



Irina Zhariy

**Russian Scientists at a German
University: Career and Professional
Prospects (the case of Bielefeld
University)**

WP 2010-02

Bielefeld University



St. Petersburg State University



**Centre for German and
European Studies (CGES)**



CGES Working Papers series includes publication of materials prepared within different activities of the Center for German and European Studies both in St. Petersburg and in Germany: The CGES supports educational programmes, research and scientific dialogues. In accordance with the CGES mission, the Working Papers are dedicated to the interdisciplinary studies of different aspects of German and European societies.

The paper is written on the basis of the MA Thesis defended in the MA SES in June 2010 (supervised by Elena Shershneva). The publication of this MA thesis in the CGES Working Paper series was recommended by the Examination Committee as one of four best papers out of twelve MA theses defended by the students of the MA programme "Studies in European Societies" at St. Petersburg State University in June 2010.

Irina Zhariy graduated from Novgorod State University in 2008, Department of Linguistics and Intercultural Communication. 2010 she finished her studies at the MA SES (with distinction). Her main research interests lie in the sphere of various academic systems, their transformations, and individual career strategies emanating from them.

Kontakt: izhariy@yandex.ru

INTRODUCTION	3
CHAPTER I. CAREER AND THE DETERMINANTS OF ITS UNFOLDING	7
1. CONCEPT OF “CAREER”	7
2. FACTORS INFLUENCING CAREER CHANCES IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD	10
3. ACADEMIC CAREER	13
CONCLUSIONS OF CHAPTER I	33
CHAPTER II. GERMAN ACADEME	35
1. ACADEMIC CAREER SYSTEMS FROM COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES	35
2. CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE ACADEMIC CAREER STRUCTURE IN GERMANY	38
3. RECENT REFORMS IN THE GERMAN ACADEME	42
CONCLUSIONS OF CHAPTER II	43
EMPIRICAL RESEARCH	43
1. INITIAL SUPPOSITIONS	44
2. THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH	44
CHAPTER III. FACTORS OF ACADEMIC CAREER ADVANCEMENT AND ACADEMIC CAREER RISKS IN GERMANY	46
1. THE MAJOR DETERMINANTS OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GERMAN ACADEME	46
2. CAREER RISKS IN THE GERMAN ACADEME	51
CONCLUSIONS OF CHAPTER III	56
CHAPTER IV. RUSSIAN SCIENTISTS IN THE GERMAN ACADEME	57
1. REASONS INDUCING RUSSIAN SCIENTISTS TO GO ABROAD.....	57
2. FINANCIAL SUPPORT PROVIDED FOR FOREIGN SCIENTISTS IN GERMANY	59
3. PATH TO THE GERMAN ACADEME	60
4. POTENTIAL CHALLENGES AND DIFFICULTIES RUSSIAN SCIENTISTS MIGHT FACE IN GERMANY	60
5. RESETTLEMENT AND INTEGRATION “CUSHIONS”	66
6. EXODUS OR CIRCULATION?	67
7. CAREER PROSPECTS OF RUSSIANS IN THE GERMAN ACADEME; THE MAJOR BARRIERS TO CAREER ADVANCEMENT	70
CONCLUSIONS OF CHAPTER IV.....	73
CONCLUSION	75
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	81
REFERENCES	81
APPENDIX	89

ABSTRACT

Due to globalizational tendencies in science and research, i.e. their internationalization, the issue of career and professional prospects abroad is increasingly gaining in importance. This holds true also for the case of Russian scientists coming to Germany in pursuit of academic careers and professional growth. The present MA thesis makes an attempt to explore and analyze career and professional opportunities available for Russian scientists in the German academic world, and to identify the major barriers for Russian academics on the way to the top of the German academic career structure (professorship). The study draws upon the analysis of classical and contemporary sociological literature on relevant issues, official documents concerning the formal career structure in the German academe, Internet resources (e.g. Hochschulrektorenkonferenz, Deutscher Hochschulverband), statistical data for Bielefeld University, and qualitative research conducted in Bielefeld University.

Introduction

This research investigates the problem of career and professional opportunities available to Russian scientists in the German academe. By career prospects in academe we mean, in the first place, upward mobility: progression from one academic degree to another, from one position in the academe to another. Professional growth, in turn, implies accumulation of new knowledge and enhancement of professional skills; in a word, it is development of a professional. In science and research, career and professional growth go hand in hand: in order to reach the top of the academic structure, one has to achieve a very high level of professionalism.

The broader context of the problem the present work is devoted to is “brain drain”, which can be defined as the movement of highly qualified personnel from their native country to another (in most cases a more developed and technologically advanced one). Obviously, emigration of the most talented and scientifically active specialists is a great loss for their country of origin, as human capital is the main asset of a country in the context of the current knowledge-driven society.

For Russia the problem of “brain drain” is one of the most urgent ones, taking into consideration the huge number of scientists and computer programmers who have left the country since the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991. The importance of the “brain drain” question has brought about the emergence of a number of works, the bulk of which examines the general features, nature and implications of the “brain drain” phenomenon, the individual passing of this process in various countries and its consequences, etc. Works devoted to the Russian case analyze the reasons that induced and still induce Russian scientists to migrate, and provide statistical data to

demonstrate the numerical significance of this phenomenon, which continues to persist also in the present-day Russia.

Despite the seeming abundance of the studies conducted to explore career development and its determinants, some spheres appear to be not adequately researched. For example, the author of this MA thesis failed to discover any comprehensive study of academic career chances of foreign scientists in Germany, to say nothing about the case of Russian scientists. The present investigation is meant to contribute to the elimination of this gap in the body of knowledge and to generation of interest in this subject.

The importance of the chosen topic lies in the fact that the number of Russian scientists opting for or thinking of making a career abroad (Germany being one of the countries of their destination) is relatively high, which is also stimulated by increasing dissemination of English as the international language of science, greater scope of cooperation between Russian and foreign universities and research institutes, and willingness of the more developed countries to attract the most talented and creative scientists from all parts of the world, including Russia. Usually, among those who leave are the most prominent professionals who strive for an international career and the full development of their potential. This means that the country of their origin loses its “brightest minds” and with them its main resource for future successful development and for securing its place among the world leading countries. The understanding of the reasons inducing Russian scientists to seek career abroad might help the country to stem this intellectual “outflow” through identification and elimination of the existent problems and creation of the necessary stimuli.

This work presents an attempt to give an answer to the question: “What do Russian scientists hope to achieve, what prospects do they have in mind, when they take a decision to continue their academic career abroad, in particular in Germany, and what do they actually get?” We will try to explore career and professional opportunities a German university is ready to offer foreign scientists, in our case Russian scientists, and the challenges and difficulties Russian scientists are confronted with at a German university.

As for the long-term goal of the study, it is supposed to have practical value. It is aimed at helping Russian scientists considering the alternative of continuing their academic career at a German university to take a free, well thought-out decision. A

young scientist graduating from a Russian university might not have a clear picture of the academic structure in Germany, opportunities a German university can provide for him/her, and the challenges with which he/she will be confronted there. The author does hope that the results of her work will be helpful for those planning an academic career in Germany. Enlightened understanding of the ‘for’ and ‘against’ arguments is to help Russian scientists to make the right choice, the choice that will not result in frustration in the long run.

The *research question* of this study is as follows: What career and professional opportunities does the German academe offer Russian scientists; and what factors might stimulate and hamper the career advancement of Russian academics in the German academe? Thus, the goal of this work is to evaluate the career and professional opportunities available in Germany for Russian scientists. The goal is to be realized through achievement of the following *objectives*: 1) to reveal the nature of an academic career and to identify the most important factors determining career prospects in modern world; 2) to investigate the characteristic features of the German academic career structure and to explore the implications they have for individual career strategies; 3) to study opportunities and challenges awaiting foreign scientists in the German academe; 4) to evaluate career and professional prospects of Russian scientists in the German academe.

The topic which is covered by the present MA thesis is multidimensional. Only after having plunged into investigation of the existent scientific literature on relevant problems, and having conducted own empirical research, the author of this work realized the full complexity (in terms of the number of aspects it concerns) of the respective topic. Nevertheless, we admit that there might be some questions overlooked by the author, due to the latter’s unawareness of their either existence or relevance for the present examination.

The present research is based on the analysis of classical and contemporary sociological literature on relevant issues, study of official documents (Hochschulrahmengesetz (HRG) of April 12, 2007 and Hochschulgesetz in Nordrhein-Westfalen (NRW) of January 1, 2007), analysis of discussions found on the official Internet sites of Hochschulrektorenkonferenz and Deutscher Hochschulverband, and statistical data provided by Bielefeld University. A significant part of the work draws upon the in-depth interviews conducted with 7 scientists having their roots in Russia and either

working (on a regular/temporary basis) or writing a PhD at Bielefeld University, with two German scientists and a German Professor of Polish origin working at this university, and 3 expert interviews (with Thomas Luettenberg, the head of the International Office of Bielefeld University, and two German professors). A list with more complete profiles of the respondents is attached (Appendix).

The choice of Bielefeld University for the research is explained by the reasons of access availability (the financial support for the research was provided by Bielefeld University). The question of representativeness of Bielefeld University in terms of academic career prospects for foreigners will be addressed later in this work.

In the process of this study it was found out that one scientist of Russian descent (male) succeeded in achieving the professorial position. However, the author of the given MA thesis failed in recruiting this professor for an interview, which to some extent compromises the quality of the research, as it misses the potential key respondent, who could reveal much about the road to success and its thorns. Though due to the above-mentioned reason the present work lacks an important element, the author did her best to draw upon as many relevant sources as possible in order to reveal the true, objective nature of the problem under study.

The work consists of four intertwined chapters. Chapter I investigates the nature of the concept “career”, explores the key determinants of the development of modern career – boundaryless career, and analyses the specificity of an academic career and factors influencing its unfolding. Chapter II is devoted to exploration of the academic career structure and recent reforms in the sphere of higher education in Germany. Chapter III and Chapter IV to a great extent, though not purely, draw upon the material of the empirical research. They are based on partial presentation and interpretation of individual experiences of several Russian and German scientists working/studying at Bielefeld University. Chapter III investigates the major determinants of career development in the German academe, career strategies and risks involved. Chapter IV examines the position of foreign scientists, Russian in particular, in the German academe, and analyses potential challenges and difficulties which might impede their academic career advancement. The work is crowned with Conclusion, which summarizes the key points of the whole study and contains the author’s evaluation of the problem and the directions of possible future research.

Chapter I. Career and the determinants of its unfolding

1. Concept of “career”

We will begin our investigation with the definition of the term “career”. The term ‘*career*’ is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary in the following way: an individual’s “course or progress through life” (or a distinct portion of life). It is supposed to be connected with remunerative work, and sometimes also with formal education. Nowadays career is mostly considered to mean a course of successive actions performed by an individual which make up his/her occupation.

The traditional concept of ‘career’ denotes it as a progression up an ordered hierarchy within an organization or profession. Career concerns a person’s work and life roles over his/her lifespan. This interpretation of career holds that people can progress through their career both horizontally and vertically.

The phenomenon of ‘career’, which can be described as a progression from education to continuous full-time employment, and then to the continuous full-time retirement, has been studied in the works of many sociologists (Hughes, 1937; Becker and Hughes, 1968, Becker and Strauss, 1956; Moen, 2005).

Hughes (1937:413) introduced the following definition of ‘careers’: “a series of statuses and clearly defined offices”. The author points out that these ‘offices’ are created by employing organizations, professional associations, and legislative acts (the issues of working hours, wages, and ERISA* - Employee Retirement Income Security Act). At the same time they represent the biographical paths and experiences of the individuals occupying them. Thus, one can say that every person has his/her own occupational career path, in which both work and life histories are intertwined. Hughes also emphasized the presence of the subjective side in the phenomenon of ‘career’, which is expressed in “the moving perspective in which the person sees his life as whole and interprets the meaning of his various attributes, actions and the things that happen to him” [ibid].

Occupational careers to a great extent determine the identity of a person and very often influence his/her position in the societal hierarchy. They are not only a way to comprehend one’s own self, but are also a means of knowing about others. Careers also enable people to speak about the changing nature of their life: past experiences, present situation, future prospects (Kanter, 1977). Careers perform one more important function:

they enable us to preserve the social structure which determines the system of expected attitudes and patterns of behaviour. Thus, the central idea is that the concept of 'career' provides a dynamic link between individuals and institutions (Moen, 2005:190).

The concept of 'career' should be viewed as a historical invention, which came to the fore only with the development of bureaucracies and corporations. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, most workers were engaged either in the sector of agriculture, or in family business. Individual farmers and artisans had 'life plans', but it is not justified to call these 'careers'. Gradually, paid work became prominent in the contemporary society, which resulted in the fact that the idea and the emerging reality of occupational careers started to determine life chances, the quality of life and life choices (Mills, 1956).

Merton (1968:145) paid special attention to the role of concepts in the perception of the situation and, consequently, in the construction of thought and behavior. The concept of 'career ladder' conveys the idea of the organizing principle and provides a logical explanation of the ways the "labor market and the state organize and allocate employment opportunities, risks and resources". According to Moen (2005:191), the distinction between the primary and the secondary sectors of labor market has to do with the "systematic patterns of opportunity and constraint tied to (1) educational and occupational credentials, abilities, experience, and training, along with (2) gender, age, and life stage, as well as, (3) organizational employment practices, legislation, regulation, and labor markets".

Moen (2005:191) views the patterned regularities found in normative (full-time, continuous) occupational careers and normative (full-time, continuous) retirement as "systems of rules, relations and expectations that are fundamental to understanding the gendered and age-based, as well as class- and race-based allocation, socialization, and stratification processes distributing paid work, unpaid care work, and the resources they bring".

Since the middle of the 20th century, occupational mobility and the paths to achievement of a solid financial position and a high status in the society have been at the hub of sociological studies (Blau and Duncan, 1967; Kelley, 1973; Sewell et al., 1976; Rosenfeld, 1992, etc). Sociologists were working on different dimensions of the phenomenon of 'career'. There have been studies devoted to the patterned regularities in the sphere of the division of labour, including the division into paid and unpaid work, and the processes of socialization and allocation of resources, in their connection to

class, gender, age, and race divides. Some scholars focused on the problem of particular occupational paths and organizational arrangements (Spilerman, 1977; Althausen and Kalleberg, 1981, 1990; Rosenbaum, 1984). Granovetter (1974) investigated a particular stage of the occupational career, namely getting a job. Others chose as the centre of their work the issue of structural barriers to career development (Barker, 1993; Blau et al., 1998).

Moen (2005:194) points out that sociologists, in particular American ones, tried to comprehend the mechanisms standing behind the appearance of winners and losers in the economic system which is organized along career lines. Special attention here should be paid to the understanding of the notion of a 'successful career'. American sociologists, like all Americans, had the tendency of equating 'success' with the attainment of occupational status, opportunity to gain seniority, and necessarily upward mobility in terms of prestige and income (Moen, 2005:194). This idea is in line with the well-known traditional 'American dream'.

In her article, Moen (2005:194) also pinpoints the drawbacks of classical works on 'career' as being inherently gendered (Hess, 1987; Bem, 1994), and thus, reflecting primarily the experiences of men, not women. The author suggests that there should be a reconsideration of the classical theories and introduction of new approaches which could adequately analyze the present-day situation, which is characterized by the diversity of the workforce: almost proportionally composed of males and females, more heterogeneous in terms of ethnic, age, and racial characteristics, immigrant status, educational level, etc.

The conventional understanding of 'career' as a lock-step transition from education to employment to retirement implies that every stage is separated from the previous and the next ones by time and space, which are specific for this particular stage. This imposes a certain perception of what a 'career' is and how it should unfold. But the problem is that the rules emanating from these concepts, such as allocation of paid sick leaves and health insurance only to particular groups of workers, seem to be irrelevant now, when many workers have to change jobs and employers many times, and only few of them have the "backup of full-time housewives, when seniority no longer guarantees security, and when the minimum wage is the poverty wage" (Moen 2005:195).

2. Factors influencing career chances in the contemporary world

Traditionally organizational careers have been viewed as evolving hierarchically within a single organization over the span of lifetime. The understanding of a career as a gradual, stable evolution associated with upward mobility can be found in the work by Miller and Form (1951), who perceived careers as “a series of social adjustments to the larger culture, culminating in job permanence” (Eby, Butts, and Lockwood, 2003:689).

However, the nature of careers has undergone significant changes, which led to the appearance of new models of career development. The present-day organizational structure is characterized by much greater volatility and instability. In most cases individual career is no longer confined to one organization. Nowadays, people can not expect lifetime, uninterrupted employment in a single organization or a steady climb up a corporate ladder. Increasingly, they are faced with involuntary job loss, movement both within and across the boundaries of organizations, and, of course, career interruption and disruption (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996b; Sullivan, Carden and Martin, 1998; Sullivan, 1999; Eby and DeMatteo, 2000).

These shifts have led to the emergence of new approaches to studying careers: the concept of a boundaryless career (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996a). A characteristic feature of such a career is that it is not bounded to a single organization, but rather consists of a number of experiences across both organizations and jobs (Goffe and Jones, 2000; Peiperl M., Arthur M., and Anand, 2002).

Eby, Butts, and Lockwood (2003) made an attempt to investigate the question of predictors of success in the context of boundaryless careers. They identified three groups of factors, “career competencies”, which have an impact on career advancement in the era of boundaryless careers: 1) “knowing why”; 2) “knowing whom”; 3) “knowing how”.

The competency “knowing why” is composed of career insight, which implies realistic career expectations, awareness of own strengths and weaknesses, and specific career goals. The importance of these factors has been noted in previous studies (London, 1983; Noe, Noe, and Bachhuber, 1990; London, 1993). Individuals possessing these qualities are expected to opt for the careers in which investments made in their organization, occupation, industry, and social arena (e.g. friends, non-work activities) can contribute to achievement of their professional goals. These investments are

supposed to enhance an individual's perception of career success and his/her internal (within the organization) and external (outside the organization) marketability (Eby, Butts, and Lockwood, 2003:691).

Another component of the first group of career competencies is proactive personality expressed in the inclination for proactive behavior. Bateman and Crant (1993) define highly proactive people as individuals able to identify career opportunities and take advantage of them, demonstrate initiative and determination in the face of failures. It is considered that these qualities can propel a successful career development, as in the conditions of boundaryless career, individual should be prepared to taking personal responsibility for their career, adjusting to constantly changing working conditions and shifting priorities, building personal networks (Hall & Associates, 1996). Moreover, proactive individuals are thought to be "imaginative, curious, broad-minded, and active" (Barrick and Mount, 1991). They are also looking for new experience and new ideas (openness) (Costa and McCrae, 1992). The importance of being proactive, seeking mentoring, and cultivating the skills of asking and networking for academic career success has been pointed to also in some of the recent studies (Stenken and Zajicek, 2009).

The next career competency, "knowing whom", includes career-related contacts and networks (DeFillippi and Arthur, 1994). These contacts can be divided into two groups: relations with others on the part of the organization, and personal connections (e.g. professional and social acquaintances). Such contacts are beneficial for individuals as they provide the latter with a resource for learning (mentoring), expertise, and reputation development (Hirsch, 1987; Lado, Boyd, and Wright, 1992; Arthur, 1994; DeFillippi, Arthur, 1994; Parker H., Arthur, 2000). Moreover, "knowing whom" might provide access to new valuable contacts and job opportunities (Arthur, 1994). According to Parker and Arthur (2000), investments in this group of competencies are indispensable for successful career advancement in the context of boundaryless careers, because this leads to the formation of 'career communities' and networks providing "venues for career support and personal development" (Parker and Arthur, 2000:105).

Contacts and networks are viewed as an integral part of career in the contemporary world. This is due to several reasons. First, nowadays workers are confronted with a lower level of job security, that is why it is helpful for individuals to

have extensive networks, both inside and outside their organization, - this will facilitate the process of finding and getting further employment (DeFillippi and Arthur, 1996; Arthur and Rousseau, 1996a; Higgins and Kram, 2001). In the environment of rapidly changing technology and incessant progress, it is vital to maintain up-to-date knowledge and skills, which will lessen the risk of being moved to the background and finding oneself out of profession. Networks will help professionals to be at the cutting edge of the latest developments and approaches (Higgins and Kram, 2001). The issue of mentoring and networking will be analyzed more comprehensively further.

Finally, the last category of competencies “knowing how” is connected with career-relevant skills and job-knowledge. Eby, Butts, and Lockwood emphasize the importance of developing “a broad and flexible skill base which is transportable across organizational boundaries” (2003: 692). This purpose is fulfilled through continuous learning and activities aimed at enhancing an individual’s “net worth” inside and outside the organization.

The findings of the research carried out by Eby, Butts, and Lockwood (2003) provide strong support for the above-analyzed theories presupposing importance of three groups of competencies (“knowing why”, “knowing whom”, and “knowing how”) for career development in the context of boundaryless careers. Moreover, the results of their study enabled these scientists to make further conclusions about the connections between these competencies and career evolution.

Consistent with other works in this field, Eby, Butts, and Lockwood (2003:701) found out that not all individuals can succeed in the boundaryless career. Their findings suggest that among the qualities that seem to be most important for successful career one can name the following: being proactive, flexible, and adaptable to new experiences (i.e., having a high level of openness to new experience), knowing own strengths and weaknesses (i.e., having career insight). Thus, individuals possessing these characteristics are more likely to thrive in the unstable, volatile work environment. This finding is consistent with ideas expressed by Mirvis and Hall (1996).

Concerning the second group of career competencies, “knowing whom”, the results of Eby, Butts, and Lockwood’s research (2003) also prove a great role of networks in career success. As it has been demonstrated by previous studies, networking might serve the purpose of reemployment (Granovetter 1973; Granovetter 1974; Lin and Dumin, 1986) and is positively related to traditional indicators of career success, such as

promotion rates, bonuses, and job mobility (Burt, 1997). Apart from this, Eby, Butts, and Lockwood's study extended previous research by identifying a positive relation between networking and higher internal and external marketability. They point out that extensive contacts within the organization increase external marketability, and vice versa (external contacts enhance internal marketability). The results of their research correspond to other works in regard to the idea that networks are particularly important in contemporary marketplace (Hirsch, 1987; Powell and Brantley, 1992).

As far as the last class of competencies is concerned, their findings confirm that devoting time to activities aimed at building and diversifying an individual's skill set has a remarkable bearing on career development in today's economy. Thus, continuous learning is an important factor enhancing both internal and external marketability.

3. Academic career

3.1. Specificity of an academic career

Above we were speaking about career in general and the aspects of career development which have been addressed in sociological literature. But academic career has its own specificity, which results in peculiarity of its development. In order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the environment in which academics work and make their career, we should investigate this issue.

First, it is necessary to reveal the nature of the academic profession. In accordance with Parson's theory of the academic profession, the ideal type of the full university is supposed to perform four functions: pure research, training future teachers and researchers, teaching undergraduates to become in the future educated citizens and possibly academicians and professionals, and training practitioners in the professional schools (Parsons, Platt, 1968: Introduction). On the basis of this theory, Parsons suggests that the nucleus of the academic profession is composed of the integrated core of research and teaching which underlie the four functions of a university.

When analyzing Parson's theory of the academic profession, Light (1974:5) draws attention to the fact that each of these four functions is in some conflict with the others. It is evident that the time devoted to research comes into conflict with the time given to teaching, the attempt to skimp on one activity in order to spare more time for the other leads to compromised quality of work, sometimes in both spheres. Some of the faculty try to resolve this conflict by expanding their working time, they work nights and

weekends. This leaves them with less time for their families and for leisure activities. Others make attempts to eliminate this conflict by teaching in the sphere of their research.

Further in the same work Light examines another important aspect of Parsons and Platt's theory of the academic profession – influence. The academic world, which rests on cognitive rationality, is made of experts, which means that instead of the hierarchical structure of authority there prevails the associational structure based on persuasion. Light distinguishes between the two kinds of influence: influence at one's local institution and influence in the discipline. But these two kinds of influence are not necessarily interdependent. Halsey and Trow (1971:393) made the following statement in this regard: "Rank is the chief source of academic status only within the university, where it carries power. It counts for much less outside the university, where men are judged on their scholarly accomplishment".

Tenure can be considered as a link between the two kinds of influence. "Tenure is an event when specific national status gets translated into general local status and influence" (Light 1974:9). It is not always the case that national status and influence in one's discipline always become translated into general influence at one's local institution, as it is shown in Gouldner's "Outsiders and Empire Builders" (1958).

As Parsons and Platt rightly argue, the dominant form of authority in academe is a collegial mode of relationship (associational structure), as opposed to the hierarchical, bureaucratic model of organization (1968: 1-14). This idea has the following implications: first, academic institutions are essentially professional organizations (associational model of relationship in the collective). Light (1974:10) places stress on the fact that for a "collegial association of professionals whose purest activity is basic research, teaching undergraduates is not a "natural" function but something done for the institution". Thus, Light comes to the criticism of Parson's theory of the academic profession, which holds that research and teaching harmoniously reside in the kernel of the academic profession. Light contends that there always exists a tension between scholarly activities and institutional obligations (teaching undergraduates) (1974:8).

Light starts the main part of his article with the definition of the basic concepts which lie at the centre of the academic profession. According to Light (1974:10-11), faculty can be defined in the following way: "people with academic appointments at institutions of higher education". Light distinguishes several characteristic features of a

profession: “1) it has exclusive powers to recruit and train its members; 2) it has exclusive powers to judge who is qualified; 3) it is responsible for regulating the quality of professional work; 4) it has high social prestige; 5) it is grounded in esoteric and complex body of knowledge”. A scholarly profession represents an occupation which is endowed with the characteristics of a profession and whose primary activity is the advancement of knowledge; it is certified by an academic discipline and doing professional work. An academic profession (an intersect of faculty and scholarly profession) is a subset of a scholarly profession, which is characterized by academic appointments at institutions of higher education, and has the first two powers of a profession, with the third power being exercised to a large degree (ibid).

The following conclusions can be made from these ideas on academic profession:

1) There is no single academic profession, because each discipline is a separate profession in itself – has “its own history, its own intellectual style, a distinct sense of timing, different preferences for articles and books, and different career lines” (Light 1974:12).

2) An academic profession should be seen as a “part of the larger scholarly profession, which includes scientists and researchers who do not necessarily have academic appointments” (Clark 1986:26). Not only research professors should be taken into account but also other scientists involved in basic research. In some disciplines, the latter category is significant, and its members might change their spheres of employment from industry to academe to government. In this way, the academic profession is a subset of scholarly profession which consists of the academics who occupy a position at a university and do publications and perform recruitment, training and granting of qualification to new members. Thus, academicians are not only gate-keepers of the entrance to all the professions in academe but are also creators of new professions through development of new knowledge (Light 1974:12).

3) College and university teachers who make no publications of research should be investigated separately. Light says that there is much debate in regard to whether teachers should be included into the academic profession or not, but what is obvious is that teaching has a markedly different status, and, consequently, institutional and occupational differences, when compared to research. As it has already been stated above, the core activity of professionals is the advancement of knowledge, that is scholarship. Undergraduate teaching, in contrast to graduate teaching which is closer to

professional activities, as it means training new scholars, does not belong to core activities of the profession. Professional reputation rests on scholarly achievements which are expressed in publications and reputational standing in academe, not on undergraduate training (Light 1974:15). A widespread scholar reputation always contributed to a successful academic career development, whereas being a popular teacher among undergraduates, as suggested by some research, could even bring harm to an academic (Stanford, 1971:360).

Summing the third point up, one can say that undergraduate teaching and administrative tasks should be viewed as institutional activities, not core ones. Thus, they are marginal to the professional activity and development of academics. Professors are ostensibly hired to teach, that is what they usually get their salary from an institution, and the failure to perform this task will result in dismissal from office. However, the basic nature of their career rests on professional activities which are often left for the time off.

4) There is a tendency for faculty members to identify themselves by the field they specialize in, rather than by their institutional functions (Clark, 1986:25-26).

A few words should be said about the relation between academics and institutions they are employed at. This relation differs from the relation between professionals and institutions found in other professions: faculty are defined by the institutions that employ them. This can be demonstrated by the following example: a doctor, wherever he/she is, remains always a doctor, but a professor is a professor as long as he/she is employed by an institution which defines him/her as a professor.

An alternative model of an academic profession was provided by Clark (1984). He introduced the idea of matrix, which holds that academics belong to a set of groups: subdepartments, departments, multidisciplinary units, undergraduate colleges, graduate and professional schools, etc. Moreover, they belong to a profession, to a particular institution, and to a national system of higher education. Thus, Clark points out that academics function in a number of criss-crossing matrices, which determine their identity, loyalties, and authority. An academic belongs concurrently to a particular discipline, a field of studies, an institution, etc. (Clark, 1984:112). He emphasizes the fact that the primary matrix of higher education is not identical, but varies from institution to institution, from country to country, and depends on individual preferences (e.g., German universities lay emphasis on disciplinary criteria and research, whereas British universities – on undergraduate teaching and institutional commitments).

The differences in focus either on discipline or institution are reflected in social stratification found in the sphere of higher education. From Trow's (1984) perspective, higher education can be viewed as a stratified system of institutions which are graded both formally and informally in status, prestige, prosperity, and influence. According to Trow, educational institutions compete with each other for prominent teachers and researchers, high-potential students, research funding, scientific honors and awards – all this represents competition for prestige and reputation. That is the reason for all academic policies and decisions to be aimed at guaranteeing the achievement of the most favorable working conditions, and thus, at maintaining or even improving the relative reputational standing of the institution in question among other institutions.

Special attention should be paid to the problem of emergence of the modern academic careers. Drawing upon the works by Finkelstein (1984) and following Light (1972), Clark (1986:27) analyses three interrelated strands of modern academic career, namely disciplinary, institutional, and external. "The disciplinary career includes activities connected with the discipline and its goals (specialized training, research activity, participation in professional organizations). The institutional career includes activities associated with employment at a particular institution (movement in a tenure system). The external career includes those work-related activities pursued outside the institution but requiring the faculty member's professional expertise (consulting, government service, other public service)".

While studying the contemporary academic career, Clark (1986:28) dwells upon institutional, disciplinary, and personal aspects of this phenomenon. The term 'career' has French origin and initially had the meaning of 'race course'. The academic career course has both its start (entry into academe) and its finish (retirement). As Clark points out, the institution which employs a faculty member, and to a lesser degree the discipline in which the person specializes, determine the conditions, rules, and norms of the academic "race", i.e. the career structure in the academe. The race course in academe is characterized by a system of hierarchical positions which serve as indicators of a person's progress in the institution. The discipline provides opportunities for peer recognition and in this way might contribute to successful development of both institutional and disciplinary academic careers (Finkelstein, 1984:43).

Sociological studies have been focusing on different facets of academic career: academic career entry, processes of socialization of graduate students for academic

roles, the mechanism of academic stratification system, the importance of ascription, achievement and sponsorship in the allocation of entry positions (Caplow and McGee, 1958; Clark and Corcoran, 1983, etc.).

In accordance with the sociology of science studies carried out in the 1960-s – 1970-s, publications, citations, honors, and awards can more reliably predict disciplinary recognition rather than the achievement of a good academic job. Progress of an institutional career is more or less predictable, at least for men. The research in the sociology, economics and psychology of higher education seems to suggest that academic institutional career is stimulated by publications, assumption of administrative tasks, participating as a member in important committees, and advanced by seniority (Clark, 1986:28).

In most cases, the academic career success is the result of achievements in all three strands mentioned above. At the same time one should bear in mind the possibility of a conflict between the commitments required by different strands. Clark (1986:31) exemplifies such a conflict by the necessity for a faculty member to combine teaching and research during his/her career course in academe. Academics are asked to perform both activities simultaneously, but, unfortunately, this combination is rarely in balance, because teaching and research are different skills. An excellent researcher might be a poor teacher, and vice versa. Moreover, it is not always possible for an academic to allocate his/her time and energy in such a way so that one activity does not undermine the other. In reality, though, it sometimes happens that either the quality of pedagogical activity or the quality of research suffers. Thus, the combination of the two activities remains unresolved, which has a significant impact on the career development of a faculty member.

Faculty members are professionals who are supposed to partake in both research and teaching. As Clark (1986:32) underlines, the orientation of an institution to either research or teaching varies among institutions, and is sometimes determined also by the cultures of disciplines. It is expected that professors will devote more time to graduate students than other professionals. Thus, the academic profession is not a “free profession”: there is often a conflict between institutional expectations and other professional values.

An institution might set as a priority research or teaching, but it may also require productivity in both spheres (it is practically always the case in the German academe).

Moreover, an institution might make demands in one activity, but reward more generously the other, in which case double signals about the importance of these activities will be sent. Academics themselves might have interests and preferences which are contradictory to the priorities of the institutions they are working for. Thus, striking a balance is absolutely indispensable.

3.2. Reputational standing as a factor of an academic career advancement

It is important to understand now what other factors influence the academic career advancement. Obviously, the development of an academic career is dependant on the reputation in the scientific community, which in its turn is determined by scientific productivity. If we address the existent literature on the topic of an academic career, we will find that many scholars studied the interrelation between scholarly productivity and status attainment in academe, considering the former to be central to the achievement of the latter.

Having come to the conclusion that scholarly productivity determines to a great extent the reputational standing in academe (Cole and Cole, 1973; Mullins, 1973; Gaston, 1978), we should now try to reveal the determinants of scholarly productivity. Much research has been done in this field (Allison, 1974; Bayer, 1977; Cole, 1979; Reskin, 1979; Long and McGuinnis, 1981). There have also been studies on gender-specific factors influencing scholarly productivity (Centra, 1974; Zuckerman and Cole, 1975; Lloyd, 1975, Cole, 1979). Most works devoted to the investigation of the connection between scholarly productivity, gender and status in academe have concentrated primarily on the positional aspects of status attainment (rank and salary), whereas reputational aspects have not been so thoroughly explored (Cole, 1979; Long, 1978). Thus, one can say that though scholarly productivity and gender have been seen as important factors influencing status attainment, their role in reputational aspects of status attainment has not been sufficiently studied.

Cole (1979) investigated the connections between scholarly productivity, gender and reputational standing in academe. For Cole, reputational standing in academe included two components – perceived quality of work and general visibility of the scientist (whether his/her name is a renowned one). His work presents an exploration of reputations of American male and female scholars. As the indicator of reputational standing in academe, Cole took selectivity of current department, number of the received

honorary awards, and academic rank. The results of his research brought him to the conclusion that gender had a great influence on the prominence and esteem of a scholar (Cole, 1979: 115). But according to Cole, it is not gender per se that determines a scholar's reputation, rather, gender has an impact on research performance of a scientist, which, consequently, influences status attainment in academe.

Thus, from Cole's perspective, the fact that female scientists are less prominent, less known in the scientific community in comparison with male scientists can be explained by their inferiority in research performance (both quantity and quality of work). In Cole's sample, the male scientists had more publications and a higher citation index. In this regard, Cole's findings conform to the findings of other scientists, who attribute lower research performance of female scientists to gender barriers, such as family obligations, deficiency of networks, and limited access to resources (Bayer and Astin, 1975; Cole and Zuckerman, 1983).

Davis and Astin (1987) continued the direction of research outlined by Cole (1979), while extending it in two new ways: first, they included subjective (self-assessment) and objective (assessment by others) measures in the concept of reputational standing in academe; second, they supplemented the notion of scholarly productivity with the publication of chapters (in contrast to publication of books and articles as a measurement of scholarly productivity in Cole's research). They based their research on a highly productive sample of American academics, and expected to get the results demonstrating a negative effect of (female) gender on reputational standing in academe.

Their findings suggest that the year of degree is negatively correlated with reputational measures, as it takes time to become visible and to achieve a high status in academe. The quality of employment institution has a more direct connection to measures of visibility and reputation than one's training institution. The results of the research also revealed the importance of taking into consideration the publication of chapters in addition to the publication of books and articles, as the former are often solicited from the author by the editor of the volume. Thus, publication of chapters by itself implies visibility and high reputational standing in the academic community: the editor compiling the volume must know the author. Moreover, in cases when the chapter is not an original work created for a specific volume, it is mostly a reprint of some prominent and renowned article predestined to become classics. In one word, the very nature of chapter publication makes it clear why the number of published chapters can

be seen as a trustworthy indicator of the prominent reputational standing of the author in academe (Davis and Astin 1987:270).

According to Davis and Astin, the amount of published articles not always reflects a prominent position in scientific community, which is due to the so called “publish or perish” phenomenon in contemporary academe. This phenomenon implies that academic scholars are under constant pressure to publish, which can result in the publication of articles of lesser quality. In the context of everyone, from graduate students upward, in academe publishing articles at a frantic pace, it is no longer possible to judge the quality of a scholar’s work and his/her reputation in academe just by the number of published articles.

Previous research on scholarly productivity, reputational standing in academe and gender suggested the existence of a negative relationship between female gender and reputational standing (Cole, 1979). In their study, Davis and Astin wanted to find out whether female scholars who were as productive as male ones in several types of publications enjoyed the same reputational standing in academe as their male counterparts. Their findings demonstrate that female scholars were equal to male scholars in terms of reputational standing. This runs contrary to the results of Cole’s research (Davis and Astin 1987:272).

When elaborating on possible explanations of such a contradiction, Davis and Astin laid emphasis on the changes in historical and social context. Among such changes one can mention the appearance on a “new” scholarship (research on women), which contributed to greater women’s opportunities for scholarly study. “The attractiveness of this new area, the recent establishment of a number of scholarly journals devoted to women’s issues, an increase in support from funding agencies, an expanded interest on the part of publishers offer new opportunities for women to establish networks, get practice in terms of editing as well as soliciting articles, and increase writing output. These, in turn, are important experiences that provide women with the skills and insider’s knowledge, previously controlled or monitored by men, that help them sharpen their expertise and ability as scholars”. Davis and Astin conclude their article with the supposition that the contradictory findings in regard to the interrelation between gender and academic reputational standing can be attributed to the social differences between the women in Cole’s 1969 sample and their 1980 sample (Davis and Astin 1987:273).

Thus, in contrast to Cole, who considered that female gender had a significant impact on research performance and, as a consequence, on reputational standing in academe, Davis and Astin, basing on the findings of their research, suggest that provided female scholars have equal scholarly productivity as male colleagues, female gender will have no remarkable impact on reputational standing in academe. This hypothesis was presented in 1987. One can expect that since that time female emancipation and promotion of women's rights have achieved even greater results in equality of both genders. Should not we speak about equality of chances in achieving equal scientific productivity and barriers preventing its achievement, rather than just about equal reputational standing of both genders in academe given equal scholarly productivity?

The situation of women in academe will be more thoroughly investigated in the next chapter.

3.3. Women in academe

The representation of female academics in higher education has always been significantly below the participation rate of females as students. Although such a disbalance could be attributed to discrimination against women in academic recruitment and promotion, numerical inequality of male and female academics by itself cannot be viewed as a sufficient proof of presence of such discrimination. Although one comes across individual cases of discrimination against women in academe (some of the examples are presented in scientific literature), this can not be considered an ample basis for making judgments about the system in general. It is necessary to take into consideration bases for inequality which lie in women's nature and their social roles. There has been much research devoted to women's disadvantaged position in academe. Different studies investigated different aspects of this phenomenon.

As it has already been mentioned earlier, reputational standing in academe is to a great extent determined by scientific output in the form of research and publications. Fox (1983) investigated the problem of research productivity and came to the conclusion that it is greatly influenced by work habits and practices. Among these one can mention the amount of time devoted to work, the manner of allocation of time, ability to explore several questions simultaneously, etc. Helmreich et al. (1980) emphasized the importance of publication rates and citation rates as indicators of a scientist's work commitment, mastery, prominence, and competitiveness. Other scientists similarly noted

that scientific productivity is defined by commitment and motivation, which means being ambitious, enduring, and dominant. These qualities are mostly seen as inherently masculine. The implications of this reasoning seem to be that from the very start women are predestined to fewer scientific achievements and, consequently, to an inferior position in academe in comparison with men.

Another factor influencing the chances of academic career development is geographic mobility. A scientist can become promoted within his/her own institution or get an appointment at another university (in Germany the second variant is almost always the case due to the ban on house promotion). If the scientist lacks geographic mobility, he/she will be unable to accept the offered appointment. Marriage differentially restricts the geographic mobility of professional men and women, as it has been demonstrated in several works (Heckman et al., 1977; Marwell et al., 1979; Rosenfeld and Jones, 1987; Romanin and Over, 1993).

The findings of these studies showed that the majority of women were ready to sacrifice their career, if the advancement of their spouses' career required a move. But male counterparts in their turn rarely gave priority to their wives careers (geographic mobility fostering careers of females was rather an exception to this informal rule). Because women academics are more likely to be in dual-career families (Marwell et al., 1979) than men academics, geographic mobility is much more problematic for them. This leads to the situation when female academics have to reconcile themselves to a lower-lever job either as a consequence of a move to follow the husband or an inability to accept an attractive position in the location removed from the husband's employment. Moreover, the same reasons turn out to be barriers for women to enhancing qualification and acquiring experience (e.g., abroad), which also has a negative effect on academic career prospects.

One should also bear in mind the impact of family life-cycle on career development of a woman. Several surveys showed that women academics were less likely to be married or to have children in comparison with male colleagues and women in population in general (Baldwin, 1985; Cass et al., 1983; Harper, 1987, Romanin and Over, 1993). This is attributed to complexity of combining family obligations and high demands made by academic work. Female academics that are married and have children are often faced with career discontinuity at the rates much higher than those of male colleagues. In most cases women are the family members who take upon

themselves the responsibility for child care and day-to-day management of the household.

Spitze (1988) expressed doubts concerning the capacity of women to combine family life-cycle responsibilities with a high level of work commitment. Some findings (McDowell, 1982) suggest that the number of children in the family might have a negative impact on publication rates and research output in general, as scientific work requires commitment of time and energy, and academics with families cannot concentrate exclusively on their profession.

Nevertheless, not all scientists are so skeptical about the possibility of combining a profession and family responsibilities. E.g. Romanin and Over's (1993) research seems to suggest that being a mother and a wife does not necessarily mean impossibility of making also an academic career. Some women in their sample managed to combine substantial family and domestic responsibilities with a successful academic career. However, one cannot deny that only few, the so called 'hardy survivors', will be able to really succeed in both spheres.

Bain and Cummings (2000) investigated the problem of women in academe in the context of three distinctive approaches: societal, professional-organizational, and institutional. Their study of the academe's 'glass ceiling' is based on worldwide statistical data and own research. Bain and Cummings found out that organizational factors seemed to be most influential in regard to career prospects of women in academe; institutional factors also had some bearing, whereas societal ones had just a minor impact.

Worldwide statistics demonstrates that the proportion of female professors in general is very small: "fewer than one in 10 professors worldwide is a woman. Within any academic system, the higher the prestige of an institution, the lower the proportion of professors who are women" (Bain and Cummings, 2000:509-512). Bain and Cummings come to the conclusion that this situation can be best explained by two professional-organizational factors which inhibit career advancement of women in academe: experience and academic productivity. According to them, one can attribute lower levels of experience and academic productivity of female academics to the difficulty of combining academic work with family obligations (see arguments above) and to women's marginal position in academe caused by lack of networks, thinner CV-s,

lower chances of getting a grant, lacking equipment, motivation, and time, and, as a consequence, producing less research.

Another organizational aspect that needs to be taken into consideration is networking within academe. As Bain and Cummings point out, the procedures of academic career advancement were established long ago, in the time when universities were “the exclusive province of males” (Bain and Cummings, 2000:499). As shown in some studies, in most universities male academics continue to occupy the highest ranks, and they are reluctant to modify the existent formal and informal rules. “Old-boy networks” might not only stimulate the preservation of “male-friendly norms”, but contribute to the appearance of gender bias in key decisions (O’Leary V., Mitchell, 1990).

Certain attention should be paid to institutional factors which also influence women’s academic career prospects. Bain and Cummings distinguished several institutional models. We are interested in the German model which is relevant to the present research. The classical German university, which traces its origins back to medieval times, is known for its strong emphasis on research. European universities in general have the tendency to “organize their staff in a large number of relatively specialized clusters, or chairs, whereas the American universities rely on a smaller number of departments” (Bain and Cummings, 2000:500). The German university views the highest academic rank of a full professor with special regard. In this relation it bears resemblance to the English university. In both of these models only a small proportion of all academic professionals have the chance to attain this position. At American universities, in contrast, there is a higher level of correlation between the number of academics in lower ranks and those who are allowed to achieve the highest rank of professor. Thus, in the German model the chances of becoming a professor are relatively low, and the chances of female academics are still lower due to the factors investigated above.

3.4. Mentoring and networking, and their role in career advancement

There has been much research devoted to the issue of the role of networking and mentoring in the career development. Sociological literature on this subject demonstrates that this is a multifaceted phenomenon which might have a strong impact on the results of career planning. Below we will present an overview of sociological studies done in this field, which will enable us to detect the most important aspects of

professional networks which should be paid attention to in order to acquire a deeper understanding of their role in academic career building.

In the first place, we need to give a definition to the concept “mentor”. Drawing upon the work by Levinson et al. (1978), who made a big contribution into the study of the mentorship phenomenon, we will adopt the following interpretation of a “mentor”: a person who is typically 8-15 years older than the protégé, functions in the same work setting, and for the period of 2-3 years plays the role of both a parent and a peer for the protégé. Among the functions fulfilled by the mentor one can mention those of a “teacher, sponsor, host and guide, exemplar, and counselor” (Levinson et al., 1978). Merriam (1983:162) presented the following description of mentoring: “a powerful emotional interaction between an older and younger person, a relationship in which the older member is trusted, loving, and experienced in the guidance of the younger. The mentor helps shape the growth and development of the protégé”. Moore and Salimbene (1981:52) view mentorship as an “intense, lasting, and professionally centered relationship between two individuals in which the more experienced and powerful individual, the mentor, guides, advises, and assists in any number of ways the career of the less experienced, often younger, upwardly mobile protégé”.

We find no contradiction in these definitions. Together they help us gain a more comprehensive understanding of the nature of mentoring relationship, which is not confined to exclusively professional sphere but also includes emotional element. So, we accept all the definitions. There is a whole set of other descriptions of “mentor” and “mentorship”, but they are basically very similar to the ones presented above.

C. Wright and S. Wright (1987) investigated the role of mentoring in career development of young professionals. They define a mentor as “a veteran professional who takes an active interest in the career development of a younger professional” (Wright and Wright, 1987:204). Referring to Bova and Phillips (1982), the scientists (ibid) identify the following functions performed by mentors which contribute to successful career development of their protégés: 1) encourage dreams and career aspirations of their protégés; 2) offer their protégés the opportunities to participate in their work and learn from this experience; 3) get their protégés acquainted with the unwritten rules, practices and politics existing in their profession – organizational socialization (Williams and Blackburn, 1988).

As it has been discovered in earlier studies, professionals having a mentor tended to have a higher level of job satisfaction, faster promotion, more solid career plans, and higher probability of becoming a mentor themselves (Missirian, 1982; Roche, 1979).

The results of the study carried out by C. Wright and S. Wright strongly supports the supposition that a properly developed mentoring relationship can make a remarkable contribution to the dynamic career development. Moreover, they emphasize the fact that mentoring is by no means a unilateral relationship, on the contrary, according to them, mentoring has a reciprocal nature and is beneficial in terms of career development not only for a protégé but also for a mentor (Wright and Wright, 1987:207).

During their investigation, they found that mentoring is more common for business, whereas in academe the philosophy of working independently is more widely-spread. As one of the respondents in their sample said, “faculty members are often struggling with their own careers and are less likely to help and support each other” (Wright and Wright, 1987:207). The opinion that mentoring is underdeveloped in the academic world has been expressed in earlier studies (e.g. Levinson et al., 1978).

Instead of exploring solely subordinate relations found in academe (mentor-protégé), C. Wright and S. Wright addressed also the question of other career relationships existent among professionals, i.e. peer relationships and relations with colleagues. Their findings suggest that all professional relationships (with mentors, peers and colleagues) are an integral part of academic productivity and career progress, as they perform important career and psychological functions. This idea is supported by other studies (Blackburn et al., 1978; Cameron, 1978).

In their paper C. Wright and S. Wright made an attempt to identify the benefits a mentoring relationship brings to both the mentor and the protégé. The benefits to protégé are more obvious, that is why we will start with them. First, the scholars dwell upon the benefits found in the sphere of *career advancement* (Wright and Wright, 1987:205). By participating in research projects of their mentors, protégés get the chance of acquiring invaluable experience, becoming acquainted with the technical aspects of their profession (Phillips, 1977; Kram, 1980), developing research, writing, speaking, and critical thinking skills.

Another aspect of mentor’s help to a protégé in this area is assistance in formation of career aspirations and their realization by providing the protégé with an access to research funds and publication support (Cameron, 1978; Bogat and Redner, 1985).

Moreover, the mentor can help the protégé to consolidate his/her reputational standing within the department and play the role of a protector while defending the abilities and talents of the protégé (Moore, 1982).

The mentor's support for a protégé in the sphere of research is of crucial importance, because in the majority of Western countries (e.g. in Germany) research skills are of paramount importance for a scientist planning an academic career, as research has precedence over teaching. Besides, publications of the results of research projects are the criterion by which a scientist is judged in academe (Crane, 1965). Additionally, in the process of working relationship with the protégé, the mentor has the opportunity to evaluate the scientific potential of the former, and consequently introduce him/her to the colleagues, and thus increase job opportunities of the protégé (Cameron, 1978).

Another field of benefits of a mentoring relationship to a protégé is *networking*. Above we have already mentioned the importance of professional contacts for career development. It should be noted that scientific productivity is also strongly related to the number and quality of professional contacts (Blackburn et al., 1978). Mentors have the ability to facilitate for their protégés the process of establishment of new professional contacts and networks. This is done both directly – by introducing their protégé to the colleagues and important people in the profession, and indirectly - by taking the protégé to important meetings and conferences, where the latter have the chance to establish contacts by themselves. Mentors can also stimulate the enhancement of their protégé's visibility by involving them in scientific discussions with peers. This could gain their protégé reputation in the professional organization and their field of specialization.

C. Wright and S. Wright (1987:205) also mention the role of mentors in *professional development* of their protégé. In the first place, mentors help their protégé to learn the “ropes” of the profession, acquire realistic career expectations, get a deeper insight into the opportunities and risks involved, and the unwritten rules and norms in academe. Second, on the basis of the above-mentioned factors, mentors help their protégé to define long-term academic career goals and find their niche in the field.

Some words should be said about the beneficial effects of mentoring relationship for the protégé's *personal identity*. The importance of self-confidence for career success is undeniable. The fact that a young scholar has working relations with an established scientist can serve for the former as a source of confidence in own talent and abilities.

The mentor's support and readiness to take into consideration his/her protégé's ideas and suggestions in themselves are the sign of appreciation and respect of the mentor for his/her protégé. Such collaborative work encourages protégé's hard-working and creative potential and leads to development of new talents and further discovery of the protégé's potential.

The importance of respect for the protégé on the part of the mentor has been put emphasis on in some other works. For example, Torrance (1983) considered that in case a protégé sees the mentor's respect for his/her, he/she will have more motivation to take intellectual risks and discuss with the mentor new ideas without the fear of being rejected or even ridiculed. This does not imply that the mentor should not make critical remarks about the work of the protégé. On the contrary, constructive criticism which does not hurt the person will stimulate the development in the protégé of the ability to critically evaluate his/her work and accept critical remarks without taking personal offence. This will help the protégé to improve his/her productivity and become a real scholar able to consider one's work from different perspectives.

Emotional support and counseling of the mentor on work-related and personal questions also play an important role in the protégé's professional development (Cameron, 1978; Kram, 1980). The protégé is not supposed to become his/her mentor's "clone", who has no ideas of his/her own and is just able to reproduce the work of the mentor and perform the work imitating the mentor's style and methods. In the ideal, mentoring relationship is meant to help the protégé most fully reveal and develop his/her creative potential while drawing upon the experience and scientific achievements of the mentor.

In regard to the benefits derived by the mentor from the mentoring relationship, C. Wright and S. Wright (1987:205) identify the following spheres: *professional/career development, networking, and personal identity*. The idea that protégés can stimulate career advancement of their mentors has been expressed in some previous works (Levinson et al., 1978; Kram, 1983). C. Wright and S. Wright stress the point that by providing technical support and expressing his/her ideas, by sharing enthusiasm, own knowledge, and experience, protégés can stimulate their mentor's thinking process and research ideas, and in this way propel his/her productivity.

Having active and productive protégés, who gradually establish their position in a professional organization, wins their mentors a reputation and increases their

professional visibility. Apart from this, being a good mentor who takes an active part in the career development of his/her protégé is seen as leadership ability among colleagues. Additionally, as it has already been noted by Kram (1980), the fact that a mentor devotes much time to development of scientific potential in his/her protégé gains the former respect of his/her peers, which contributes to the formation and strengthening of collegial networks.

The effect of mentoring relationship on the mentor's personal identity has also got coverage in the studies fulfilled before the work by C. Wright and S. Wright (1987). The process of mentoring brings mentors a sense of professionalism, patronage, and personal satisfaction, as they perceive it as a way of contributing to the scientific growth and professional and career advancement of the younger generations of scholars (Blackburn, Chapman, and Cameron, 1981). Mentors tend to see the accomplishments of their protégés also as own achievements for which they can also take some credit. To some extent, mentoring can be compared to parenting, because it also means nurturing and watching the protégé growing and developing.

Mentoring can also be viewed as a means of continuity in work. Mentors pass on knowledge, experience, skills, values and attitudes to their protégés (Levinson et al., 1978). Kram (1983) draw attention to the fact that mentoring enables the mentor to somehow extend himself/herself through the next generation of scientists. Moreover, mentoring relationship gives the mentor the opportunity to have a more lasting effect on the organization, profession, or even the field of his/her specialization.

However, mentoring relationship is not always beneficial for both parties. In their work, C. Wright and S. Wright (1987:206) also analyze possible drawbacks of mentoring and the cases of counterproductive relationships. As the scientists mention, their study strongly supports the findings of earlier works concerning the benefits of mentoring for both the mentor and the protégé. Nevertheless, according to them, potential complications and problems involved in mentoring, which, unlike the benefits, have not been extensively explored, are not infrequent.

Under certain conditions, mentoring relationship can be harmful for the protégé, the mentor, or both of them (Kram, 1985). When analyzing possible problems which can arise in the process of mentoring, Fury (1979) presented the following list: 1) loss of control and influence on the part of the mentor; 2) confinement of the protégé to one perspective – that of his/her mentor; 3) the mentor's withdrawal from the organization; 4)

sexual harassment on the part of the male mentor towards the female protégé; 5) the protégé's strong attachment to a poor mentor. Fury worked out this list for the world of business, but it seems to be relevant also for the academe.

Let us study the potential dangers in more details. As C. Wright and S. Wright (1987:206) demonstrate in their paper, there are several scenarios of "poor mentoring". One of such is when the mentor is extremely critical about the work of his/her protégé (Hunt and Michael, 1983), has peremptory style and is unwilling to consider his/her protégé's ideas and suggestions. This might lead to the situation when the protégé is morally suppressed by the mentor's imperiousness, which prevents creative development of the former. Indifference towards the protégé on the part of the mentor is also detrimental, as it could damp the protégé's interest in science and thus hamper his/her scientific growth, or even reverse him/her from science.

Some mentors might get tempted into imposing their ideas, attitudes and values upon their protégés, thus creating their own "clones" instead of facilitating their protégé's independent development. This danger has been also warned against by Kram (1983). Another potential pitfall of mentoring relationship noted by C. Wright and S. Wright (1987:206) is exploitative attitude of the mentor, who uses the protégé for advancing his/her own academic career without offering any protection or supervision in return. This situation is very harmful for the protégé, who always stands in the shadow of his/her mentor, invests time and energy into the work which brings laurels not to him/her but the mentor.

The mentor might also turn out to be too overprotective and discourage the protégé from taking initiative, thus blocking career opportunities for the latter. Furthermore, the mentor, who inwardly recognizes the worth of the protégé, might feel threatened when the latter starts making professional and career progress. This process of redefinition of roles could generate hostility and resentment (Kram, 1983). As one of female mentors in C. Wright and S. Wright's sample said (1987:206), the moment when the student leaves the mentor and continues his/her work with other research groups is pregnant with conflicts, because it requires role negotiations and implies future rivalry of the former mentor and the protégé who are now to compete with each other in the same institution for grants, research funds, and reputational standing in academe. Hunt and Michael (1983) pointed to the danger of premature termination of mentoring relationship: the

protégé, who so far had not managed to gain a firm foothold in academe, might get disillusioned and lose self-esteem and self-confidence.

The protégé might grow too dependent on the mentor and fail to perform any work independently, without the guidance and support of the mentor. Some of the young professionals who took part in the study carried out by C. Wright and S. Wright (1987:206) confessed that the initial period after breaking away from the mentor is the most trying one. It is a real challenge for a young scientist, who has grown accustomed to participating in the research projects of the mentor and being guided by him “from the conceptual stage to final write-up” to start working on his/her own.

Above we have investigated some of the problems that might await the protégé in mentoring relationship. But the mentor is also running some risk (Kram, 1985). The mentor can wrongly evaluate the protégé’s potential, and the latter’s poor performance could have a negative effect on his productivity and reputation. Some personal characteristics of the protégé might also markedly complicate the process of mentoring. In case the protégé is hypersensitive to criticism, or is unwilling to take into consideration the remarks and corrections of the mentor, mentoring might be futile (Wright and Wright, 1987:206).

The conclusion C. Wright and S. Wright (1987) come to concerning the role of mentoring is that a well- and properly developed mentoring relationship can be most beneficial for professional and career development of both the protégé and the mentor, because good working relations stimulate sharing and exchange of ideas and knowledge, which contributes to scientific progress in general. However, poor relationships are mutually detrimental in terms of valuable career and opportunity costs.

Another important question raised by C. Wright and S. Wright (1987) is the role of mentoring in the career opportunities of women and minorities. The scientists lay stress that although the bulk of the research is based on white male experience, mentoring is equally, if not more important for females (Henning, Jardim 1977; Roche, 1979). When commenting upon the role of mentoring for women, one of the female professional in C. Wright and S. Wright’s (1987) study stated that male and female scientists are viewed differently in academe, that it is more difficult for women to win reputation and credibility in the scientific community, and to become involved in the “old boy network” without patronage and support of a mentor.

C. Wright and S. Wright's emphasize the fact that most of the studies on successful women cited mentorship as a crucial element in their success (Phillips, 1977; Missirian, 1982). Some other scholars underlined the shortage of female mentors in business, academe, and other professions, which turned out to be a factor impeding career development of females (Shapiro, Haseltine, and Rowe, 1978; Dixon-Reeves, 2003). As Dixon-Reeves (2003:24) rightly states, "effective mentoring is the key to professional development, publication, tenure, and advancement through the ranks of academia".

There is empirical evidence that mentors tend to choose protégés with whom they identify, i.e. those who are closer to them on the basis of gender, race, and social class (ibid.). Taking this into consideration, we can presuppose that this is the reason why many females and minorities are confronted with the challenge of lacking a mentor, and, consequently, having less favorable conditions for career advancement.

Other scientists pointed to another reason of women's being in a disadvantaged position in the process of mentorship. Some research suggests that mentors and protégés in mixed gender alliances are running the risk of being faced with "gossip, jealous spouses, and sexual attraction or tension" (Missirian, 1982). Other scholars accentuate that in order to prevent the emergence of these problems, both partners in a mixed gender pair have to be very mature to be able to keep their relationship on the professional basis exclusively.

As C. Wright and S. Wright (1987) mention, there is not much literature investigating special problems minorities are confronted with. Obviously, in case identification is based on race and culture, minorities are in a distinctly disadvantaged position, because they are underrepresented in academe. Another dimension of minorities' disadvantaged position might be their field of specialization – they could lack colleagues working in the same field as they are – thus they can be disadvantaged in terms of research collaboration. From the above-presented arguments it follows that minority females have compounded difficulties in finding an appropriate mentor, and hence have the slightest chances of career advancement.

Conclusions of Chapter I

The notion of 'career' usually refers to the progression from one full-time job to another (in a series of typically related jobs), ending with full-time retirement, over the

lifespan (in the past, this was mostly relevant to the experience of white, middle-class, young men married to full-time housewives). Over the time, the nature of the workforce was changing in the direction of greater diversity in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, age, level of education, etc., which led to the gradual disruption of the division of labour market into primary and secondary (traditionally composed of women, minorities, immigrants, and low-skilled people) sectors. Occupational career represents a path in which both work and life histories are intertwined.

The nature of careers has also undergone significant changes: the present-day organizational structure is associated with much greater volatility and instability. This has led to an increase in the importance for career advancement of such factors as realistic career expectations, proactive behavior, networking and mentoring, and life-long learning.

The academic career has its own specificity, which results in peculiarity of its development and specific career strategies. One of such characteristic features is an associational structure, in contrast to the hierarchical, bureaucratic model of organization. This structure lays emphasis on the role of influence, which means that collegial relations might have a significant impact on academic career unfolding. Another peculiarity is the contradictory nature of an academic profession: conflict between institutional obligations (e.g. undergraduate teaching, administrative tasks) and core professional activities (research and publications in the first place).

Scientific productivity determines the reputational standing of a scientist in academe and is central to academic career development. As it has been demonstrated above, female gender might have a strong negative relation to academic productivity. Possible explanations of this could lie both in women's nature and their social roles, and certain organizational factors hampering their career progress (e.g. deficiency of networks and mentoring relationships).

Chapter II. German academe

1. Academic career systems from comparative perspectives

It is impossible to explore academic career chances without investigating the career structure in academe. The career structure, which is formed by institutions and formal and informal rules and regulations, has a significant impact on the level of satisfaction with employment and working conditions in academe, and determines to a great extent the ability of the higher education system of a country to attract and keep the most important resource – human capital.

When investigating academic career prospects in a particular country (in our case Germany), it is necessary to focus on the national career system found in this country, because national regulations and traditions having their roots in the history and initial organization of the system of higher education (path dependency) have a strong impact on academic careers and labor markets. Kaulisch and Salerno (2005:4) lay emphasis on the fact that selecting, hiring and promoting procedures in academe are dependant not only on the criteria created by the academic's discipline but are also influenced by the timing of academic careers. The importance of the time and place of the scientist's degree awarding for future academic career chances has been also noted in other studies (Caplow and McGee, 2001; Burris, 2004; Miller et al., 2005).

In an effort to systematize the findings of previous studies and identify the most important factors having influence on academic career prospects, Kaulisch and Salerno (2005:4) introduced 5 groups of such factors: 1) academics' employment; 2) credentials; 3) intra-organizational practices; 4) inter-organizational relations; 5) academic disciplines. Each of these groups should be addressed separately.

1) Employment rules in academe cover the general timing and sequence of academic career events. They are incorporated in staff structures (defining staffing procedures and determining power hierarchies between different levels in universities) and career ladders. One can distinguish between two types of academic staff structures: the chair- and department-model (Neave and Rhoades, 1987).

The first model is typical for Continental Europe, whereas the second is to be found in the UK and the USA. The characteristic feature of the chair-model is a high level of power and authority concentration in the hands of an individual professor, who has both

scientific and administrative responsibilities in his/her institute, actively participates in the allocation of resources, and often conducts direct negotiations with state ministries. Chairs are endowed with the power to take decisions concerning employment in their institute, and define the degree of scientific freedom of their subordinates. The department-model, in contrast, has more emphasis on inter-rank collegiality. Though chair positions are also maintained in the system of higher education in the UK, its power is markedly diluted. Non-professorial staff in the British system is far from being equal to full professors, but at the same time they are less dependent on the latter than their counterparts in the countries of Continental Europe and participate more actively in the decision-making of the department (Kaulisch and Salerno, 2005:5).

The two types of staff structures have different degrees of “steepness” at various stages of academic career. In the chair-model, the promotion from a non-professorial position to a professorial one is a much greater step than in the department-model. Thus, one can say that the higher education systems of the UK and the USA have more recognizable career ladders in terms of intra-organizational career progression than the system in Germany, where “career progression is based more on credentials, state control or chairholders’ goodwill” (ibid). The British and American higher education systems, which have the tendency to stress organizational careers, and where the achievement of permanent positions is based on organizational decisions, are characterized by an earlier granting of permanent positions.

2) The next group of rules deals with credentials. In order to obtain an academic position or be promoted, an academic has to have certain certificates and qualifications. There are some differences in the use and design of credentials among academic career systems (Sörensen, 1992). The main function of any credentials in any system is to provide the necessary information about the candidate and to serve as a guarantor of his/her suitability for the position, and to make prognoses about his/her future performance.

3) Intra-organizational practices relate to the existent hiring and promotion practices in the organization. Different academic systems have different degree of freedom or flexibility to hire and fire academic staff. The British and the American systems are characterized by greater autonomy over such matters in comparison to Germany, where the decision is remanded to the state (Kaulisch and Salerno, 2005:6). Though there are some exceptions to the rule: in the chair-model a candidate can be

selected for a non-professorial position by a professor without a formal procedure; and even in case when there is a formal procedure, professors' protégés have a high chance to get the position. State control, in its turn, can be expressed in the "direct influence on whom a university appoints, the ranking of candidates or the funding of the position" (ibid). In the situation when universities have some impact on the process of hiring and selection, the role of internal governance in balancing administrators' and academics' power to influence staffing and promotion increases.

4) The fourth set of rules, inter-organizational relations, reflects the prestige hierarchies of universities in the country and the level of openness of the academic system to inter-organizational job mobility. In some countries, where the institutional prestige hierarchies are very steep, the name of the institution which grants a PhD degree plays a decisive role in the future career opportunities of an academic. There is also evidence that the prestige of a supervisor and of the journals in which a candidate had publications has a great influence on selection process (Caplow and McGee, 2001). In other countries, where the state promotes universalistic principles of assessment of universities, quality of studying courses and funding, there is no such a steep prestige hierarchy (Neave and Rhoades, 1987). Thus, prestige is mostly associated with an individual rather than with a university.

Academic career systems also differ in the level of inter-organizational job mobility. In some systems mobility is most welcome, because it is viewed as a means of additional scientific development through exchange of ideas and knowledge with colleagues (Gläser, 2001). In some countries there is a ban on house promotion (promotion to a professorial position in the university where the scientist got the degree - Germany). In others, internal promotion to professorship is the only route to a permanent position, which results in low inter-organizational mobility. Both types of systems have advantages as well as disadvantages: higher mobility gives institutions greater flexibility, yet it might also be associated with a higher risk of prestige and productivity loss (e.g. if a prominent academic leaves for another institution), etc.

5) The last group of rules deals with the rules specific for different academic disciplines. Kaulisch and Salerno point to the difference in the way academic work is organized, assessed and rewarded in various disciplines (2005:7). The nature of the field influences the organization of academic work, which, in its turn, influences the organization of academic units, relationships of faculty members with the colleagues,

etc. For example, in some fields communication is carried out through conference presentations, whereas in others refereed journals are more typical. Expected per-year scientific productivity also varies in different disciplines: in history with its research output expressed in books expected productivity is lower than in such fields as economics or education, which are journal-oriented. In physics and biology research is mostly conducted in large, multi-institution teams, which differs dramatically from the stereotype of a historian, who, according to conventional views, works on his/her own.

2. Characteristic features of the academic career structure in Germany

Now we will concentrate on the academic career structure of Germany. Following the logic of the above-presented system of factors influencing academic career development, Kaulisch and Salerno (2005:8-10) analyzed the academic career structure of Germany. Below you will find the summary of the most important characteristics of the German academic career structure, which draws upon the findings of their study, other scientific articles on contemporary academic system in Germany and the information obtained during the interviews conducted for the present work.

1) *Academics' employment*: the highest position in the German institutions of higher education is that of a professor. This position is associated with "access to the most resources, power and prestige". Professors conduct negotiations with the Ministry about the resources and facilities for their institute, are responsible for human capital management, i.e. perform administrative functions. Apart from this, professors define responsibilities of the staff and evaluate their scientific qualifications and achievements. Thus, we see that such a system presupposes that even the academics having experience of ten or more years heavily depend on the "whims and motivations of a single professor" (Kaulisch and Salerno).

The organizational hierarchy in the German academe is built around the professor. The recent reforms in the system of higher education have contributed to the reduction of professorial power, but still professors remain key actors in the questions of staffing in their institutes and faculty. The role of the latter increases when it comes to selection of a candidate to a tenured position. The German system of higher education does not have a "regular" career ladder: career paths tend to be relatively unstructured, and there are no clear promotion criteria. Under the level of a tenured position, all academic

positions are contract-related (their term is fixed by the conditions of the contract). This means that academics have to periodically take care of the prolongation of their employment.

Scientists begin their academic career path with positions or scholarships/grants enabling them to obtain a doctoral degree. In order to achieve a professorial position one has to defend Habilitation (a second thesis or several scientific publications of outstanding quality – cumulative Habilitation - recently introduced Junior Professorship offers now another career track). Those academics who work towards the completion of the Habilitation (post-doctoral or Habilitation phase) are granted the employment status of temporary Beamte (a special form of public servant) – this provides them with a higher salary than other scientific staff involved in third-party projects receives. After successfully completing Habilitation, scientists receive the academic title of Private Lecturer (Privatdozent) and the teaching license. The academics who have obtained this academic grade can apply for a professorship. Habilitated academics that so far have not got the position of a full professor may work as freelancers for a university or be employed by it. With the title habilitated academics get the right to supervise doctoral candidates and the responsibility to do teaching for a certain amount of hours (this work is not paid). In case of failure to fulfill this responsibility, scientists can be deprived of their title.

The process of selection of a candidate to a position is defined by the rank of this vacant position. Appointment to a position of a scientific collaborator is mostly carried out internally (candidates are chosen from former student assistants or graduates). When a vacant professorial position is to be filled, a special commission (Berufungskommission) consisting of professors, other academic staff and students, is formed by the faculty. After exploring the qualifications and CV-s of all the candidates who have applied, the committee presents a ranked list of three most suitable candidates (this list has hierarchy: 1st, 2nd and 3d places). The list, which must be approved by the faculty, often bypasses university senates and is submitted directly to the Ministry. The latter has the power either to decline the list outright or accept it and conduct negotiations with the candidates, following the descending order of the list, until an appropriate candidate is selected.

Retirement provisions are strictly observed and correspond to national regulations for public servants (retirement begins at the age of 65). In some of the Bundesländer, in

accordance with recent reforms, the selected groups of professors are allowed to work until 68. “Retired professors are often eligible to have an office in their former institute (Kaulisch and Salerno, 2005:9).

2) *Credentials*: In order to get access to an academic career one is to have a 4-5-year university degree (Diplom or Master). Further promotion in German academia requires a doctoral degree and eligibility for a professorial position – a Habilitation. In general, the path to a doctoral degree has a loose structure.

The Habilitation, which until recently was the only way to a tenured position, is the second dissertation which should have a subject different from the one of the doctoral thesis, thus demonstrating the academic’s broad knowledge of the field. Some faculties have the provisions according to which a candidate who failed to prove his/her broad knowledge of the discipline is entitled only to a Habilitation limited to his/her specialization. This significantly limits the candidates’ career opportunities, as he/she can apply for a full professorship only in this specialization. In the contemporary academic system of Germany the requirements for Habilitation are not so clearly specified. For example, some faculties accept a cumulative Habilitation, which consists of the scientist’s main published articles. Another innovation is the introduction of Junior Professorship, the successful completion of which offers an alternative way to a full professor position.

3) *Intra-organizational practices*: In the issues related to selection and promotion the faculty is the primary decision-taking and rule-setting actor. In accordance with the federal level regulations, professors are to have the majority of votes in the commissions working on these questions, with the exception of teaching-related issues. In general, the appointment to the position of a full professor is carried out at the level of the respective Land. The power of the university management to influence the processes of selection and promotion is very limited. As Kaulisch and Salerno (2005:10) note, it is not uncommon for “personal preferences or politics between established professors to become influential in the process of filling vacancies”.

4) *Inter-organizational relationships*: According to the law, all universities in Germany are considered equal. The study courses and degrees found in them are comparable. The same can be said about the prestige and authority of a full professor across universities. However, chairs differ from each other in the level resources provision.

Similar to the situation found in other systems of higher education, old and well-established universities in Germany are more prominent in prestige and the development of networks due to their longer history, which influences significantly the chances of securing external funding. The most important sponsor of third-party projects is DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft). Typically, the type of organization of the scientist's employment (university, Fachhochschule or public non-university research centre) has a greater impact on his/her academic career chances than the university by which he/she was granted the degree.

As it has already been mentioned, the academic career under the tenured level is composed of a series of fixed-term contracts. This results in the higher level of inter-organizational mobility (which might be relatively high even among professors, who could use an invitation to a professorial position as a means to improve their salary, working conditions, reputational standing either in their own university –bargaining - or in another one), greater likelihood of competition between academics and academics' exit from science.

5) *Academic disciplines*: Above we mentioned that criteria for assessing academic performance and achievements vary across disciplines. This is relevant for the German system. Usually faculties are organized around one or several close disciplines, though decisions concerning granting doctoral and Habilitation degrees are confined to one discipline. This strong relationship existent between degrees and disciplines plays a big role in determining academics chances on the academic labor market. This dependency finds its reflection in the cases when a vacant position can be filled by scientists from a number of disciplines. In case the candidate for a position has excellent qualifications but comes from the discipline foreign to the one of the department offering the vacancy, his/her application might be declined because of the disciplinary mismatch and not because of content-related qualifications.

A few words should be said about salaries in the German academe. Since 1 January 2005, the old C salary scale was substituted with the W one. *Junior professors* are appointed on W1, and have a basic salary of 3,405.34 euros; the basic salary of *W2 professors* (professorship without Chair) amounts to 3,890.03 euros, and *W3 professors* (full chaired professorship) receive a basic salary of 4,723.61 euros. Basic salaries, which are minimum remuneration, are pensionable and are subject to general salary adjustments, called index-linking. In contrast to the C salary scale, the W system does

not offer salary increases based on the length of service. However, the basic salary is supplemented with family allowances and various performance bonuses. Academics holding a position in accordance with federal C salary scale regulations will remain in this scheme and will continue to receive salary increases based on the length of service. However, in case of leaving for another university, academics will have to switch to the new W salary scale (Deutscher Hochschulverband: Salaries in Academia, April 2008).

3. Recent reforms in the German academe

The recent reforms which have been carried out in Europe are aimed at reversing the process of “brain drain” from Europe to the USA and making the academic labor markets of European countries more attractive for talented scientists and researchers from other parts of the world. The most urgent question which arises in this regard is whether these reforms expressed in introduction or abolition of certain institutions serve the purpose of creating more efficient and responsive academic labor market structures, and what implications for academics’ careers these changes have. The study of the dynamics of these shifts and their consequences will help us better understand individuals’ career strategies.

Among the most radical changes in the sphere of higher education of Germany one should mention the introduction of a new position of a Junior Professor (2002) and abolition of Habilitation as an obligatory qualification for obtaining the position of a professor. The Junior Professor model provides an alternative to the traditional academic path. It is aimed at attracting young professionals to science by offering them the opportunities to start independent research at an earlier age. The reform should foster scientific excellence, because it helps overcome some of the drawbacks of the older system: the dependency of a young academic on a single mentoring full professor might dampen academic freedom and, consequently, hamper scientific progress and individual professional development.

The current formal structure of the German academia is designed in such a way as to guarantee maximum efficiency and effectiveness of its functioning and to eliminate such phenomena as corruption, nepotism and favoritism. Recent reforms in the legislation concerning the system of higher education (Hochschulrahmengesetz) are aimed at fostering these ideals: e.g. a ban on house appointment (Hausberufungsverbot) (a candidate is not allowed to receive the first appointment at the same institution where

he/she achieved qualification for a professorship). Another innovation in the German academe is the law about a 12-years period (“12-Jahres-Klausel”) introduced to limit the period (up to a maximum of 12 years) a person having an untenured position can stay at the university (Section 57 b Hochschulrahmengesetz). At the present moment permanent positions below the professorial level do not exist in Germany.

Conclusions of Chapter II

In contrast to the UK and the USA, the German academic career system, as other systems of the European model, allows potential academics start their academic career before completion of a doctoral thesis, but they are expected to attain a doctoral degree relatively early on and after that defend the second dissertation (Habilitation). The German academic career system appears to be the most difficult one for academics to achieve the professorial position. Mainly, this is due to its more loosely defined career structure. The way to professorship is long and thorny: the employment which consists of a series of fixed-term contracts induces academics to constantly search for new contracts, which is challenging, as it generates the feeling of job insecurity. However, those few who succeed in securing a professorial position will be generously rewarded: they will enjoy the degree of power, authority and autonomy which is incomparable with those typical for professors in other academic systems.

Empirical research

To a great extent, though not purely, Chapters III and IV base upon the material of the empirical research. Hence, it should be emphasized that the facts given in them often present a subjective perception and interpretation of reality by the respondents through the prism of their personal experience. This means that these facts should not be viewed as universal truth: there is a possibility of misinterpretation, exaggeration or distortion. Moreover, these few cases covered by the present research might not be representative. Yet, we find this information extremely valuable and helpful for the understanding and analysis of the problem investigated in this MA thesis. This data is beneficial because it informs us about certain subtle nuances involved in the problem of academic career development. It can serve as a prompt, a guidance for those weighing career and professional prospects in Germany. The findings of the present empirical research conform to a great extent with the results obtained in previous works. Nevertheless, this research goes beyond the scope of other studies, because it

contributes to identification and exploration of a number of issues which, until this time, were not covered in scientific literature.

1. Initial suppositions

We expect to find the confirmation of the theories analyzing the determinants of modern career development, in particular factors influencing academic career unfolding. The results of the empirical research will show whether the theory of “weak ties” can be applied to the employment route of the respondents in our sample. We are also interested in the theory presented by Eby, Butts, and Lockwood (2003), who identified 3 groups of factors defining career chances in the contemporary world. It is important to find out whether these groups of factors will prove to be relevant for the case of career advancement in the German academe. In the theoretical part we were dwelling upon the problem of the position of females in academe. It was shown that female academics are faced with challenges of different character: some are emanating from women’s nature itself, others are caused by certain institutional and organizational factors. It is logical to expect some positive developments in the sphere of the latter group of factors, which create more favorable conditions for female academics. However, we presume that the factors associated with feminine nature will still persist.

2. The design of the research

2.1. Setting:

The choice of Bielefeld University as a setting for the present study is explained by the reasons of access availability (the financial support for the research and the invitation were provided by Bielefeld University). Moreover, the researcher had some professional contacts at this university, which was helpful for finding respondents.

Some attention should be paid to the question of representativeness of Bielefeld University. On the one hand, the information about this university found in the Internet seems to suggest that it can be called a “reform” university, as it follows a different style of organization and teaching in contrast to the older established universities. This opinion is supported by all the respondents: some of them emphasized the fact that Bielefeld University is reforming a lot and always tries to be the spearhead of reforms. But, on the other hand, all the participants adhered to the idea that in terms of career prospects for foreign scientists the conditions existing in this university are similar to

those found in other universities of Germany (one respondent was more specific in his answer – he underlined the resemblance of Bielefeld University only to the German universities of the same profile). This idea is confirmed by Internet sources. Thus, we give an affirmative answer to the question of representativeness of Bielefeld University in this regard.

2.2. Method:

Data was obtained through in-depth, semi-structured interviews. The total number of the taken interviews is 13. The average duration of an interview amounted to 1-1,5 hours. Some of the respondents were addressed for the second time per e-mail and asked additional questions (requests either to comment upon the old information or provide new information). Some inquiries were sent a few days after the interview, some – several months later (questions which arose in the process of analysis of data).

The research started with the consultation with a German professor, with whom the author is connected by a professional contact, who helped with identifying some of the scientists of Russian descent presently studying or working at Bielefeld University. These persons were subsequently contacted and asked to participate in the research. Two of them were recruited for the study. Another way used to find scientists with Russian roots was sending inquiries to dean's offices of some of the faculties of Bielefeld University. The answers got were different: some faculties informed the author that there were no scientists of Russian descent at their faculty, others reported that the inquiry was redirected and the answer was to be expected. From some of the faculties no reply followed. Still, the Faculties of Mathematics and Physics helped a lot in providing access to several scientists, who not only participated in the interview but also referred the author to other potential participants. The interviews with four German scientists were taken not during the researcher's stay in Bielefeld, but later in Russia, when these academics came to St. Petersburg State University to do teaching.

2.3. Respondents:

The sample is composed of 7 Russian scientists and either working (on a regular/temporary basis) or writing a PhD at Bielefeld University; 2 German scientists, 1 German professor of Polish background, and 3 experts (Thomas Luettenberg, the head of the International Office of Bielefeld University, and two German professors). The sample consisted of 4 females and 9 males.

The respondents who took part in this research belong to different age groups; have different positions and academic titles. They come from different faculties, which proved to be valuable, because career chances might also be influenced by the field. The interviewees are not necessarily representative of other scientists writing PhD or working at Bielefeld University, less so of the Russian academics having their post-graduate studies at or employed by other universities of Germany. These thirteen participants can be called only an availability sample obtained through the author's personal contacts and snowballing recruitment technique.

One more point that needs to be stressed is that though we use the term "Russian scientists" in the title of the work and in some other parts of the present MA thesis, it may possible that it is not quite justified. As it becomes clear from the interviews, in most cases we should rather speak about the phenomenon of blurred identity and greater or lesser adoption of the German culture.

Chapter III. Factors of academic career advancement and academic career risks in Germany

1. The major determinants of career development in the German academe

1.1. Mobility

As stated earlier in the work, in some academic structures mobility is an integral part of an academic career. This holds true for the case of the German academic system. The structure existing in Bielefeld University is typical of all other German universities. Academics in the German academe are very mobile, which is partly explained by the existent laws (e.g. ban on house promotion) (respondents [1], [3], [4], [5]), and partly by the German scientific culture (respondent [3]).

Respondent [3] emphasized the role mobility plays in the academic career of scientists in Germany. According to this respondent, the primary difference between the career of a Russian academic and the career of a German academic was that in Russia academic career usually evolves within one university (studies, post-graduate studies, the position of an associate professor, the head of the department, the rector). In Germany, on the contrary, a scientist is very mobile, changes up to 4-5 universities. The interviewee noted that taking part in different research teams and getting experience in different spheres was very important for academic career chances to. A professor should

be knowledgeable in different fields, be flexible, have the talent to be the head of a big collective, several working groups.

1.2. The role of networking and mentoring

The present research supported the theory of “weak ties” introduced by M. Granovetter. The guest scientists [6], [7] mentioned that they got employment in the projects through personal networks: one [6] had been invited to take part in the project by his supervisor at St. State University, who from time to time came to Germany to participate in different projects; the second [7] had found employment through his colleagues in St. Petersburg. In both cases the initiative was taken not by the scientists themselves (they were not looking for these job opportunities). They were contacted and offered employment.

A German professor [13] emphasized the role networking played in her career: “I had to make my way through and establish contacts on my own. I was very fortunate that having presented my findings, I was very quickly invited by colleagues from other places. I was lucky, because my French, English and also American colleagues started inviting me to their institutes to give lectures. They met me during the conferences at which I was giving presentations on my results. And also I owe a lot to my German colleague who very early on invited me to one important conference, where I met a group of French and English colleagues. So in a way, networking was absolutely necessary. Thanks to networks I gradually established contacts, primarily during conferences. Without networking I would not be here”. She also spoke about, in her opinion, the most important meeting in her career, which was at a conference, when a colleague, who worked at Cambridge at that time, suggested introducing her to a prominent scientist. This was followed by an invitation to work in Oxford: “And I would say, I would not be here in my position without this Oxford experience. I learned a lot in Oxford”. Together with the scientist she was introduced to, she conducted a number of joint research projects; they kept publishing each other’s articles, over the time exchanging ideas.

Another respondent’s [1] experience in the first years of her stay in Germany shows how much a mentoring relationship can give a protégé. She mentioned that though she had two formal mentors supervising her PhD dissertation, the real help and support came from informal mentors, whom she had met during her participation in one research project. Those scientists, according to her, taught her a lot, helped her in her

work on dissertation (assisted in transcribing interviews, compiled a list of the most relevant literature, read all the text of her PhD and provided comments and recommendations, helped to edit the final version of the thesis, etc). One of the reasons which induced them to help her was, as they said, that once they had also received such help, and they believed it was their duty to pass on this “heritage”. The respondent noted that she continued that tradition by sometimes performing the functions of a mentor).

A few words should be said about the role of personal contacts in finding a supervisor for a PhD dissertation and in securing a temporary position in academe. As it was stated by several scientists [1], [11], [13], a standard academic career in Germany has the following pattern: a talented student is noted by some professor at the seminars, is offered a job of a student collaborator, writes a PhD in the same project, etc. [1] emphasized the fact that from the very beginning of an academic career a scientist needs support: “[...] he should be supported, induced to make publications and presentations”. Thus, personal contacts begin to become influential very early on: reputation gained in the student years might do a big service later. Respondent [9] highlighted the role of personal networks in getting a temporary position in the German academe. He said that when a professor is looking for an assistant, he/she prefers to choose someone he/she knows personally to be confident that the choice is right.

One should also take into account the role of networks in the selection process to a professorial position. The majority of the respondents confessed that they believed informal contacts played a certain role in the process of being appointed to a tenured position¹. One interviewee [12] argued that the role of contacts in academic career development might vary in different faculties, because some lay more stress on being neutral and objective, and do their best in order to eliminate any possibility of bias.

¹ Respondent [12] “I think it depends on the department of a faculty, because there are some departments who take pride in being really neutral. So they want to make sure by all means that the process when they choose a candidate is really neutral and objective. But we know of departments where it is not the case, and where it is really important to do networking. But still even if the process of choosing a candidate for professorship is really objective and so on, I am sure it makes a difference to be a good networker. I mean not because you are in the position to call the persons who are in the committee and say: “We are good old friends. Can you do something for me?” But if you are a good networker, people know you, because they went to conferences where you gave lectures, you are publicly known. And of course, this improves your chances. So surely, if you want to have an academic career in Germany, you should not be a hermit, you should be an out-going person. This may be a problem, because we might conceive of a genius that he is rather reluctant when it comes to meeting people, talking to them and so on. Maybe he is a wonderful scientist, but no one realizes that, if he is not open-minded and so on. E.g., I know one person, he is a very good scientist, very, very good. But he is extremely shy. I am afraid he won't get any professorship, even though he is definitely first-class”.

Respondent [5], answering another question expressed an idea, which is closely connected with the problem in question: "... you analyze the structures here, see how everything works, the hierarchy, how people advance up the career ladder. [...] You see that it is not always the case that the people who moved to the top have obtained this thanks to their scientific achievements"² In answer to the direct question about the process of appointment to a professorial position, she answered that in Germany this was a real democratic selection process. Though later she added that sometimes, when, for example, a scientist working at the same university applied for the position (the ban on house appointment prohibits applying to the same university where one got the title of Privatdozent), some complications appeared. As she said, colleagues might be against this applicant, and try not to let him get the position. According to this interviewee, such hostility might be also caused by envy: if the applicant does more than those who are taking the decision, he/she might not be chosen.

Respondent [1] reported on one trick which might be used to predetermine the results of the process of choosing a candidate to a professorial position. As stated earlier, the first stage of the process of appointment to a tenured position is composition of the position's description. According to the interviewee, the description can be composed in such a way as to make it most suitable to a particular person. This trick works in the following way: all can apply for the position, but if we know that we want to choose Mr. X, and we know that his specialization includes some very narrow and specific spheres, we can make such a description of the position that only very few of all the applicants will match it; among them will be our Mr. X.

One of the experts [9] also admitted that he thought informal contacts played a big role in the appointment process. He noted that even the introduction of the law banning house promotion could not completely eliminate the influence of networking, as scientists often have very extensive networks. So scientists might have acquaintances in other universities, in other cities. The interviewee emphasized that he did not consider these networks to be corruption. He explained that very often relations are formed during university years. Scientists have personal contacts with their friends, "guys from the University", know about their professional work, are acquainted with their publications and presentations at various conferences, and want to have them as colleagues. On the

² «... смотришь здесь на структуры, как здесь все работает, на иерархию, как вообще люди двигаются по карьерной лестнице. [...] Видишь, что не всегда люди, которые продвинулись высоко, они действительно это сделали по своим каким-то заслугам в науке».

one hand, it is good, because this will secure good working relations and a close scientific connection, which will enhance productivity and result in greater scientific achievements. But, on the other hand, when the choice is based exclusively on friendship, this will be nepotism.

As can be seen, networking plays a certain role during all the stages of career development in the German academe. Personal contacts might prove being important even for the entry into the academic world. However, their role seems to increase in proportion to the progress up the career ladder. Thus, we found confirmation of the theories emphasizing the importance of proactive behavior and development of mentoring relationships and networks for success in academic career. At the same time, it should be noted that here we are not speaking about corruption and nepotism, but rather about a natural desire of people to work with those whose scientific work and personal characteristics are known to them. This contributes to the creation and preservation of good working relations in the collective, which is beneficial for advancement of science. Of course, the situations when, for example, the choice is based primarily on friendly relations rather than merit, or when envy makes people reject the candidacy of a most worthy scientist, might happen (“human element” is to be found everywhere!); but these are, we presume, exceptional cases. The very structure of the German academe is aimed at guaranteeing that merit and scientific achievements are the main factors enabling a person to achieve a professorial position.

1.3. A ‘must’ for those striving for an academic career in Germany

Many respondents were asked to consider the question: What are the necessary prerequisites, a must, for scientists planning an academic career in Germany? The answers varied: interest and love for one’s work [7], [13]; diligence [13]; knowledge of German [5]. An expert [9] laid stress on the importance of reputation (this is in accord with the theories presented earlier in this work – see Chapter I, 3.2. Reputational standing as a factor of an academic career advancement). The same idea was expressed by another respondent [3], who believed that a career prospects in the German academe depended to a great extent on a scientist’s reputational standing in the scientific community. In general, the interviewees were speaking of a whole system of preconditions determining academic career unfolding: scientific achievements (publications, participation in conferences, citation index, etc. – these are determinants of reputational standing in academe), absence of career discontinuity, good speaking

and writing skills, being a good supervisor, a good colleague and a good networker. Thus, the answers given by the respondents in our sample correspond to the primary determinants of academic career development, which were explored in greater detail in Chapter I.

2. Career risks in the German academe

One of the greatest risks in the German academe is academic career disruption. Almost all the interviewees (with the exception of guest scientists, for whom the changes in the German academic structure are not so topical) mentioned one of the recent reforms in the sphere of higher education in Germany, namely the law of 12 years in academe. This demonstrates its importance for the issue of academic career prospects in Germany. Many respondents, not just those with Russian roots but also Germans, were very critical speaking about the law of a 12-years period in academe. One of the interviewees [12] pointed to the fact that the idea of the minister who introduced this law (Edelgard Buhlman from SPD) was, so to say, to limit the sufferings of academics having a non-tenured position, as the latter believed that having a temporary position for the whole life was a real curse for an academic. But, as she noted, the problem is that before you could choose, you could say: “I only have a non-tenured position, but I’d rather prefer being a scientist, than being a teacher at school or a taxi-driver, or what else”. But now the system forces you to leave it after these 12 years.

Another respondent [1] expressing her attitude to this innovation reported the following story: she had an acquaintance, who had started her academic work before the introduction of this law and who was never going to write a Habilitation, who had to leave the academe at the age of 45. She added that in case you were unable to finish your Habilitation and become a professor by the end of 12 years, you would be thrown out (“вышвырнут”) of the university. Many other respondents also mentioned that the situation faced by those who come to the end of the 12-years period in the German academe having only an untenured position is very unpleasant (respondents [3], [4], [11]).

Another career risk has to do with gender-related issues in the German academe. One of the experts [9] (male) expressed an opinion, which prompted the author of the present work to write a separate chapter on the problem of women in academe. He stated that though many advertisements for a professorial position contained the phrase

“women preferred”, in reality they were never preferred. This situation of women, according to this interviewee, is partly explained by the fact that female academics do not have networks; there are not many female professors who could provide support and mentoring relationship for other female scientists.

Female respondents [1], [12] also touched upon some of the problems with which females are confronted in their academic career aspirations. One of the prerequisites of an academic career in Germany is absence of career discontinuity, which is often unavoidable for a female having a family (especially, when she is mother). Thus, the question of when to establish a family has not lost its importance for female academics. Respondent [12] noted that now the position of female academics was really getting better. Partly this is due to the fact that people pay more attention to equal opportunities issues; partly this has to do with governmental measures that oblige universities to provide better opportunities for female academics. Nevertheless, the problem of combining career and family remains as urgent as it used to be. According to the statistical data provided by Bielefeld University, the number of female professors at this university amounts to 47, out of the total number of 210 academics occupying a professorial position.

Apparently, the introduction of the law of 12 years in academe has significantly increased the risk of academic career disruption in the German academe and introduced changes in career strategies, while limiting alternatives. Before scientists could make a choice in favor of staying at the university under the position of a professor (e.g. taking one temporary position after another, or having a tenured position below the professorial level), whereas nowadays they have only two alternatives: to become a professor or leave the university. As has been shown above, this law made the position of female academics particularly vulnerable.

Below we will investigate in more detail the career strategies existing in the contemporary German academe and the risks which are associated with them.

2.1. Career strategies and risks involved

In Chapter II we mentioned that the contemporary German academic career structure is characterized by two paths to professorship: Habilitation and a successfully finished junior professorship. Each of these paths has its advantages as well as disadvantages.

The position of a *Privatdozent*

A *Privatdozent* is a person who has defended Habilitation and has all the qualifications to apply for full professorship. However at the same time, this title signifies that so far the scientist has no permanent position, and it is still questionable whether he/she will finally become a professor. From the interviews with the respondents in our sample, we can make a conclusion that a *Privatdozent* in Germany is simultaneously faced with 2 challenges making his/her further employment difficult: first, with the fact that many positions are not open for a person with a Habilitation, and second, with the existing law of a 12-years period in academe. A scientist who has got the title of *Privatdozent* is under the obligation to do teaching at the university in order not to lose the title, but this work is unpaid. Hence, very often *Privatdozents* are confronted with financial difficulties and have to rely on the financial support of their families³.

Some of the respondents told about several “tricks” used to overcome certain restrictions introduced by the present academic structure in Germany. These tricks can be viewed as a means of adaptation to and of the system.

Tricks: 1) After the expiry of the 12 years of work in the German academe, a scientist (under the level of a professor) who wants to stay at the university can be involved only in third party projects (not funded by the state or university) (respondents [1], [3], [11], [12]). To the organizations providing non-governmental funding belongs, for example, the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)).

³ Interviewee [12] described the position of a *Privatdozent* in German academe in the following way: “Once you have defended Habilitation, you become *Privatdozent*, which means that you have done all the work, all the qualification, but you have no steady job so far. You are still waiting for the opportunity to get a full professorship. The problem becomes even worse, because there are some positions which are no more open to you, once you have Habilitation done. For example, a normal research position won’t be given to you, because you are overqualified. Because there are stupid administrative regulations saying that a person with Habilitation should not get this job any more. So, you are really in a bad position. You are obliged to teach, but you won’t get any money for that. You give courses, lectures, but without any money. In fact you don’t have any rights as a *Privatdozent*. It is a very bad position. There are people who stick to it, who wait for years until they get a professorship, if they are lucky. But if you have a closer look at the situation, you often find that they have a family, where money is not a problem. So parents support their 45-year old son. Or maybe there is a husband or wife with a proper job, who provides financial support for the *Privatdozent* or *Privatdozentin*. But in fact, I know of many cases, when no professorship followed and people were forced to choose another career, e.g. some of them became ordinary teachers at school. But the problem is that ordinary teachers at German schools, they are officials of the state, but if you have your Habilitation done, you are too old to get the same position as the other teachers. So the payment is worse, and you have less social security benefits.”

Employment in the third party projects can help a scientist prolong the period of his/her work at the university. However, this is a rather short-term possibility.

2) Another trick described by respondent [12] is the possibility of *Beauftragung* (commission) – giving the person with *Habilitation* the position of a *Lehrkraft für besondere Aufgaben*, which is not tenured. Normally, this position is not available for a *Privatdozent*⁴.

3) The German junior professor [12] argued that the introduction of the law of the 12-years limit also influenced the decision of some German professors in regard to academic career entry of young scientists. According to her, some of professors nowadays prefer to find funding for the most talented students, rather than give them a position in the German academe. This is done to start the “clock” of 12 years as late as possible⁵.

In case a person failed to find a job after the expiry of 12 years in academe, he/she can apply for social aid (*Arbeitslosengeld* - money for the unemployed). Foreign scientists working in Germany but not having German citizenship are also entitled to welfare benefits (respondents [1], [9]). But as one of the scientists with Russian roots noted, when reflecting upon the possibility of becoming unemployed, in her opinion, foreigners were less open to risks. Being a sociologist herself, she emphasized that

⁴ When asked to tell about the positions which remain available for a *Privatdozent*, the interviewee spoke about a new position called *Lehrkraft für besondere Aufgaben* (“teacher for special tasks”). This position implies employment of highly qualified scientists who, as suggested by the respondent, have to do teaching all day long. They teach up to 18 hours per week, which is a lot for a university teacher. That means that the scientists having this position cannot make any progress in their scientific career, because they do not have any time to write any papers and do research. The interviewee said that these scientists were reduced to “teaching automatons”. She added that their work was very badly paid. However, as she noted, even those positions could be held by persons with *Habilitation* only under certain circumstances; normally, they were not open for a *Privatdozent*.

⁵ “And today, say, you have a talented student who writes a terrific master’s thesis. Normally you would want to give him a job. Maybe there is a vacancy, and you would like to give him a research position. But now, when you have this 12 year limit, you might think again: “Maybe this will risk his career opportunities, if we give him a position at the university right now, because then the clock goes on and on; the 12 years begin to count. So it might be better to get him a funding, with which he can write his PhD thesis, and try to get him into an academic position after his PhD is finished. Because, otherwise, he might not have enough years to get a tenured position”. Normally, at a German university it takes 6 years to write a PhD and 6 years for *Habilitation*. So it can easily happen that the 12 years are over, and you just handed in your *Habilitation*, and then you drop out. You are unemployed all of a sudden, and of course, it may take some time to get full professorship. Then there is this gap. So nowadays you think: “Oh, here you should be careful. It is a clever person. He can spend his 12 years. Better not to give him an academic position too early”. Maybe you give a position to a less talented student, because you think that this student won’t make an academic career. So don’t you worry about the 12 years”.

though some theories suggested that migrants were more open to risks, she had an opposite impression: “Without a German citizenship... you have a feeling... You are less inclined to take risk. [...] Being unemployed is also rotten for Germans. But somehow it is easier for them. They will manage somehow”⁶. She expressed the idea that foreigners tended to clutch more at security, which was detrimental for their career. To illustrate her point she gave an example: foreign scientists might agree to perform some administrative tasks to earn more money, and thus be more confident in the future. A scheme to earn less, but to be able to devote more time to science could be very risky. The interviewee concluded by stating that Germans were able to rely more heavily on the support of their families and the state.

The position of a *Junior Professor*

One of the respondents [12] who participated in our research occupied the position of a junior professor. She shared her experience of having this position and confided some of the problems a scientist of this position is faced with. The first thing that should be emphasized is that so far the full potential of junior professorship has not been fully realized: the primary goal of junior professorship is to introduce an alternative path to the position of a full professor (the traditional path being a Habilitation) and to lower the age when scientists can engage in independent research. However, many junior professors still prefer to work simultaneously on their Habilitation, because they are often skeptical about their career opportunities without this second dissertation⁷. In this case junior professorship by no means lowers the work load of a scientist, but leads to the contrary effect: an academic has to combine the responsibilities of a junior professor with the work on his/her Habilitation. As can be seen from the experience of respondent [12], though the position of a junior professor is extremely alluring, as it offers a young scientist almost all the privileges of a full professor, at the same time it is extremely challenging and requires full reliance exclusively upon yourself⁸.

⁶ «Если у тебя нет немецкого гражданства... У тебя такое ощущение... У тебя меньше готовности идти на риск. [...] Быть безработным – это скверно и для немцев. Ну, как-то им проще. Они как-то потянут».

⁷ Some German states opposed the introduction of junior professorships, e.g. Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg; in the universities of many other states, where junior professorship is offered as an option, Habilitation is still given preference to.

⁸ “[...] officially you have all the rights and duties of a real professor. But often you find out that among other professors you have difficulty in raising your voice, because they say: “She is only a junior professor”. So officially you have equal rights and duties, but in fact your work doesn’t count that much among certain members of the fellow community. In theory it counts as

Conclusions of Chapter III

The empirical research seems to suggest that the most important factors determining career chances in the German academe are research activity, publications,

much as their works, but there are people, especially older ones, who won't that easily accept that you have the same rights. [...] The traditional way to professorship used to be, and may still be, to write Habilitation. You do it normally in the position of an assistant professor, and you are an assistant professor to a full professor. I used to have such a position as well, so I know what I am talking about. If you are lucky, your professor looks after you. He protects you, challenges you, promotes you, tells you: "Go to this country and write this paper, etc". [...] If you are to take over some tasks the department wants to give to you, your professor can say: "She won't take over any more tasks. She has enough work to do". So it is a feudal relationship, like in the Middle Ages. He/she is kind of you patron, patronizing you, but also protecting you. This can turn out to be really bad, and there are, of course, examples when professors exploit their assistant professors. But in a good case, it is fine, because you really get this protection. So it depends on individual relations. [...] One main reason for establishing this junior professorship was the idea of making young scientists independent of their professors, getting them out of this dependency: an independent junior professor who is not obliged to work for somebody else, for the full professor. So that is the idea. An independent person who can do research as he/she pleases. But the downside is you don't have this protection. Besides your contract is limited to 3 years, because junior professorship means you get 3 years, then you have ranking; and if you are lucky you get 3 more years. So of course, you will be eager to please. If the faculty or the department says: "We need a colleague who goes into this or that committee". You have problems with saying "no". You say: "OK. I will do it. I will go into this or that committee. I will take over these tasks. No problems". Because you want to survive this ranking after 3 years, you want to get prolongation of your contract. And there is nobody to say: "She/he won't do it. It is enough". It is your responsibility. And it is not easy to say "no" under these circumstances. And then the next thing is when an assistant professor has to undergo this Habilitation process, usually he/she can rely on his/her boss, the full professor. That the full professor will support this Habilitation process: he/she will talk to the colleagues and say: "Look, my candidate is about to hand in his/her Habilitation. Please do support this Habilitation", and so on. So you are also protected in such a situation. And junior professor does not have anything like that, when it comes to this evaluation after 3 years. Now the question is who is checking the efforts you have made during your first 3 years. Your colleagues will do. So the situation is as follows: you work at a department, as a junior professor you are supposed to have the same duties and rights as all the other professors, but all the other professors, as you well know, will check your efforts after the 3 years. Is this really an equal position? You see what I mean? You have a very, very weak position at your department, because you know they will check me, they will rate me. And there will be nobody who stands behind me and backs me up. So that is the problem. And there is another problem, if you have finished your Habilitation, you get this title of Privatdozent, you can write 'Dr. ... habil.'. The public can see that is the qualification you have reached. What happens if 6 years of your junior professorship are over, you have not written Habilitation, but you are, so to say, an approved junior professor, because you have undergone this qualification process, you have survived the ranking procedure, and this ranking procedure is supposed to be an equivalent to Habilitation, because your colleagues checked your efforts and so on. But you drop out, and what can you write on your cards, if you haven't got full professorship? Nothing. There is nothing like Dr. approved junior professor. The public won't see that you have got a specific qualification. There is a discussion going on in the meantime about how this problem should be dealt with. E.g., some universities say: "OK. A junior professor will get the title of APM professor", *ausserplanmäßiger professor*, an unordinary professor. But then again everybody knows: "Auserplanmäßiger professor, OK. You did not make it. Come on". It is an official sign: "I am not tenured. I don't have a job. Please help me!"

citation index, reputational standing in scientific community, development of mentoring relationships and extensive networks, good timing and continuity of an academic career. The major risk is academic career disruption, which is associated with the law of the 12 years. This law makes the position of an academic in Germany less secure, which often leads to lowered productivity due to additional pressures and propels the process of outflow of German scientists (“brain drain”, e.g. to the USA). Moreover, this law is often seen as family- and women-unfriendly, because it does not allow discontinuity in the career, which is associated with family responsibilities. This makes the situation of female academics especially difficult. Referring to the results of our research, we could say that though much has been done to improve the career chances of female academics in Germany (e.g. Gleichstellungsgesetz – the law of equal opportunities for males and females), challenges caused by the necessity to combine career and family responsibilities still remain a great barrier to academic career advancement of females, who are sometimes induced to sacrifice their private life and to deprive themselves of the chance to create a family in the name of the academic career. Both paths to professorship existent in the contemporary German academic career structure, Habilitation and junior professorship, have their advantages and disadvantages for scientists choosing them as career strategies.

Chapter IV. Russian scientists in the German academe

This part is devoted to the investigation of the background of the problem under study. It explores the reasons which cause Russian scientists to go to Germany, including career and professional prospects; the base provided by the German academe which enables foreign scientists to come; difficulties of different nature associated with coming to work in the German academe for a limited period (e.g. guest scientists) or with immigration to Germany, etc. Thus, this part is devoted primarily to the position of foreign scientists, Russian in particular, in Germany.

1. Reasons inducing Russian scientists to go abroad

All the Russian academics (with the exception of the two guest scientists, who periodically come to Germany to work for 1-2 months in research projects, and a PhD student) left Russia in the 1990-s, a dramatic period in the history of the country, and opted for a career abroad. All of them had a relatively high level of job satisfaction and none regretted this choice. Among the major reasons which induced them to take this

decision they mentioned inadequate research funding in Russia leading to a precarious financial and reputational standing of scientists, who have to “survive” («ВЫЖИВАТЬ») (respondents [1], [2], [4]) on their salary. This corresponds to the findings of previous research (MacWilliams, (2004); Dezhina (2005)).

One respondent commenting on the situation in Russian science added that these financial problems often result in the fact that Russian scientists do not pursue specific research interests and are ready to work on any topic abroad, which has negative effects on the quality of research. Often scientific interests of Russian academics are not realized in research projects and publications due to absence of a research fund. Moreover, in Russia in contrast to Germany scientists are disadvantaged in terms of time: they have to teach much, which leaves them little time for research (respondent [1]).

Another factor which plays a role is higher levels of salary and prestige offered in the German academe. Respondent [5] pointed to the fact that scientists in Germany enjoy higher prestige (they are considered to be “the elite of the society”). As several respondents noted, in Russia their professional achievements did not engender in others such a great respect as in Germany. To a greater extent, this is connected with the financial situation of Russian scientists (e.g., post-graduate students’ scholarship does not even provide means of subsistence. So, one has to combine studies and employment) (respondents [4], [6]).

Respondent [2] expressed the opinion that foreign academic markets, in contrast to the Russian one, provide a great number of opportunities and an active scientific life. This respondent called the state of science in Russia as “non-existence” («НЕБЫТИЕ»), “silence” («ТИШИНА») and stagnation.

Guest scientists [6], [7] emphasized the fact that for them participation in research projects conducted in Germany is a good chance to acquire experience, new knowledge and skills. Both of them completed their studies not long ago; one was planning to become a PhD student in Russia. So, these are very young scientists, who so far did not become established academics. At the present moment they are at the very start of their professional career. For them the participation in international collaboration research projects is a means of professional development and of securing reputational standing in scientific community, thus, advancing their career. Moreover, international projects helped these scientists to multiply their contacts and establish new networks. One of

them [6] added that involvement in these research projects provided the opportunity to demonstrate his talents and possibly be noticed by some influential people. Both mentioned that Bielefeld University provided very favorable working conditions (private office, valuable resources of libraries, free access to Internet scientific magazines – university subscription, effective and efficient solution of emerging technical problems, etc), which facilitated their labor and made it more pleasant.

From the perspective of one of the experts [9], Russian scientists come to Germany not to make an academic career there, but rather to complete post-graduate studies. Some hope to enlarge their scientific specialization, say in social science (Bielefeld University is famous for its studies in sociology and history). Another possible explanation is that scientists come to Germany with the idea to develop professionally and to expand their networks. This might grow into the beginning of the international scientific career. The new contacts might prove helpful in providing new job opportunities, for example, through invitations to new research projects – some projects might be carried out in other countries, etc.

2. Financial support provided for foreign scientists in Germany

During the interviews we identified three groups of grants and scholarships, obtained by some of the respondents, provided to support studies and scientific research of foreign scientists in Germany:

DAAD grants: The DAAD awards a large number of grants for the purpose of study and research abroad. Usually these grants are awarded to students from the 4-th semester upwards. The DAAD grant is provided for one academic year, and it covers travel and course fees. Two of the respondents came to Germany having got the DAAD grant [1], [4].

The Alexander von Humboldt Foundation promotes the international exchange of young academics from all disciplines. Each year it awards up to 600 research scholarships to foreign academics up to the age of 40 who have obtained the doctorates. The grant is provided for one year, and it also covers German language courses. 2 respondents got this grant [2], [3].

Scholarships for participation in research projects: These scholarships, covering travel and all local costs, were provided by the research projects carried out in Bielefeld University. Both guest scientists [6], [7] were awarded this scholarship.

One should also mention a number of political foundations providing funding, and thus, supporting scientific aspirations of foreigners in the German academe: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Friedrich-Naumann-Stiftung, Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung, etc.

3. Path to the German academe

From the interviews it becomes clear that Russians have different paths to the German academe: some came to Germany having completed graduate studies in Russia and having received some grant (e.g. the DAAD or Alexander-von-Humboldt grants), and began their academic career with writing a PhD dissertation in Germany; one person came after several years of scientific work in other foreign countries (the USA and France) and after being awarded the Alexander-von-Humboldt grant; another arrived in Germany as a child together with her parents, one of whom had come to this country to work in academe – in this case the person had grown in German society, attended a German gymnasium, learnt German and adopted a new culture. This individual is a special case, because for her the transition from a gymnasium to a university was smooth and proceeded in the same way as for native Germans. By the time she found herself at a German university she perceived herself and was viewed by others as a German. Guest scientists, who come to Germany for a limited period, found their way there through contacts existent between German and Russian universities and the networks of German and Russian professors who happened to work in one project. Of course, there are roads which were not presented in our sample. The path to a German university is important because it often has a significant impact on a scientist's career chances in the German academe.

4. Potential challenges and difficulties Russian scientists might face in Germany

Bureaucratic difficulties: All the respondents deny the existence of any bureaucratic problems; are unanimous in the idea that there are more problems with the bureaucratic apparatus in Russia than in Germany. Another possible challenge

belonging to the formal side is recognition of Russian diplomas. The diplomas of the Moscow State University and the St. Petersburg State University are accepted in Germany [9]. In regard to the acceptance of diplomas of other Russian universities further inquiry is needed. Variations are also found across fields. As one of the respondents [7] noted, diplomas in medicine are not accepted, so physicians have to receive also a German diploma, whereas for mathematicians (do not have to have a German diploma) it is easier, because there is a single mathematical language.

Language barriers: As empirical evidence demonstrates, it is possible to come to Germany even if one has only a good command of English, but does not speak German. One can write a PhD in English [1], [4]. But in order to get an access to the PhD defence one has either to pass an exam in German or be a member of the Graduate school and attend German classes within the framework of this Graduate school. If a person has the DAAD grant, he/she does not pay for language courses [4]. Two of the respondents pointed out that in their case attendance of the language courses was just a matter of observed formality to get an access to the PhD defence (the level of language courses was not high enough for them).

Both guest scientists [6], [7] said that they never experienced any trouble because of the lack of the German language knowledge. The working language of the projects they were taking part in was English. In day-to-day situations, outside professional sphere, they could also manage well speaking only English.

Though all the respondents considered it to be possible for a scientist coming to Germany in pursuit of academic career not to know the German language (e.g. teaching in English by native speakers is welcomed), they still believed that some basic knowledge of the language was most helpful for the adaptation period, and saw its later studying as a must. A German junior professor [12] believed that if a scientist was not a native English speaker, it would be more desirable if he/she could teach in German than in English.

All, with the exception of the guest scientists who at that moment were not thinking of academic career in Germany, emphasized the role the German language plays in the process of socialization. One interviewee [2] pointed out that the fact that his German was not so good prevented him from participation in discussions, local intrigues and scandals. But in general, he rejected the existence of great difficulties, because all the staff knew more than one language.

When commenting upon the role of the language, [4] said that knowledge of the German language meant a lot in Germany. People speaking only English found it hard to adapt. She believed that German was indispensable for integration into the system, for understanding this system, for having the opportunity to acquire new knowledge within the university. Another interviewee [5] considered that lack of knowledge of the German language markedly limited the field of professional activity. She explained that a scientist could be invited to a particular position which allowed teaching in English. However, if the academic planned to advance up the career ladder, that would be a very complicated task, because a professorial position in Germany is not confined to mere teaching but also includes conducting research and making publications, and various public activities and administrative responsibilities, such as participating in the faculty meetings, being a member of different committees, communicating with colleagues and the administration, taking decisions, etc. All this, according to this respondent, is unimaginable without German.

This opinion is close to the one expressed by another respondent [3], who was convinced that German was very important: for publishing, participating in conferences, making reports and presenting the findings of research, for being conspicuous and for attracting attention to your person. He added that his German was fluent, but still he was not a native speaker. To illustrate the significance of the language, he suggested taking himself and his German colleague as an example: a native German can fully concentrate on the contents, whereas he had to devote attention to the form, had to think how his ideas could be best formulated. He realized that the substance was of paramount importance. Nevertheless, he believed that the skill to convey this substance, eloquence, also played a big role. Thus, he concluded that in this sense he was handicapped.

The empirical evidence of the present research enables us to speak about the role of the German language in defining academic career chances in Germany. Those of the respondents with Russian roots who have been working in the German academe for a long period, which means that they had time to get acquainted with the system, emphasized that German was absolutely indispensable for scientists pursuing an academic career in Germany. This is especially relevant for Russians, not native English speakers, because native English speakers are welcome to teach in English. Other foreigners are asked to teach in German. The German language is also important for

making publications and presentation, for being able to take part in various discussions. Apart from this, one should lay stress upon the fact that German is a key element in socialization process, which influences the establishment and developments of relations with students, supervisors, colleagues, and the administration. However, we also discovered that those scientists who come to Germany to participate in international projects will encounter no big difficulties if they speak only English. In most cases English, not German, is the working language in the projects of this kind. In everyday communication English is also widely spread in Germany.

Cultural barriers: All the respondents rejected the existence of any cultural difficulties emanating from belonging to different nationalities. Neither of them reported any occasions when they felt embarrassment caused by cultural barriers. The head of the International Office renounced even the concept of “cultural barriers”. Nevertheless, all the respondents mentioned some discomfort in the first months of their stay in Germany generated by a new environment. This was only natural, as one of the respondents [6] put it, as any person needs some time to adapt to a new setting. One of the cultural differences, noted by two of the interviewees [1], [4] was a smaller power distance and less hierarchical structures in the relations between the chief and his/her subordinates, a professor and his/her students (stress is laid on collegiality, communication of equal partners (colleagues)).

Discrimination and prejudiced attitude: None of the respondents recognizes the existence of discrimination against Russian scientists at German universities. Some (respondents [1], [5], [6]) even mentioned that there were positive prejudgments for Russian scientists. These concerned experts in technical spheres: mathematicians, geneticists, physicists, etc. These interviewees thought that there was a general belief abroad that education in exact sciences was superior in Russia.

When exploring this issue, we should also examine the relations of Russian scientists with colleagues, as attitudes in the collective have a big influence on how comfortable and secure a person feels in a new country. Respondent [2] was absolutely positive that at Bielefeld University, as in other universities of Germany, there was no prejudices against nationality. This opinion was shared by all other respondents, some of whom mentioned that for scientific communities nationality played no role (respondent [5]). Respondent [1] told about several situations when her German colleagues rendered her assistance on their own initiative (she did not even asked for help): lent money and

helped to move to another accommodation. Another interviewee [4] also mentioned that she knew she could rely on her German friends in face of difficulties.

Though, all the interviewees were unanimous about absence of prejudices against nationality, one of them [2] added that some negative attitude to Russian scientists is not caused by national characteristics, but by the state of education and science in present-day Russia. Dwelling upon this issue, he added that many Germans were aware of the situation in modern Russia; many spoke Russian, read different newspapers and knew about corruption, about what was going on in the system of education (“fake education”).

Difficulties of integration: The issue of integration is closely connected with the questions of language and culture (the role of the German language in the process of socialization). In general the respondents mentioned no big problems of integration. Results of the interviews suggest that adaptability is influenced by such factors as the duration of staying in the new country and general experience of living abroad. Psychological factors also play a big role here, because the adaptation period and its course depend to a great extent on individual features: some are more flexible and have a higher adaptability, whereas others might be unable to ever get rid of the feeling of being out of place. Respondent [1] noted that among the characteristics of North Rhine-Westphalia was the difficulty in finding human contact, which made integration more complicated. She held that more mature people were confronted with greater adaptation difficulties than, say, students. Thus, in her opinion, the age factor played a role: for young people it is easier to adapt to a new environment than for older age groups. Some respondents ([1], [2]) also emphasized the reciprocal nature of integration: to become integrated one has to wish it.

Relations with supervisors: As it has been noted in the theoretical part of this work, supervisors might not devote much time to their students writing a PhD dissertation. This is supported by the experience of two of the respondents who wrote their dissertations in Germany.

Respondent [1] told that she was confronted by indifference and lack of interest in her PhD dissertation on the part of both formal supervisors. She did not bear the grudge, and believed that there was no discrimination involved. In her opinion, this situation could be explained not by the fact that she was a foreigner, but by lack of time all professors were faced with. From her perspective, this state of affairs is not infrequent: many Germans had the problem of hardly ever being able to find their supervisors and

talk to them. She considered this to be a structural problem: the more qualified and experienced the scientist was, the less time he/she had for passing on his/her knowledge.

Another respondent [4] emphasized the importance of the topic of a PhD dissertation. She mentioned that typically students enter post-graduate studies following the same pattern: a student has written a thesis under the supervision of a professor, later the professor suggests his student further developing the topic and writing a PhD dissertation under his supervision. Another pattern is when the chair is working on a particular subject and the professor has some project, some topical problem to investigate. In this case a PhD dissertation would serve the aims of either the research project of the chair, or the concrete project of the professor. Thus, a student receives the topic from the professor. However, in her case she studied in Russia and had her own topic. Her task was to find a professor with similar interests who would agree to supervise her PhD thesis. As she noted, it is impossible to find a professor who has absolutely the same interests as you. She succeeded in securing a formal mentor. But, according to her, that person was not so deep in the topic to guide her. She said that his supervision was more in terms of support on the organizational level, e.g. to put a signature of the supervisor, rather than scientific guidance. She expected that the supervisor would direct her, make critical remarks, give advice, etc, but in her case she got no feedback. She was left to herself and worked independently. She laid emphasis on the fact that she believed that this situation was caused not by her being a foreigner – no discrimination was felt. But, as she said, if she had studied in Germany, she could also have had the option of automatic transition to a PhD dissertation, to a topic that would be really interesting for the professor. Due to the fact that she came from a different structure, with a very different topic, she was confronted with such difficulties. But, according to her, these difficulties would be also experienced by Germans. On the one hand, her choice of the topic was explained by her personal interest, but, on the other hand, she had no alternatives, because at that moment she did not know what problems were topical in Germany. She confessed that if she had been aware of the importance of choosing a topic which could be interesting for the professor, she might have made a different choice.

We believe that the problems connected with the supervision of PhD dissertations, which were mentioned above, are as urgent for native Germans as for foreign students.

Most probably, this has nothing to do with discrimination, but rather this situation should be viewed as a structural problem (see the explanation of respondent [1]). However, the experience of interviewee [4] demonstrates the importance of the dissertation topic for future development of relations of a student with his/her supervisor. Apparently, foreigners face greater challenges in this connection, because they come from a different academic structure and a different scientific culture, so, they run a higher risk of choosing a topic which will be of minor interest either to the supervisor or to the whole academic community of this country⁹.

5. Resettlement and integration “cushions”

As one of the respondents [2] mentioned, in Germany foreign scientists found themselves in “hothouse conditions” («тепличные условия»).

Guest scientists [6], [7], who had come to Germany to take part in a research project, did not have trouble with bureaucratic procedures, e.g. the university obtained a visa for them. All the questions concerning their search for accommodation were solved by the administration of the project in Bielefeld University.

As stated earlier, post-graduate students are entitled to apply for DAAD grants which cover all the costs; young academics who have obtained doctorates can apply for Alexander-von-Humboldt grants. Within the framework of Alexander-von-Humboldt grants German language courses are provided not only for the scientist who received it, but also for his/her spouse. This provision partly solves the problem which is of paramount importance for married scientists – the integration of the scientist’s family into the German society. As one of the respondents [7] rightly remarked, once the family of a scientist feels out of place abroad, the scientist is unable to fully devote himself/herself to science.

Special attention is paid to the children of the foreign scientist who has taken a decision to continue his/her academic career in Germany. One of the respondents [5], whose father came to Germany in 1995, told that she was given the opportunity to choose a gymnasium she wanted to study in. She mentioned that usually, when Russians come to Germany, their children are sent to the Hauptschule (the lowest level school). After that these children have a great difficulty in getting access to a

⁹ This is especially relevant for scientists working in social sciences, where scientific interests might differ dramatically across scientific communities of different countries.

gymnasium, which has a very significant negative effect on their further educational and professional chances. In this regard scientists and their children are in a privileged position.

Every German university has special structures providing help and support for foreign scientists working at this university (Auslandsamt - International Office). This Office helps to solve accommodation and visa questions, provides information about public transport, addresses the issue of the scientist's spouse integration of, etc. Apart from this, German universities also have a Welcome Centre which periodically organizes parties for foreign scientists. These structures are also aimed at creation of favorable conditions and welcoming atmosphere for foreign academics, which serves the purposes of greater socialization and integration in German society in general, and the academic community in particular. All the respondents, to a greater (respondents [1], [2], [4]) or lesser extent (with the exception of the guest scientists), were familiar with these organizations, though none of them had ever asked for their support. They explained this by the absence of need to do so; some said that they preferred to resort to their German friends' help (respondents [1], [4]).

6. Exodus or circulation?

Above we were speaking about the implications of "brain drain" for the country of origin. However, as it was already noted in previous works (Gaillard & Gaillard, 1997), pendular migration of scientists might also be beneficial for their native countries (the return and diaspora options), as it might contribute to enhanced prestige of the countries of origin, improvement of scientific and academic standards, creation of modernized research and academic institutes, adoption of the most advanced technologies of the world leaders – in one word, it contributes to achieving a higher level of development through borrowing know-how from the most prominent countries, who are at the cutting-edge of technology and innovation.

Those academics who return to their home country after completing post-graduate studies or some research projects abroad, could contribute much to the stimulation of science and research in this country. They come back being more mature and experienced scientists, who had the chance to be introduced to the latest foreign achievements and developments in their field of specialization, and the state-of-the-art

technological inventions. Thus, returning home, they got the opportunity to apply and share their new skills and experience, and to work for the glory of their motherland.

Evidence seems to suggest that in the case of the Russian scientists who took part in the present research, we should speak about exodus rather than circulation. All the respondents in the sample, except guest scientists, said that they were not planning to return to Russia. One of the guest scientists [6], when asked about what country he wanted to work in, replied that for him the identity of a scientist was more important than the identity of a Russian. So, he did not care much whether he would work in Russia or abroad. The most important thing for him was to most fully develop his potential. This position is very similar to the one taken by another respondent [4], who laid emphasis on the fact that for her the primary goal was not to stay abroad, but to maximally enrich her experience.

However, one of the respondents in the sample, the second guest scientist [7], was going to continue his career in Russia. He said that he had considered the possibility of staying in Germany, but had abandoned this idea. In the explanation of his decision he noted that he believed this would be hard for him, because by spirit he was closer to Russia; all his relatives and friends were there. He also pointed to such barriers as differences in mentalities, lack of knowledge of the German language. He realized that in Germany he could have a higher salary, but he still preferred to stay in his native country. Besides, he expressed the opinion that a person could become a scientist anywhere: what country one would work in did not make any difference. The majority of the respondents mentioned that they wanted to preserve contacts with their native country (respondents [1], [4], [5]). A notable exception is the interviewee [2], who claimed to have “very deep cultural barriers towards Russia”.

In regard to the predominant attitude among the respondents towards the present-day Russia, we can presume that the majority does not feel hatred or disdain (in case of respondent [2] one can read bitterness), rather pity and compassion.

When expressing their thoughts about the situation of their colleagues in Russia, most of them mentioned, sometimes in passing, that scientists there were deprived of the opportunity to devote all their time and energy to science and research, because they have to constantly think of how to make both ends meet (respondents [1], [2], [4], [5], [6]). Moreover, the great teaching load in the Russian academe is seen by some as

a great obstacle on the way to professional development both as a scientist and researcher (respondent [1]).

The respondent who was having her post-graduate studies in Germany [4] in the answer to the question in what country she wanted to stay replied that she would prefer to stay in Germany. In explaining her choice she recalled the time when she was a student in Russia: she had to combine evening studies with employment. She said: “I know what it means to combine two different activities. I know how difficult it is. And I know that I will be unable to repeat this feat”¹⁰

Another factor, identified by another interviewee [2], prompting Russian scientists to stay abroad is that a person who has lived for some time in a foreign country will always feel a longing to travel, because he/she grows accustomed to “a comfortable role of a stranger”, who does not have some of the obligations of the indigenous population (e.g. going to church, etc), because he/she is not privy to this new system. Being not privy to the background of the national mythology of this foreign country, according to this respondent, gives a person freedom; he/she gets used to it, and this does not let him return home. In case this person, nevertheless, comes back, he/she cannot communicate with his/her friends as before; they will never have the same relations they used to have. This is explained by the fact that this person knows another reality, whereas his/her friends, who have never lived abroad, will be unable to understand him/her.

This idea is supported by the opinion of another respondent [4] who claims that international experience might be harmful for one’s career in Russia. This interviewee believed that if a person has lived abroad for several years, it would be difficult for him/her to return home. Coming back, he/she would have to live through the adaptation process, already in his/her native country. Moreover, as it seems, it does not make much sense to go to Germany for post-graduate studies if one intends to come back to Russia and work there, because, according to the expert [9], a German PhD diploma is not recognized in Russia, and vice versa.

Many scientists of Russian origin (respondents [1], [2], [5]) expressed their wish to get German citizenship. One respondent had [3] already obtained one. Some of them

¹⁰ «Я знаю, какво это совмещать две разные сферы деятельности. Знаю, насколько это тяжело. И знаю, что я такие подвиги уже повторить не смогу».

had lived in Germany for a long time, and, as they said, liked it. In explaining their decision to get German citizenship, they stressed that they wanted to become full members of German society. Another reason mentioned in this connection was that a Russian citizen who plans to go abroad has to overcome a great number of bureaucratic difficulties (obtain visas, etc) (respondents [2], [6]). A scientist who takes an active part in various international conferences, workshops, etc. travels much. In this case being a Russian citizen might turn out to be a significant barrier.

7. Career prospects of Russians in the German academe; the major barriers to career advancement

As follows from the answers of the Russian respondents in our sample, the majority of them plan to continue their academic career in Germany. This means that they will have to compete on a par with their German colleagues. The question that rises in this regard is whether Russians and native Germans have equal chances in this kind of competition. To answer this question let us first address the responses of the respondents who were asked to evaluate academic career chances of Russians in Germany. There is some variation, even some contradiction, in the answers given.

Respondent [5]: “The chances are not bad. E.g. a person having higher education comes to Germany to work at school. Here it is a relatively highly-paid profession. As far as I know, Germans are looking for foreigners with higher education to teach at school. They also invite scientists, especially to state-funded projects. Russians are welcome, especially mathematicians”¹¹

Respondent [1]: “If I were a German, I think it would be easier... I would have a chance to achieve a professorial position. I think, as it is, I have even slimmer chances. But this is rather a structural problem. And, of course, it is not because I were German, but because I would have a higher level of socialization in this scientific community, it would be easier... From the very beginning I would have spent less time on my PhD dissertation. It would have been easier to understand what a structured text is, how to

¹¹ «Шансы неплохие. Например, в Германию приезжает человек с высшим образованием, чтобы работать здесь в школе. Здесь это довольно высокооплачиваемая профессия. Насколько мне известно, немцы сейчас ищут иностранцев с образованием, чтобы они преподавали в школе. Они приглашают также ученых, особенно в проекты, финансируемые государством. Охотно приглашают русских, особенно математиков».

write it, how to make publications, etc. I lacked all this. But this is not because ... The academic environment in Germany is rather open for foreigners”¹²

[3]: “Even for a native German, the way from a student to a professor is very long and thorny, to say nothing of foreigners. It is not enough just to be No. 1 in your sphere. It is necessary to understand the structure and be able to become integrated into it. The biggest chances Russian scientists have in the case when they come here as early as possible, e.g. right after graduating from the university or completing post-graduate studies. Even if you are a very good scientist and have achieved much in your motherland, here you are known to nobody (informal criteria play a big role), so your chances to obtain professorship are equal to zero. The age factor also plays a large role. One can become a professor already at the age of 35, but these are geniuses. The norm is 40. If you are over 45, your chances diminish considerably. Over 50 – there are no chances at all. [...] To be successful here, you should be head and shoulders above Germans. Germans are practical people: they will choose those who bring more benefit. But if my German counterpart and I have equal qualifications, I will not cherish illusions. It is clear they will prefer him”¹³

When asked to evaluate career chances of foreigners, in particular Russians, in the German academe, a German junior professor [12] stated: “Career prospects at a German university are bad for Germans as well”.

¹² «Если бы я была немкой, я думаю мне было бы проще... У меня были бы шансы получить профессорскую должность. Думаю, так у меня их еще меньше. Но это структурная проблема скорее. И, безусловно, мне было бы проще, но это не потому, что я была бы немкой, а потому, что я была бы лучше социализирована в этой научной системе, было бы проще... Изначально меньше бы времени потребовалось на диссертацию. Проще было бы понять, что такое структурированный текст, как его писать, как публиковать и т.д. Этого мне действительно не хватало, но это не потому... Академическая среда в Германии достаточно открыта для иностранцев все-таки».

¹³ «Даже для немца путь от студента до профессора очень длинный и трудный, не говоря уже об иностранцах. Недостаточно просто быть номером один в своей сфере. Необходимо понять структуру и суметь встроиться в нее. Самые большие шансы российские ученые имеют в том случае, если они как можно раньше приезжают сюда, например сразу после университета или аспирантуры. Даже если ты очень хороший ученый и на родине уже добился многих успехов, здесь тебя никто не знает (неформальные критерии играют очень большую роль), так что шансы здесь получить профессию у тебя нулевые. Важным также является возрастной фактор. Получить профессию можно уже в 35 лет, но это вундеркинды. Норма же составляет около 40 лет. Если ты выбился за рамки 45 лет, то твои шансы резко падают. А после 50 лет – шансов уже нет. [...] Чтобы добиться здесь успеха, нужно быть на голову выше немцев. Немцы – народ практичный: от кого будет пользы больше, того и возьмут. Но если у меня и моего немецкого коллеги одинаковая квалификация, иллюзий питать не приходится. Понятно, что возьмут “своего”».

When speaking about professional and career chances in academe, it is impossible not to mention the work by M. Weber “Science as a Vocation”, in which the author accentuated the role of passion for science as a key to success. This was also mentioned by some of the respondents in our sample. Really, it is difficult to imagine science without genuine interest, commitment, and quest for knowledge. True scientists are those who are endowed with sheer love for and devotion to their work; they can be called life-long “servants” of science.

As noted above, *prima facie* these answers seem to be controversial. However, a closer look reveals that respondent [5], in contrast to the other interviewees, is speaking not of a career in the German academe. Moreover, this respondent has different point-of-departure conditions, when compared to other respondents with Russian roots: attendance of gymnasium in Germany, a much longer period of residence in this country, being perceived by others and herself as being a German. Apart from this, this interviewee is at the very start of her academic career. It might be the case that other respondents, whose answers are given above, have a deeper understanding and a more objective vision of academic career chances in Germany due to a longer period of work in the German academe, and hence, better acquaintance with the system and awareness of certain subtle aspects which are not obvious to an outside observer. It is apparent that for respondents [1] and [3] the problem of career chances in the German academe is much more acute. These are people who have neared the culmination, the decisive moment of their academic career. Their more detailed responses reflect their deeper and more serious analysis of the issue in question.

According to the statistical data provided by Bielefeld University, the number of professors having non-German citizenship is 19 (4 females) - of the total number of 210 academics occupying a professorial position. Among the scientists of Russian descent working at Bielefeld University, only 1 has the position of a professor¹⁴. What stands behind such an insignificant proportion of non-German professors at Bielefeld University?

Our findings seem to suggest that such problems as discrimination and cultural barriers emanating from belonging to different nationalities and, consequently, from having different background, do not exist, or at least do not play any noteworthy role.

¹⁴ We have absolutely no information about him or his academic career evolution.

The explanation behind it might be the very nature of scientific community which welcomes diversity: scientists tend to be more cosmopolitan. Partly this could be due to the influence of globalizational tendencies in science – internationalization of science. Hence, when analyzing career prospects of Russians in the German academe, we should discard the idea that their career chances are lowered by discrimination. If we accept the opinion that Russians face greater barriers on their way to the top of the academic career structure in Germany, we should look for other explanations.

In the previous chapters we found out that the visibility of a scientist, his/her reputational standing in the scientific community is of paramount importance for career advancement in academe, the German academe included. Obviously, foreigners are disadvantaged in this regard. First, because they spend a lot of time outside Germany and are not well-known in this country. Second, because they had fewer opportunities to establish helpful mentoring relations and professional networks, which could contribute to enhancing their visibility in the scientific circles. Thus, when a foreign scientist comes to Germany at a more mature age, he/she has to start everything from the very beginning, whereas German counterparts by that time usually have built a certain basis for future advancement of their academic career (e.g. acquired reputation of a talented student, found formal and informal mentors, established contacts with future supervisors, colleagues, etc). Moreover, one's reputational standing depends to a great degree on his/her participation in various conferences, presentation of one's works, publications, etc. In most cases, all this requires good knowledge of German – this is another challenge for Russians. Apart from this, one should mention differences in scientific cultures in Russia and Germany: e.g. there are certain differences in the requirements to publications, etc. All these factors might prove to be substantial barriers, because adaptation to a new environment, study of the German language, establishment of new contacts and attainment of a prominent reputational standing require time. As stated above, time is one of the decisive factors in one's academic career in Germany.

Conclusions of Chapter IV

The central aim of our work, as stated in the Introduction, is to discover in what way studies and scientific work in the German academe can contribute to improvement of academic career and professional prospects of Russian scientists. Thus, we made an attempt to investigate both the opportunity of an international career of a scientist, not

confining our research exclusively to the German academe, and one's career chances within it. Bearing in mind all the arguments presented in this MA thesis, we would say that the German academe has great opportunities to offer Russian scientists in terms of professional growth and beginning an international career in science and research. However, when speaking about career opportunities solely in the German academe, we should be more cautious. On the one hand, as we discovered, it is possible to find a supervisor for a PhD dissertation, to have post-graduate studies, to get the positions of a junior scientific assistant, of a guest scientist and of a scientific collaborator, which is already a lot. On the other hand, the possibility to become a Privatdozent and to obtain the position of either a junior professor or a full professor raises more questions. In theory these options are also available to Russian scientists. We even discovered that one scientist of Russian origin succeeded in achieving the position of a full professor. But the fact that we failed to get any information of this person and his career evolution makes it problematic for us to evaluate the real chances of Russians' arriving at the top of the academic career structure in Germany. Moreover, none of the respondents in our sample has so far reached any of these stages. It is possible that it is just a matter of luck that no Russian Privatdozent or a junior professor, or a full professor happened to be in our sample. But it is also probable that there are none of those at Bielefeld University, with the exception of that mysterious professor mentioned above. Whatever the explanation might be, it is undeniable that the current career structure in the German academe is characterized by a long and precarious way to a full professorship and an intense competition. The recent reforms in higher education have made the career prospects in the German academe even more vague and insecure.

Conclusion

In the Introduction we mentioned that the broader context of the problem explored in this work is 'brain drain'. Having analyzed the information in sociological literature and Internet sources on international migration of scientists, and the data obtained during the interviews, we can make a tentative conclusion about the relevance of this supposition to the case of the migration of Russian scientists to Germany. As it has been demonstrated, none of the scientists with Russian roots working/studying in Germany, with the exception of one guest scientist, announced an intention to return to Russia. Only this guest scientist declared that he was going to proceed with his academic career in Russia. It seems that for him the connection to the country of origin was stronger than the attraction of higher salaries abroad, of which he was conscious. Noteworthy, he was also the only person among the Russian respondents who believed that he could stay in Russia without compromising his chances of developing his scientific potential. All other respondents were convinced that Germany could offer by far greater opportunities for professional growth. Thus, we should speak of the exodus of Russian scientists rather than circulation.

Obviously, we cannot claim the representativeness of this sample: we have interviewed several scientists of Russian origin working/studying at Bielefeld University, while the rest of Russian scientists at this university and other universities of Germany remained uncovered by the present research. However, we presume that the individual experience of these several scientists reflects a general trend.

It should be noted that though we unite all the interviewees of Russian descent under the general heading 'brain drain', the nature of Russian scientists' migration in the 1990-s and the beginning of the 21st century has significant differences. In the 1990-s the scientific outflow from Russia was mostly represented by established, mature scientists or those young scientists who had already completed their graduate and post-graduate studies and had knowledge and experience welcomed abroad. Those scientists were fleeing from destitution and devastation of Russia in the 'roaring 90-s', and decay of science and research. Thus, the migration of many Russian scientists in the 1990-s was not a matter of free choice but rather a forced decision.

Nowadays, the number of young Russian people going abroad for higher education and post-graduate studies is increasing. This phenomenon has to do with globalizational tendencies in the sphere of education: harmonization of educational standards and

programs, e.g. Bologna process. Very often doing post-graduate studies abroad becomes the beginning of an international career. One should also mention the role of globalizational tendencies in science, which are reflected in the increasing internationalization of scientific work and intensifying integration of scientists into a common global scientific community. This is realized in the practice of having publications in foreign editions and more active participation of scientists in international projects and programs.

Evidently, Germany has much to offer those who are striving for an international scientific career. It seems that at the present moment the opportunities provided by the German academe by far surpass those available for scientists in Russia, as the country still has not fully recovered from the utter devastation of the 1990-s, though the situation is changing for the better. In the first place, Europe, including Germany, is one of the cultural and scientific centers, the home of many prominent old and new universities. Second, it provides scientists with much greater funding opportunities than Russia is able to. Apart from this, many European countries have at their disposal excellent research infrastructures, including independent research institutes. Many European research institutes and universities are eagerly inviting young scientists from other countries, because they are well-educated, often highly experienced, and introduce cultural diversity, which might contribute to elaboration of a more creative approach and stimulate a more intense exchange of ideas.

Experience abroad gives Russian scientists a unique chance to expand their horizons, to acquire new knowledge and skills, to get familiar with a new academic structure and scientific culture. It goes without saying that English is the main language of science, grants, contracts and scientific works. Study and work in Europe enables Russian scientists to train in an English-speaking environment, in case of Germany they can also learn German. This develops language skills, which is an indispensable element of an international career. Moreover, experience abroad offers a good chance to get acquainted with potential mentors and to establish useful contacts, networks.

As stated earlier, publications are the main yardstick of scientific success. In Germany, as well as in Europe in general, Russian scientists get access to prominent scientific journals enjoying worldwide excellent reputation. Publications in such journals increase the visibility of a researcher and might help to secure grants. A good mentor, whom one has the chance to find abroad, can help a young scientist to get involved in

important projects and to write high-level papers which will be published in the best scientific journals. These are key elements for a continued and thriving scientific career.

It is doubtless that all the above-presented factors might prove to be decisive in professional and career growth of a scientist. So, it appears to be natural that Russian scientists are eager to take advantage of these benefits available abroad when the opportunity presents itself. They are also attracted by a higher living standard, higher prestige and better working conditions in Germany. All these factors are favorable for scientific work, because this enables a scientist to fully devote himself/herself to his/her work. As empirical evidence demonstrates, the possibility to grow professionally, to broaden one's horizons and most fully develop one's potential has always been a strong driving force inducing Russian academics to go abroad in the pursuit of career.

Basing on the results of the present study, we presume that it is unjustified to generalize career prospects of Russian scientists in the German academe, because academic career chances are dependent on a great number of factors: individual professional background, personal qualities, the discipline, etc. We reject the idea that the mere fact of being a Russian (or being a foreigner in general) will have a negative influence on career chances in the German academe. For example, we surmise that the respondent who came to Germany as a child [5] and was in the same position as native Germans from the very entry to a German university will have roughly the same career chances as native Germans. However, as stated above, this is a special case. Perhaps it is even expedient not to include this person to the group of foreign scientists in Germany. All other Russian respondents in our sample came to Germany in mature age and were foreigners in the full sense of this word at the beginning of their academic career in Germany. It is they whose career prospects are evaluated below.

Relying on the conducted interviews, we ascertained that German universities have a well thought-out system of institutions aimed at helping foreign scientists planning to work in Germany to overcome difficulties of different kind - financial, organizational, cultural and language barriers, including the question of integration - associated with resettlement in Germany, and make this process as painless as possible.

In the process of our investigation we came to the conclusion that the German system of higher education is characterized by a very long and risky process of career making. The way from a student to a professor is very thorny even for Germans, to say

nothing of foreigners. The number of professorial positions is strictly limited, and the number of applications to a tenured position is enormous. There are some variations across disciplines: e.g. in physics the number of applicants amounts to 100. In social sciences competition is even greater. The results of our study seem to suggest that there are some positive prejudices in favor of Russian mathematicians, physicists and specialists in some other fields, we refrain from making judgments about whether these prejudices are justified or not, which give these professionals a certain advantage.

We also found confirmation of the theories maintaining that informal criteria play a big role in the German system of higher education and often have a significant impact on academic career chances. We repeat that this does not have to do with corruption and nepotism, as well as with discrimination against foreigners. Speaking about informal criteria we mean the level of socialization and integration into the system. It is obvious that there is a strong interconnection between the knowledge of the German language and the level of socialization and integration of a scientist into the German system (this has been more comprehensively analyzed in the empirical part). The establishment and preservation of networks and mentoring relationships is heavily influenced by the degree of integration into the system. Thus, we see that in this regard foreigners are in a disadvantaged position in comparison to native Germans. Formal, cognitive, and structural differences in national academic labor markets, reluctance of German academics to recognize non-German diplomas, language barriers, lack of networks and inconspicuous position in Germany due to the fact that foreign scientists spent many years outside Germany and had lower chances to establish important contacts and to secure a prominent reputational standing in the German academe, with the exception of the academics known in the whole world) – all these factors make the task of achieving a professorial position extremely difficult.

Unfortunately, the present research is lacking an interview with the only German professor of Russian origin working at Bielefeld University. This person could share his experience and contribute to our understanding of the problem in question. As it is, we resorted to all available resources to present an objective, realistic analysis of career prospects of Russian scientists in the German University.

One of the questions we had before conducting this investigation was whether Bielefeld University can be called a representative example of all other German universities in terms of career prospects for foreign scientists. Basing on the fact that its

formal structure is similar to the one found in other universities and drawing upon Internet resources and the interviews, we give an affirmative answer.

At the present moment this study does not go beyond the scope of the presentation and partial analysis of individual experiences of several Russian and German scientists working at Bielefeld University. Nevertheless, the fact that instead of basing exclusively on empirical material this work also draws upon official documents of the recent reforms in the German academe, and contemporary articles covering debates on the relevant issues and containing opinions of experts, apparently enhances its scientific value and reliability.

Still, it is undeniable that further research is needed to go beyond the level of making hypotheses and to give an answer to some of the questions the present work is unable to answer due to its limitations. One of such limitations is that at the present stage the author does not have sufficient evidence to make a tentative conclusion in regard to the question whether there is anything special about career prospects for Russian scientists in the German academe, or whether we can reach a higher level of abstraction and speak about career prospects for all foreign scientists from Central and Eastern Europe by the example of Russian scientists.

Taking into consideration the arguments presented in this paper and the academic career structure in Germany, one is inclined to believe that Germany provides Russian scientists with great avenues for professional growth. In regard to academic career development, we cannot give a straight answer. On the one hand, career opportunities under the level of a professor are considerable and possible to realize, as it has been shown by some of the Russian respondents in our sample, who at the present moment enjoy, according to them and their colleagues, relatively high salaries and prominent reputation in the scientific community. But on the other hand, one should not forget the high risk of academic career disruption characteristic for the German academe (the law of the 12-years period), which at best means the necessity to restructure one's life, and at worst – a crisis and a forced withdrawal from science. At the same time, Germany, if we stop considering it as the country where Russian scientists can hope to make an academic career, can serve as a port of entry to an international scientific career. After acquiring experience and qualification in Germany, Russian scientists can resort to chain migration to research projects in other countries which offer more realistic prospects of achieving the top of the academic structure.

Drawing upon the results of the present research, we can give the following recommendations to Russians planning to pursue an academic career in Germany: 1) go to Germany as early as possible (at least after graduate studies); 2) learn actively the German language; 3) attend some courses at the university where you plan to work on your PhD thesis to get familiar with and adapt to the environment where you will function, and to find an appropriate supervisor who will help you to formulate the topic of your PhD – in this case your supervisor will be more likely to take keen interest in your work and provide support; 3) try to secure some grant for writing a PhD dissertation instead of taking a position in the German academe (to start the clock of 12 years as late as possible); 4) be proactive, mobile and use any chance to demonstrate your talents: e.g. take part in conferences where you can be noticed by somebody important (potential mentor or employer, prominent scientist, etc); take upon yourself the responsibility of career management; be active in establishing extensive personal and professional networks; 5) be ready to working much and hard, devoting weekends to scientific work; 6) try to strike a favorable strategic balance between teaching and research; 7) be aware of special challenges awaiting female scientists; remember that discontinuity (e.g. caused by family responsibilities) might ruin your academic career; 8) be prepared to face financial difficulties of prolonged character after becoming a Privatdozent; 9) be quick and excellent in reaching academic goals; remember that time is one of the decisive factors of success in the German academe. The list of tips can be continued, but we think that the most important ones are given.

The author of the present study hopes that her findings will do a good service to those Russian scientists who are pondering over the option of going to Germany in the pursuit of either professional growth or an academic career. Some of the scientists of Russian descent have already achieved much in Germany. Only time will tell whether they will be lucky enough to become professors. One of the German respondents emphasized the role luck plays in reaching the top of the German academe. So, the final words of the author will be “Good luck to them!

Acknowledgements

The author of the present work is very grateful to all those who took part in the research for this study. Deep gratitude is expressed to Herr Prof em. Dr. Jürgen Feldhoff, Herr Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. (emer.) Ludwig Huber, Heidi Wodtke for providing statistical data, Dr. Kuznetsova for editorial help, and to Dr. Elena Shershneva for supervising the present MA thesis. The author also thanks Bielefeld University for providing funding for the research and the staff of the University for rendering support.

References

- Allison P., Stewart J. "Productivity Differences Among Scientists". *American Sociological Review*. 1974. Vol. 39. P. 596-606.
- Alpert D. "Performance and Paralysis. The Organizational Context of the American Research University". *Journal of Higher Education*. 1985. Vol. 56. No. 3. P. 241-281.
- Althausen R., Kalleberg A. "Firms, Occupations, and the Structure of Labour Markets: A Conceptual Analysis" // *Sociological Perspectives on Labour Markets / Ed. I. Berg*. New York: Academic Press, 1981. P. 119-149.
- Althausen R., Kalleberg A. "Identifying Career Lines and Internal Labour Markets Within Firms: The Study in the Interrelationship of Theory and Methods // *Social Mobility and Social Structure / Ed. R. Breiger*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990. P. 308-356.
- Arthur M. "The Boundaryless Career: A New Perspective for Organizational Inquiry". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 1994. Vol. 15. P. 295-306.
- Arthur M., Rousseau D. "The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era". New York: Oxford University Press, 1996a. P. 237-255.
- Arthur M., Rousseau D. "Introduction: The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era". New York: Oxford University Press, 1996b. P. 3-20.
- Arthur M. et al. "The New Careers: Individual Action and Economic Change". London: Sage, 1999.
- Astin H., Bayer A. "Pervasive Sex Differences in the Academic Reward System: Scholarship, Marriage, and What Else? // *Academic Reward / Eds. D. Lewis, W. Becker*. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1979. P. 211-229.
- Austin A., Gamson Z. "Academic Workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions". ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education. 1985. No. 10.
- Bagilehole B. "Survivors in a Male Preserve: A Study of British Women Academics' Experiences and Perceptions of Discrimination in a UK University". *Higher Education*. 1993. Vol. 26. No. 4. P. 431-447.
- Bain O., Cummings W. "Academe's Glass Ceiling: Societal, Professional-Organizational, and Institutional Barriers to the Career Advancement of Academic Women". *Comparative Educational Review*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000. Vol. 44. No. 4. P. 493-514.

- Baldwin G. "Women at Monash". Clayton: Monash University, 1985.
- Barker J. "Tightening the Iron Cage: Concertive Control in Self-Managing Teams". *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1993. Vol. 38. P. 408-437.
- Barrick M., Mount M. "The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-analysis". *Personnel Psychology*. 1991. Vol. 44. P. 1-25.
- Bateman T., Crant J. "The Proactive Component of Organizational Behavior". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 1993. Vol. 14. P. 103-118.
- Bayer A., Dutton J. "Career Age and Research – Professional Activities of Academic Scientists". *Journal of Higher Education*. 1977. Vol. 48. P. 259-282.
- Bayer A., Astin H. "Sex Differentials in the Academic Reward System". *Science*. 1975. P. 796-802.
- Bayer A., Folger J. "Some Correlates of a Citation Measure of Productivity in Science". *Sociology of Education*. 1966. Vol. 39. P. 381-390.
- Becker H., Hughes E. *Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life*. New York: Wiley, 1968.
- Becker H., Strauss A. "Careers, Personality and Adult Socialization". *American Journal of Sociology*. 1956. Vol. 62. No. 3. P. 253-263.
- Bem S. "The Lenses of Gender: Transforming the Debate on Sexual Inequality". New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Blackburn R. et al. "Correlates of Faculty Publications". *Sociology of Education*. 1978. Vol. 51. P. 132-141.
- Blackburn R., Chapman D., Cameron S. "'Cloning' in Academe: Mentorship and Academic Careers". *Research and Higher Education*. 1981. Vol. 15. P. 315-327.
- Blackburn R. "Faculty Career Development: Theory and Practice"// "Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity"/ Eds. S. Clark, D. Lewis. New York: Teachers College Press, 1985. P. 55-85.
- Blau P., Duncan O. "The American Occupational Structure". New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Blau et al. "The Economics of Men and Women at Work". Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1998.
- Bogat G., Redner R. "How Mentoring Affects the Professional Development of Women in Psychology". *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*. 1985. Vol. 16. P. 851-859.
- Bova B., Phillips R. "The Mentoring Relationship as an Educational Experience". Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 224 944. 1982.
- Burris V. "The Academic Caste System: Prestige Hierarchies in PhD Exchange Networks". *American Sociological Review*. 2004. Vol. 69. No. 2. P. 239-264.
- Burt R. "Contingency Value of Social Capital". *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1997. Vol. 42. P. 339-365.
- Cameron S. *Women Faculty in Academia: Sponsorship, Informal Networks, and Scholarly Success*. Dissertation Abstracts International. 1978. Vol. 39. 5971a.
- Caplow T., McGee R. "The Academic Marketplace". New York: Basic, 1958.
- Caplow T., McGee R. "The Academic Marketplace". New Brunswick, London: Transaction Publishers. 2001.

- Cass B. et al. "Why So Few?: Women Academics in Australian Universities". Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1983.
- Centra J. "Women, Men, and the Doctorate". Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974.
- Chubin D., Porter A., Breckmann M. "Career Patterns of Scientists: A Case for Complementary Data". American Sociological Review. 1981. Vol. 46. P. 488-496.
- Clark B. "Perspectives on Higher Education". Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Clark S., Corcoran M. "Professional Socialization and Faculty Career Vitality". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal. 1983.
- Clark S. "The Academic Profession and Career: Perspectives and Problems". Teaching Sociology. 1986. Vol. 14. No.1. P. 24-34.
- Cole J. "Fair Science". New York: Free Press, 1979.
- Cole J., Cole S. "Social Stratification in Science". Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Cole J., Zuckerman H. "The Structure of Scientific Careers: Are Marriage and Family Incompatible with Research Productivity?" Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting. 1983.
- Costa P., McCrae R. "Neo-PI-R and Neo-FF1 Professional Manual". Odessas, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, 1992.
- Crane D. "Scientists at Major and Minor Universities: A Study of Productivity and Recognition". American Sociological Review. 1965. Vol. 30. P. 699-714.
- Davis D., Astin H. "Reputational Standing in Academe". The Journal of Higher Education. 1987. Vol. 58. No. 3. P. 261-275.
- DeFillippi R., Arthur M. "The Boundaryless Career: A Competency-based Perspective". Journal of Organizational Behavior. 1994. Vol. 15. P. 307-324.
- Dixon-Reeves R. "Mentoring as a Precursor to Incorporation: An Assessment of the Mentoring Experience of Recently Minted Ph.D.s". Journal of Black Studies. Sage Publications, Inc., 2003. Vol. 34. No. 1. P. 12-27.
- Eby L., DeMatteo J. "When the Type of Move Matters: Examining Employee Outcomes Under Various Relocation Situations". Journal of Organizational Behavior. 2000. Vol. 21. P. 677-687.
- Eby L., Butts M., Lockwood A. "Predictors of Success in the Era of Boundaryless Career". Journal of Organizational Behavior. 2003. Vol. 24. No. 6. P. 689-708.
- Enders J. "Die Wissenschaftlichen Mitarbeiter. Ausbildung, Beschäftigung und Karriere der Nachwuchswissenschaftler und Mittelbauangehörigen an den Universitäten". Frankfurt a.M., New York: Campus. 1996.
- Enders J. "Between State Control and Academic Capitalism: A Comparative Perspective on Academic Staff in Europe"// "Academic Staff in Europe, Changing Contexts and Conditions"/ Ed. J. Enders. Westport, London: Greenwood Press, 2001a.
- Enders J. "Academic Staff in Europe, Changing Contexts and Conditions". Westport, London: Greenwood Press, 2001b.

- Enders J., de Weert E. "The International Attractiveness of the Academic Workplace in Europe". Frankfurt a.M.: Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft. 2004. Vol. 107.
- Enders J., Kaulisch M. "Vom Homo Academicus zum Homo Oeconomicus? Die Doppelte Kontextualisierung der Forschung und ihre (möglichen) Folgen für die Wissenschaft als Beruf" // "Professionelles Handeln" / Ed. M. Pfadenhauer. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. 2005. P. 207-220.
- Finkelstein M. "The American Academic Profession". Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984.
- Fox M. "Publication Productivity among Scientists: A Critical Review". Social Studies of Science. 1983. Vol.13. P. 285-305.
- Fury K. "Mentor Mania". Savvy, 1979. P. 42-47.
- Gaillard J., Gaillard M. "Introduction: The International Mobility of Brains: Exodus or Circulation?" Science, Technology & Society. London: Sage Publications, 1997. Vol. 2. No. 2. P. 195-221.
- Gaston J. "The Reward System in British and American Science". New York: John Wiley, 1978.
- Gläser J. "Macrostructures, Careers and Knowledge Production: A Neoinstitutionalist Approach". International Journal of Technology Management. 2001. Vol. 22. No. 7/8. P. 698-715.
- Goffe G., Jones R. "Career Community, and Social Architecture: An Exploration of Concepts" // Career Frontiers: New Conceptions of Working Lives / Eds. M. Peiperl, M. Arthur, R. Goffe, and T. Morris. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. P. 256-272.
- Granovetter M. "The Strength of Weak Ties". American Journal of Sociology. 1973. Vol. 78. P. 1360-1380.
- Granovetter M. "Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers". Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Hall D. & Associates. "The Career is Dead – Long Live the Career: A Relational Approach to Careers". San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 1996.
- Halsey A., Trow M. "The British Academics". Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Harper J. "Survey of Academic Staff. Part 1. Report on Women". Melbourne: University of Melbourne, 1987.
- Heckman N. et al. "Problems of Professional Couples: A Content Analysis". Journal of Marriage and the Family. 1977. Vol. 39. P. 323-330.
- Helmreich R. et al. "Making it in Academic Psychology: Demographic and Personality Correlates". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1980. Vol. 39. P. 896-908.
- Henning M., Jardim A. "The Managerial Woman". New York: Doubleday, 1977.
- Hess B. "Analyzing Gender: A Handbook for Social Science Research". Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1987.
- Higgins M., Kram K. "Reconceptualizing Mentoring at Work: A Developmental Network Perspective". Academy of Management Review. 2001. Vol. 26. P. 264-288.
- Hirsch P. "Pack Your Own Parachute". Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1987.

- Hochschulrahmengesetz (HRG) of April 12, 2007.
- Hochschulgesetz in Nordrhein-Westfalen (NRW) of January 1, 2007.
- Hughes E. "Institutional Office and the Person". *American Journal of Sociology*. 1937. Vol. 43. No. 3. P. 404-413.
- Hunt D., Michael C. "A Career Training and Development Tool". *Academy of Management Review*. 1983. Vol. 8. P. 475-485.
- Kanter R. "Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy". New York: Russell Sage. 1977.
- Kaulisch M., Enders J. "Careers in Overlapping Institutional Contexts: The Case of Academe". *Career Development International*. 2005. Vol. 10. No. 2. P. 130-144.
- Kaulisch M., Salerno C. "Comparing Academic Career Systems: The Cases of Germany, England and US". USA, Philadelphia. Paper prepared for the 30th annual ASHE conference. Presented at the International Forum, November 16th, 2005.
- Kelley J. "Causal Chain Models for the Socioeconomic Career". *American Sociological Review*. 1973. Vol. 38. P. 481-493.
- Kochan K., Trimble S. "From Mentoring to Co-Mentoring: Establishing Collaborative Relationships" // "New Visions of Mentoring". *Theory into Practice*. 2000. Vol. 39. No. 1. P. 20-28.
- Kram K. "Mentoring Processes at Work: Developing Relationships in Managerial Careers". Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Yale University, New Haven, 1980.
- Kram K. "Phases of the Mentor Relationship". *Academy of Management Journal*. 1983. Vol. 26. P. 608-625.
- Kram K. "Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life". Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1985.
- Lado A., Boyd N., and Wright P. "A Competency-based Model of Sustainable Competitive Advantage: Toward a Conceptual Integration". *Journal of Management*. 1992. Vol. 18. P. 77-91.
- Levinson D. et al. "Seasons of a Man's Life". New York: Knopf, 1978.
- Light D. "The Impact of the "Academic Revolution" on Faculty Careers". ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. 1972. No. 10.
- Light D. "Introduction: The Structure of the Academic Professions"// *Sociology of Education*. American Sociological Association. 1974. Vol. 47. No. 1. P. 2-28.
- Lin N., Dumin M. "Access to Occupations through Social Ties". *Social Networks*. 1986. Vol. 8. P. 365-385.
- Lloyd C. "Discrimination and the Division of Labour". New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.
- London M. "Toward a Theory of Career Motivation". *Academy of Management Review*. 1983. Vol. 8. P. 620-630.
- London M. "Relationships between Career Motivation, Empowerment, and Support for Career Development". *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 1993. Vol. 66. P. 55-69.
- Long J. "Productivity and Academic Position in the Scientific Career". *American Sociological Review*. 1978. Vol. 43. P. 889-908.

- Long J., McGuinnis R. "Organizational Context and Scientific Productivity". *American Sociological Review*. 1981. Vol. 46. P. 422-442.
- MacWilliams B. "Russian Science Bids to Revive Past Glory". 2004.
- Marwell G. et al. "Geographic Constraints on Women's Careers in Academia". *Science*. 1979. Vol. 205. P. 1225-1231.
- McDowell J. "Obsolescence of Knowledge and Career Publication Profiles: Some Evidence of Differences among Fields in Costs of Interrupted Careers". *American Economic Review*. 1982. Vol. 72. P. 752-768.
- Merriam S. "Mentors and Protégés: A Critical Review of the Literature". *Adult Education Quarterly*. 1983. Vol. 33. P. 161-173.
- Merton R. "Social Theory and Social Structure". New York: Free Press, 1968.
- Miller C. et al. "The Allocation of Prestigious Positions in Organizational Science: Accumulative Advantage, Sponsored Mobility, and Contest Mobility". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2005. Vol. 26. No. 5. P. 489-516.
- Miller D., Form. W. "Industry Sociology". New York: Harper Collins, 1951.
- Mills W. "The Power Elite". New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Mirvis P., Hall D. "Psychological Success and the Boundaryless Career". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 1996. Vol. 15. P. 365-380.
- Missirian A. "The Corporate Connection: Why Executive Women Need Mentors to Reach the Top". Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. 1982.
- Moen P. "Beyond the Career Mystique: "Time In", "Time Out", and "Second Acts". *Sociological Forum*. Springer, 2005. Vol. 20. No. 2. P. 189-208.
- Moore K., Salimbene A. "The Dynamics of the Mentor-Protégé Relationship in Developing Women as Academic Leaders". *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership*. 1981. Vol. 2. P. 51-64.
- Moore K. "The Role of Mentors in Developing Leaders for Academe". *Educational Record*. 1982. Vol. 63. P. 23-28.
- Mullins N. "Science: Some Sociological Perspectives". Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, Inc., 1973.
- Neave G., Rhoades G. "The Academic Estate in Western Europe"// "The Academic Profession. National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings" / Ed. B. Clark. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press. 1987.
- Noe R., Noe A., and Bachhuber J. "An Investigation of the Correlates of Career Motivation". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 1990. Vol. 37. P. 340-356.
- Norrell E., Ingoldsby B. "Surviving Academic Isolation: Strategies for Success". *Family Relations*. 1991. Vol. 40. No. 3. P. 345-347.
- O'Leary V., Mitchell J. "Women Connecting with Women: Networks and Mentors" // "Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World" / Eds. S. Lie, V. O'Leary. London: Kogan Page, 1990. P. 58-73.
- Parker H., Arthur M. "Careers, Organizing, and Community"// *Career Frontiers: New Conceptions of Working Lives* / Eds. M. Peiperl, M. Arthur, R. Goffe, T. Morris. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. P. 99-121.
- Parsons T., Platt G. "The American Academic Profession: A Pilot Study". National Science Foundation, 1968. Introduction.

- Peiperl M., Arthur M., and Anand N. "Career Creativity: Explorations in the Remaking of Work". Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Phillips L. "Mentors and Protégés: A Study of the Career Development of Women Managers and Executives in Business and Industry". Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Miami. 1977
- Powell D., Driscoll P. "Middle-class Professionals Face Unemployment". *Society*. 1973. Vol. 10. P. 18-26.
- Powell W., Brantley P. "Competitive Cooperation in Biotechnology: Learning through Networks" // *Networks and Organizations* / Eds. N. Nohria, R. Eccles. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1992.
- Raider H., Burt R. "Boundaryless Careers and Social Capital"// *The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era* / Eds. M. Arthur, D. Rousseau. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. P. 187-200.
- Reskin B. "Academic Sponsorship and Scientists' Career". *Sociology of Education*. 1979. Vol. 52. P. 129-146.
- Reskin B. "Scientific Productivity, Sex, and Location in the Institution of Science". *American Sociological Review*. 1978. Vol. 83. P. 1235-1243.
- Reskin B. "Scientific Productivity and the Reward Structure of Science". *American Sociological Review*. 1977. Vol. 42. P. 491-504.
- Roche G. "Much Ado About Mentoring". *Harvard Business Review*. 1979. Vol. 57. P. 26-28.
- Romanin S., Over R. "Australian Academics: Career Patterns, Work-Roles, and Family Life-Cycle of Men and Women". *Higher Education*. 1993. Vol. 26. No. 4. P. 411-429.
- Rosenbaum J. "Career Mobility in a Corporate Hierarchy". Orlando: Academic Press, 1984.
- Rosenfeld R., Jones J. "Patterns and Effects of Geographic Mobility for Academic Women and Men". *Journal of Higher Education*. 1987. Vol. 58. P. 493-515.
- Rosenfeld R. "Job Mobility and Career Processes". *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1992. Vol. 18. P. 39-61.
- Rushton J. et al. "Personality, Research Creativity, and Teaching Effectiveness in University Professors". *Scientometrics*. 1983. Vol. 5. P. 93-116.
- Sanford N. "Academic Culture and the Teacher's Development". *Soundings* (Winter). 1971. P. 357-371.
- Schein E. "Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs". Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.
- Sewell et al. "Schooling and Achievement in American Society". New York: Academic Press, 1976.
- Shapiro E., Haseltine F., Rowe M. "Moving up: Role Models, Mentors, and the Patron System". *Sloan Management Review*. 1978. Vol. 19. P. 51-58.
- Smelser N., Content R. "The Changing Academic Market". Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Sörensen A. "Wissenschaftliche Werdegänge und Akademische Arbeitsmärkte"// "Generationsdynamik in der Forschung". Frankfurt a.M., New York: Campus, 1992.
- Spilerman S. "Careers, Labour Market Structure, and Socioeconomic Attainment". *American Journal of Sociology*. 1977. Vol. 83. P. 551-593.

- Spitze G. "Women's Employment and Family Relations: A Review". *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1988. Vol. 50. P. 595-618.
- Stenken J., Zajicek A. "The Importance of Asking, Mentoring and Building Networks for Academic Career Success – A Personal and Social Science Perspective" // "Building a Professional Career". Springer-Verlag, 2009.
- Sullivan S. "The Changing Nature of Careers: A Review and Research Agenda". *Journal of Management*. 1999. Vol. 25. P. 457-484.
- Sullivan S., Carden W., Martin D. "Careers in the Next Millennium: Directions for Future Research". *Human Resource Management Review*. 1998. Vol. 8. P. 165-185.
- Torrance E. "Role of Mentors in Creative Achievement". *The Creative Child and Adult Quarterly*. 1983. Vol. 8. P. 8-16.
- Trow M. "The Analysis of Status"// *Perspectives on Higher Education* / Ed. B. Clark. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984. P. 132-164.
- Wanner R., Lewis L., Gregorio D. "Research Productivity in Academia: A Comparative Study of the Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities". *Sociology of Education*. 1981. No. 54. P. 238-258.
- Williams R., Blackburn R. "Mentoring and Junior Faculty Productivity". *Journal of Nursing Education*. 1988. Vol. 27. P. 204-209.
- Wright C., Wright S. "The Role of Mentors in the Career Development of Young Professionals". *Family Relations*. 1987. Vol. 36. No. 2. P. 204-208.
- Zuckerman H., Cole J. "Women in American Science". *Minerva*. 1975. No. 13. P. 82-102.
- **Internet Sources**
- Academics.de
- Deutscher Hochschulverband: Salaries in Academia: What Professors earn in Germany. April 2008.
- Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (the German University Rector's Conference).

Appendix

Profiles of respondents

Scientists with Russian roots:

- [1] Scientific collaborator, Dr. (female) / Faculty of Sociology. 9 years in Germany.
- [2] Scientific collaborator (male), H.D.R. (Habilitation Doctor of Science) (the title was granted by the French Ministry of Education) / Faculty of Physics; Center of Excellence - Cognitive Interaction Technology CITEC. Performed scientific work in the USA, France and Germany. 3 years in Germany.
- [3] Scientific collaborator (male), Dr. / Faculty of Physics; Centre of Biotechnology; Institute of Biophysics and nanotechnologies. 10 years in Germany.
- [4] PhD student at Bielefeld University (female) / Faculty of Sociology. Diploma of St. Petersburg State University / Faculty of Sociology. 3 years in Germany.
- [5] Junior scientific assistant, PhD student at Bielefeld University (female) / Technical Faculty (Technische Fakultät). Attended gymnasium in Germany. 14 years in Germany.
- [6] Guest Scientist taking part in research project conducted in Bielefeld University (male). Diploma of St. Petersburg State University (2009)/ Faculty of Mathematics.
- [7] Guest Scientist taking part in research project conducted in Bielefeld University (male). Scientific collaborator at Steklov Institute, St. Petersburg; Diploma of St. Petersburg State University / Faculty of Mathematics.

German scientists:

- [8] Herr Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. (emer.) Ludwig Huber / Faculty of Pedagogics.
- [9] Prof em. Dr. (male) / Faculty of Sociology.
- [10] Herr Dr. Thomas Lüttenberg, since 2006 the Head of the International Office at Bielefeld University.
- [11] Scientific collaborator (male), Dr. / Faculty of Sociology.
- [12] Junior Professor, Dr. (female) / Faculty of History, Philosophy and Theology.
- [13] Prof. Dr. (female) / Faculty of Sociology. Has Polish roots; for a long time lived and worked in academe in Switzerland.

Interview guides

Interview with the scientists of Russian descent

- I've asked you to give me an interview because you're a Russian scientist working/studying at Bielefeld University. Could you please share your experience of working here?
- What are your position and academic degree?
- How did it happen that you came to work here? (Prompt: What brought you to the decision to leave for Germany? What prospects/expectations did you have in mind?)
- What were the major challenges for you, if you had any, when you were leaving Russia and coming to work in Germany? (Prompt: Major difficulties in the first months of your stay in Germany (bureaucratic, language, cultural, financial difficulties, etc)? Present difficulties?)
- Have you ever experienced prejudiced attitude towards your person on the part of Germans? I mean only the professional sphere.
- Tell me about evolution of your career.

- Did you have some mentor, formal or informal, who really influenced your career development?
- Are there any structures providing support for foreigners working/studying in Germany?
- What is the difference in academic structures in Germany and Russia?
- What are the major determinants of career unfolding at Bielefeld University/in the German academe in general? What is a must for those who want to make an academic career in Germany?
- Do you think that informal contacts and networking play a role in academic career development / in the process of appointment to professorship in the German academe?
- Do you think that Bielefeld University is representative of other German universities of this type in terms of career prospects for foreign scientists?
- How would you evaluate your present achievements, i.e. your career, in the German academe?
- How would you evaluate academic career prospects of Russians in Germany? (Prompt: What are the major barriers to reaching the position of a professor?)
- Where are you planning to continue your scientific activity, in Germany or Russia, and why?
- Is there anything I haven't asked you about, but what I should know within the framework of my topic?

Interview with Germans

- What are your current position and academic degree?
- How did your academic career start?
- What were the major challenges for you, if there were any, when you were starting your academic career? Present difficulties?
- Tell me about evolution of your career.
- Did you have some mentor, formal or informal, who really influenced your career development?
- What are the major determinants of career unfolding at Bielefeld University/in the German academe in general? What is a must for those who want to make an academic career in Germany?
- Do you think that informal contacts and networking play a role in academic career development / in the process of appointment to professorship in the German academe?
- Do you think that Bielefeld University is representative of other German universities of this type in terms of career prospects for foreign scientists?
- What happens to a person who defended Habilitation, but didn't manage to get full professorship. What are his/her career prospects?
- How will you evaluate academic career prospects of Russians in Germany? (Prompt: What are the major barriers to reaching the position of a professor?)
- Is there anything I haven't asked you about, but what I should know within the framework of my topic?

Interview with Thomas Lüttenberg

- I have asked you to give me an interview, because you are the head of the International Office. As far as I know, it is in the competence of the International Office to provide help and support to foreign scientists. Could you please dwell upon your work.
- What problems do people usually come to you with? The most urgent ones?
- Do you sometimes have problems connected with cultural barriers, language barriers?
- Do you provide some language courses?
- You work much with both German and Russian scientists. Is there any great difference between them?
- How will you evaluate academic career prospects of Russians in Germany?
- Is there a Russian professor at Bielefeld University?
- Do you think that Bielefeld University is representative of other German universities of this type in terms of career prospects for foreign scientists?
- Is there anything I haven't asked you about, but what I should know within the framework of my topic?

Interview with an expert

- What brings Russian scientists to the decision to come to Germany in the pursuit of academic career?
- Who decides about the employment of foreign scientists? What factors influence this decision?
- What can you say about the problem of the recognition of Russian diplomas?
- What problems Russians face in the German academe?
- Is there something special about the situation of Russians in comparison to other foreign scientists coming to Germany?
- Is there a structure of preferences in the German academe: that scientists from some countries are more welcome than scientists from others?
- What is the role of mentoring and networking in academic career development in Germany?
- How is power distributed in the German academe?
- Do you think that Bielefeld University is representative of other German universities of this type in terms of career prospects for foreign scientists?
- What happens to a person who defended Habilitation, but didn't manage to get full professorship. What are his/her career prospects?
- What is a must for those who want to make an academic career in Germany?
- Is there anything I haven't asked you about, but what I should know within the framework of my topic?



ZDES Working Papers

Arbeitspapiere des Zentrums für Deutschland- und Europastudien

Рабочие тетради Центра изучения Германии и Европы

Universität Bielefeld – Fakultät für Soziologie
Postfach 100131 – 33501 Bielefeld – Deutschland

Staatliche Universität St. Petersburg – 7/9 Universitetskaja Nab.
199034 St. Petersburg – Russland

<http://zdes.spb.ru/>

info@zdes.spb.ru