German professors usually teach an introduction to the subject to first- and second-year students and have a relatively high minimum teaching load. This is in stark contrast to the trend in Anglo-Saxon countries where academics with a strong research output tend to negotiate a small teaching load and mainly deal with postgraduate students.

A further consequence could be that internationalization may change the intellectual style. According to Galtung (1982) there is a contrast between the 'Teutonic' and the 'Saxon' style of critique. He suggested that, in the Anglo-Saxon system, debate about academic ideas tends to be oriented towards improvement. The strong aspects of an academic contribution are pointed out and avenues for improvement are shown. In contrast, in the German system critique is often destructive. The aim is to find the weakest point in an argument and to make this as clear and open as possible. If Galtung's assessment is valid, then competition has different meanings in the two systems. In the Anglo-Saxon system competition and the critique associated with it are actively sought, in order to improve the argument. In the Germanic academic culture, people are worried about competition.

Conclusion

The example of business administration academics in Germany provides support for Koza and Thoenig's (1995) observation that Europe is a highly partitioned academic market, both in terms of publishing and career patterns. With the exception of Dutch and Scandinavian academics, most Europe-based scholars still work in individual country academic systems, which are dominated by country loyalty and interest. Similar to other continental European countries, in Germany there is a stark contrast between the first and second part of an academic career. The first part, the assistant period, is characterized by short-term contracts and high dependence on one person, the chair. The second part, the full professorship or chair, offers tenure and a reputation-based work organization. Only if there is an intention to move to another university do research output and standing in the national academic community become important.

However, our analysis suggests that in German-speaking countries there are pressures for convergence to the Anglo-Saxon research model. The growing importance of evaluations and the questioning of the *habilitation* as the main qualification route for professors opens the chair system to outside scrutiny. Nevertheless, the impact of these pressures is limited as there is still a loose coupling between academic output, resource allocation and academic recruitment. In comparison to Anglo-Saxon countries, management in German universities still has limited influence on resource allocation and academic recruitment.

For the individual academic in German business schools, the old chair system as well as the newly emerging market system are relevant for careers. On the one hand sponsored mobility is still important; on the other hand it is more and more important to demonstrate an academic output that meets the requirements of international evaluation standards. This leads to contradictions between internal compliance with the organization and demands for convergence to Anglo-Saxon research standards, as German academics have to comply with the chair and the market system. The different (Teutonic) intellectual style in German academia constitutes a further difficulty for German academics in adapting to the new requirements.

At this stage it is necessary to issue a note of caution against predictions about any radical changes in the German system. As Prichard and Willmott (1997: 311) highlight, 'each university is a mix of organising practices which are historically located and variably resilient and resistant to being wholeheartedly overthrown'. This applies even more to national academic systems. Considering the strong position of German professors in universities and several decades of unsuccessful attempts to change the German academic system, Prichard and Willmott's (1997: 311) assessment for the UK that 'whatever transition may be occurring, it is likely to be patchy, extended and incomplete', will apply even more in the German context.

Note

Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the second higher education workshop of German business administration professors in Witten-Bommerholz, 18–19 February 1999, the 15th EGOS Colloquium, Warwick, 4–6 July 1999, the Founding Conference of the European Academy of Management, Barcelona, 19–21 April 2001 and the research seminar of the International University in Germany. We also acknowledge the contribution of Richard Weiskopf and useful comments by Markus Gmür, Sandra Harley, Axel Haunschild, Alfred Kieser, Stephan Laske and Hartmut Wächter on earlier versions of this paper.

References

Albers, Sönke
1999 'Optimale Allokation von Hochschul-Budgets'. *Die Betriebswirtschaft* 59/5: 583–598.

Backes-Gellner, Uschi
1992 'Berufsethos und akademische Bürokratie: Zur Effizienz alternativer Motivations- und Kontrollmechanismen im Vergleich deutscher und US-amerikanischer Hochschulen'. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung* 4: 403–434.

Bartölke, Klaus, and Jürgen Grieger
2000 'Universitäre Lehre und Universitätsstudium im Spannungsverhältnis von Bildung und Qualifizierung' in *Universität im 21. Jahrhundert: Zur Interdependenz von Begriff und Organisation der Wissenschaft*. S. Laske, T. Scheytt, C. Meister-Scheytt and C.O. Scharmer (eds), 77–96. München: Hampp.

Bengtsson, Lars, Ulf Elg, and Jan-Inge Lind
1997 'Bridging the transatlantic publishing gap: How North American reviewers evaluate European idiographic research'. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 13/4: 473–492.

Berger, Wilhelm, and Peter Heintel
1998 *Die Organisation der Philosophen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Bessant, John et al.
2003 'The state of the field in UK management research: Reflections of the research assessment exercise (RAE) panel'. *British Journal of Management* 14: 15–68.

Borchert, Manfred, and Herbert Gülicher
2000 'Zwei bis drei Bewerber auf eine Professorenstelle'. *Forschung & Lehre* /7: 345–346.

Brockhoff, Klaus, and Jürgen Hauschildt
1993 'Plädoyer für eine bedürfnisgerechte Differenzierung der Ausbildung in der Betriebswirtschaftslehre'. *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft — Ergänzungsheft* 3: 27–40.

Bruch, Rüdiger vom
2000 'Qualifikation und Spezialisierung: Zur Geschichte der Habilitation'. *Forschung und Lehre* 2: 69–70.

Bryson, Colin
2000 Wither academic workers? From leisure class to organisational pawns. Paper presented at EGOS Colloquium, Helsinki, 1–4 July.

Bulmahn, Edelgard
2002 'Praktische Erfahrungen mit der Reform gewinnen'. *Forschung & Lehre* 12: 630–631.

Cable, Daniel M., and Brian Murray
1999 'Tournaments versus sponsored mobility as determinants of job search success'. *Academy of Management Journal* 42/4: 439–449.

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

Clegg, Steward R., Stephan Linstead, and Graham Sewell
2000 'Only penguins: A polemic on organization theory from the edge of the world'. *Organization Studies* 21/0: 103–117.

Colling, Sven-Olof, Ulf Johansson, Katarina Svensson, and Per-Ola Ulvenblad
1996 'Market segmentation in scientific publications: Research patterns in American vs. European management journals'. *British Journal of Management* 7/2: 141–154.

Cooper, Cary, and David Otley
1998 'The 1996 research assessment exercise for business and management'. *British Journal of Management* 9/2: 73–90.

Danieli, Ardha, and Alan B. Thomas
1999 'What about the workers? Studying the work of management educators and their orientations to management education'. *Management Learning* 30/4: 449–471.

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft
2000 Empfehlung der Arbeitsgruppe wissenschaftlicher Nachwuchs. Bonn: Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

Dilger, Alexander
2000 'Plädoyer für einen sozialwissenschaftlichen Zitationsindex (SwZi)'. *Die Betriebswirtschaft* 60/4: 473–484.

Dorf, Yvonne J.
1999 *Der Universitätsprofessor: Hochschullehrer im Beamtenverhältnis — Selbstverständlichkeit und/oder Notwendigkeit?* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag.

Doyle, J.R., and A.J: Arthurs
1995 'Judging the quality of research in business schools: The UK as a case study'. *International Journal of Management Science* 23/3: 257–270.

Enders, Jürgen *editor*
2001 *Academic staff in Europe: Changing contexts and conditions*. London: Greenwood Press.

Enders, Jürgen, and Lutz Bornmann
2001 *Karriere mit Doktortitel? Ausbildung, Berufsverlauf und Berufserfolg von Promovierten*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Engwall, Lars
1997 'Mercury and minerva: A modern multinational academic business studies on a global scale' in *The diffusion and consumption of business knowledge*. J.L. Alvarez (ed.), 81–109. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

Engwall, Lars
1998 'Asterix in Disneyland: Management scholars from France on the world stage'. *Organization Studies* 19/5: 863–882.

Foucault, Michel
1977 *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, Michel
1980 *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings by Michel Foucault, 1972–77*. Brighton, UK: Harvester.

Franck, Egon, and Christian Opitz
2000 'Anreizsysteme für Professoren in den USA und in Deutschland: Konsequenzen für Reputationsbewirtschaftung, Talentallokation und die Aussagekraft akademischer Signale'. *Zeitschrift für Organisation* — 69/4: 234–240.

Frese, Erich, and Maria Engels
1999 'Anmerkungen zum Änderungsmanagement in Universitäten: Zur Eignung der Unternehmung als Referenzmodell'. *Die Betriebswirtschaft* 59/4: 496–510.

Galtung, Johan
1982 *Struktur, Kultur und intellektueller Stil: Ein vergleichendes Essay über sachsonische, teutonische, gallische und nipponische Wissenschaft*. Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin (unpublished).

Gibbons, Michel, Camille Limoges, Helga Nowotny, Simon Schwartzman, Peter Scott, and Martin Trow
1994 *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

Gioia, Dennis A., and James B. Thomas
1996 'Identity, image and issue interpretation: Sense making during strategic change in academia'. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41: 370–403.

Glotz, Peter
1996 *Im Kern verrottet? Fünf vor zwölf an Deutschlands Universitäten*. Stuttgart: DVA.

Gmür, Markus
2002 'Betriebswirtschaftliche Organisationsforschung zwischen Ökonomie und Sozialwissenschaft: Der Einfluss deutsch- und englischsprachiger Fachzeitschriften auf die Organisationsforschung in Deutschland 1990–1999'. *Die Betriebswirtschaft*, 62/5: 533–546.

Halsey, Albert Henry
1992 *The decline of donnish dominion: The British academic professions in the twentieth century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hanft, Anke, *editor*
2000 *Hochschulen managen? Sind Führungs- und Managementmodelle der Wirtschaft auf Hochschulen übertragbar?* Neuwied: Luchterhand.

Hansen, Ursula, Thorsten Henning-Thurau, and Markus F. Langer
2000 'Qualitätsmanagement von Hochschulen: FACULTY-Q als Erweiterung von TEACH-Q'. *Die Betriebswirtschaft* 60/1: 23–38.

Harley, Sandra, and Frederic S. Lee
1997 'Research selectivity, managerialism, and the academic labor process: The future of nonmainstream economics in UK universities'. *Human Relations* 50/11: 1427–1460.

Harley, Sandra, Michael Muller-Camen, and Audrey Collin
2004 'From academic communities to managed organisations: The implications for academic careers in German and UK universities'. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 64/2: 329–345.

Henkel, Mary
2000 *Academic identities and policy change in higher education.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Henning-Thurau, Thorsten, Gianfranco Walsh, and Ulf Schrader
2003 *VHB-Jourqual: Ein Ranking von betriebswirtschaftlich-relevanten Zeitschriften auf der Grundlage von Urteilen der VHB-Mitgliedern.* http://www.v-h-b.de (accessed 10 June 2003)

Hödl, Erich, and Wolf Zegelin
1999 *Hochschulreform und Hochschulmanagement. Eine kritische Bestandsaufnahme der aktuellen Diskussion*. Marburg: Metropolis-Verlag.

Homburg, Christian
1998 'Die Rolle der deutschen Betriebswirtschaftslehre im internationalen Vergleich'. *Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Studium* 27/8: 386–393.

Huff, Anne Sigismund
2000 'Changes in organizational knowledge production'. *Academy of Management Review* 25/2: 288–293.

Jacobs, Otto H.
1993 'Thesen zur Arbeitsteilung im Hochschulsystem'. *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft — Ergänzungsheft* 3: 41–49.

Jary, David, and Martin Parker editors
1998 *The new higher education: Issues and directions for the post-Dearing university*. Staffordshire: Staffordshire University Press.

Kieser, Alfred
1998 'Going Dutch — Was lehren niederländische Erfahrungen mit der Evaluation universitärer Forschung'. *Die Betriebswirtschaft* 58/2: 208–224.

Kieser, Alfred
2002 'On communication barriers between management science, consultancies and business companies' in *Critical consulting: New perspectives on the management advice industry*. T. Clark, and R. Fincham (eds), 206–227. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kipping, Matthias
1998 'The hidden business schools: Management training in Germany since 1945' in *Management education in historical perspective*. L. Engwald and V. Zamagni (eds), 95–110. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Köhler, Richard
2004 'Editorial: Publish or perish'. *Die Betriebswirtschaft* 64/2: 127–130.

Koza, Mitchell P., and Jean Claude Thoenig
1995 'Organization theory at the crossroads: Some reflections on European and US approaches to organizational research'. *Organization Science* 6/1: 1–8.

Küpper, Hans-Ulrich
2000 'Denkmuster verändern. Wettbewerbsorientierte Strukturierung des Führungssystems von Universitäten'. *Forschung & Lehre* 3: 116–118.

Laske, Stephan, and Alfred Zauner
2000 'Architektur und Design universitärer Verhandlungssysteme' in *Universität im 21. Jahrhundert: Zur Interdependenz von Begriff und Organisation der Wissenschaft*. S. Laske, T. Scheytt, C. Meister-Scheytt and C.O. Scharmer (eds). München: Hampp.

Laske, Stephan, Tobias Scheytt, Claudia Meister-Scheytt, and Claus Otto Scharmer, *editors*
2000 *Universität im 21. Jahrhundert: Zur Interdependenz von Begriff und Organisation der Wissenschaft*. München: Hampp.

Locke, Robert R.
1985 'Business education in Germany: Past systems and current practice'. *Business History Review* 59/Summer: 232–253.

Locke, Robert R.
1996 *The collapse of the American management mystique*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Macharzina, Klaus
1993 'Zur Effizienz betriebswirtschaftlicher Forschung im deutsch-amerikanischen Vergleich'. *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft — Ergänzungsheft* 3: 85–96.

Meffert, Heribert
1998 'Herausforderungen an die Betriebswirtschaftslehre — Die Perspektive der Wissenschaft'. *Die Betriebswirtschaft* 58/6: 709–730.

Melchior, Josef
1995 'Politischer Systemwandel und Hochschulpolitik in Österreich seit 1945'. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 24/1: 83–109.

Melchior, Josef
1997 'Innovation und Universität. Trends in der internationalen und österreichischen Hochschulpolitik'. *Kurswechsel* 2: 55–66.

Meyer, Heinz-Dieter
1998 'The German Handelshochschulen, 1898–1933: A new departure in management education and why it failed' in *Management education in historical perspective*. L. Engwald and V. Zamagni (eds), 19–33. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Miller, Henry
1995 'States, economies and the changing labour process of academics: Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom' in *Academic work: The changing labour process in higher education*. J. Smyth (ed.), 40–60. Buckingham, UK: SRHE and Open University Press.

Muller, Michael
1997 'Institutional resilience in a changing world economy: The case of the German banking and chemical industries'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 35/4: 609–628.

Muller, Michael
1999 'Enthusiastic embrace or critical reception? The German HRM debate'. *Journal of Management Studies* 36/4: 465–482.

Müller-Böling, Detlef
2000 *Die entfesselte Hochschule*. Gütersloh: Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Neuberger, Oswald
1997 'Individualisierung und Organisierung. Die wechselseitige Erzeugung von Individuum und Organisation durch Verfahren' in *Theorien der Organisation*. G. Ortmann, J. Sydow and K. Türk (eds), 487–523. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Oechsler, Walter A.
2000 'Entwicklung von Professuren und Habilitationen im Fach Betriebswirtschaftslehre 1998–2001'. *Forschungsbericht der Fakultät für Betriebswirtschaftslehre*. Nr. 9905. Mannheim.

Parker, Martin, and David Jary
1995 'The McUniversity: Organization, management and academic subjectivity'. *Organization* 2/2: 319–338.

Power, Michael
1994 *The audit explosion*. London: Oxford University Press.

Prichard, Craig, and Hugh Willmott
1997 'Just how managed is the McUniversity'. *Organization Studies* 18/2: 287–316.

Reber, Gerhard
1998 'Wo bleibt die Internationalisierung der Betriebswirtschaftslehre'. *Die Betriebswirtschaft* 58/2: 145–148.

Reichwald, Ralf
1998 'Universitätsstrukturen und Führungsmechanismen für die Universität der Zukunft' in *Gestaltungskonzepte für Hochschulen: Effizienz, Effektivität, Evolution*. H.-U. Küpper and E.J. Sinz (eds), 238–258. Stuttgart: Schäffer-Poeschl.

Reumann, Kurt
2000 'Viele Verlierer: Warum Professoren die Eckpunkte für eine Besoldungsreform ablehnen'. *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 23 September 2000.

Rusterholz, Peter, and Anna Liechti, *editors*
1998 *Universität am Scheideweg: Herausforderungen — Probleme — Strategien.* Zürich: vdf Hochschulverlag.

Salzgeber, Stefan
1998 *Organisation — Personal — Lehre*. Doctoral thesis Institut für Wirtschaftspädagogik und Personalwirtschaft, University of Innsbruck.

Schlinghoff, Axel
2001 *Personalauswahl an Universitäten — ein deutsch-amerikanischer Vergleich der Berufungspraxis wirtschaftswissenschaftlicher Fakultäten*. Mimeo, University of Cologne.

Schmitt, Tassilo, Nina Arnhold, and Magnus Rüde
2004 *Berufungsverfahren im internationalen Vergleich*. Working Paper 53, Centrum für Hochschulentwicklung, Gütersloh.

Simon, Hermann
1993 'Die deutsche Betriebswirtschaftslehre im internationalen Wettbewerb — ein Schwarzes Loch?' *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft — Ergänzungsheft* 3: 73–91.

Sinkovics, Rudolf R., and Bodo B. Schlegelmilch
2000 'Marketing academics in Austria, Germany and Switzerland: Humboldt's ideals give way to performance pressure'. *Journal of Marketing Management* 16: 745–759.

Slaughter, Sheila, and Larry L. Leslie
1997 *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore/London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Smyth, John
1995 'Introduction' in *Academic work: The changing labour process in higher education*. J. Smyth (ed.), 1–16. Buckingham, UK: SRHE and Open University Press.

Teichler, Ulrich
1999 'Der Professor im internationalen Vergleich'. *Forschung und Lehre* 5: 242–245.

Titscher, Stefan, Georg Winckler, Hubert Biedermann, et al., *editors*
2000 *Universitäten im Wettbewerb.Zur Neustrukturierung österreichischer Universitäten.* München, Mering: Hampp.

Townley, Barbara
2002 'Managing with modernity'. *Organization* 9/4: 549–573.

Turner, Ralph H.
1960 'Sponsored and contest mobility and the school system'. *American Sociological Review* 25: 855–867.

Von Eckardstein, Dudo, Claudia Scagnetti, and Peter Ballnik
1991 Elemente einer entwicklungsorientierten Personalkonzeption für die Assistenten/innen an der WU. Materialien aus der Abteilung für Personalwirtschaft. Wien: Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien.

Von Eckardstein, Dudo, Walter A. Oechsler, and Christian Scholz
2001 'Personalmanagement und Dienstrechtsreform an deutschen Hochschulen — eine kritische Analyse'. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung* 15/1: 5–17.

Weber, Wolfgang
1999 'Personalmanagement in Universitäten' in *Strategische Personalpolitik*. W. Elsik and W. Mayrhofer (eds), 325–336. München, Mering: Hampp Verlag.

Wendel, Hans-Jürgen
2004 'Selbstergänzung oder Bestenauswahl? Über Berufungsverfahren'. *Forschung und Lehre* 8: 431–433.

Whitley, Richard
1984 *The intellectual and social organization of the sciences*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Willmott, Hugh
1995 'Managing the academics: Commodification and control in the development of university education in the UK'. *Human Relations* 48/9: 993–1027.

Willmott, Hugh
1998 'Commercialising higher education in the UK: The state, industry and peer review'. Paper presented at Higher Education Close-Up Conference, University of Central Lancashire, 6–8 July.

Wissenschaftsrat
1997 Empfehlungen zur Doktorandenausbildung und zur Förderung des Hochschullehrernachwuchses. Köln: Wissenschaftsrat.

Michael Muller-Camen

Michael Muller-Camen is an Associate Professor of International Management at the International University in Germany. He holds an MSc in industrial relations from the London School of Economics and a PhD in organizational behaviour from the University of London. His work has appeared in outlets such as the *British Journal of Management, International Journal of Human Resource Management, Journal of Management Studies* and *Organization Studies*. His main research interests are the comparative study of human resource management and organizational behaviour. He is currently involved in research projects on US multinationals in Europe, on diversity management in Germany and the development of human resource practices across Europe.
Address: International University in Germany, Campus 1, D-76646, Bruchsal, Germany.
E-mail: michael.muller-camen@i-u.de

Stefan Salzgeber

Stefan Salzgeber has been a senior lecturer at the Institute for Organisation and Learning, University of Innsbruck and is currently working as an HR manager at a non-profit organization. He holds a PhD in business administration from the University of Innsbruck. His doctoral thesis concerned the theoretical foundation of human resource management. In contrast to positivist approaches he argues for 'HRM as a critical social science'. The question of constitution of personnel is central to his framework. He is particularly interested in the work of Michel Serres, especially his ideas about 'the Parasite', complexity, order and disorder.
Address: Universität Innsbruck, Institute for Organisation and Learning, Universitätsstrasse 15, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria.
E-mail: stefan.salzgeber@uibk.ac.at