

THE EUROPEAN SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF ENGLISH  
&  
THE BRITISH COUNCIL

REPORT ON A SURVEY OF  
ENGLISH STUDIES IN EUROPE  
AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

*Compiled by Martin A. Kayman  
with the assistance of Filomena Mesquita*

*The production of this report would not have been possible without the assistance of a grant from the British Council. Particular thanks are due to Hilary Jenkins, for enabling the survey to get started, and to Margaret Meyer, for making it possible to conclude the project. Our gratitude also for their support and assistance to the members of the Board of the European Society for the Study of English and its past and present Presidents, Professors Helmut Bonheim and Adolphe Haberer, and to all the colleagues around Europe who participated in the survey.*

---

## Introduction

This project was inspired by a sense that discussions of 'English studies in Europe' were bedevilled by a tendency to assume that what others do under the title of 'English', 'Anglo-American Studies' or the like was, broadly speaking, similar to what we ourselves do. Even when one registered the fact that things were inevitably different in some respects, it was rarely the most important ones, since these were precisely our 'natural' or 'common sense' ways of doing things, the unexamined cultural assumptions that it is so difficult to make visible. Take, for example, the language of instruction. In a large number of countries, colleagues find it hard to understand how it is possible to teach 'English' in a language other than English: it is obvious that is what you do. Yet elsewhere, it is felt to be equally natural to teach in the students' own language.

Through the 1990s, as people became increasingly exposed to activities in other countries, either in the context of the European Society for the Study of English, Socrates-Erasmus exchanges, or the British Council's Oxford Conference or Literature Symposium, awareness necessarily grew of the existence of considerable differences in the way English was configured, taught and studied across Europe. But what precisely were those differences? How substantial were they? Were they merely local 'translations' of a 'common core' of studying English, or effectively incommensurable constructions of the discipline?

The seeds for a project aimed at providing some answers grew from a panel discussion on the topic led by myself and Tom Healy at the ESSE conference held in Debrecen in 1997. ESSE and the British Council agreed to support a survey aimed at establishing reliable information about the variety of meanings 'English' has in the context of Higher Education in Europe. Such information became more important with the announcement of the Bologna agreement in 1999.

The original aim was to produce both a report and a database providing a snap-shot of arrangements for teaching and studying English in Europe immediately before Bologna began to be implemented. At its most ambitious, the survey would serve as a basis for monitoring the impact of the agreement on

the shape of English Studies in Europe through subsequent five-year surveys.

As the reader will see below, the project did not achieve all its, eventually over-ambitious, goals. There were various reasons; whilst some are, in a sense, accidental—determined by the precarious circumstances in which the project developed—others, I would argue, have more significance for our understanding of the variety within the discipline in different educational contexts precisely because they bring us up against the (in)visibility of some of the most substantial differences.

## Methodology

It should be pointed out that, from the start, the survey aimed to be representative rather than comprehensive. It is presented here in the form of a synthetic report based on a series of case studies (contributing institutions are listed at the end of this report). The questionnaire, designed in the course of 1998 by myself, Rob Pope (Oxford Brookes), Richard Todd (Amsterdam), Rick Waswo (Geneva), Hilary Jenkins (BC), and Filomena Mesquita (Coimbra) was piloted in 1999 through the 30 representatives of the national associations of English or Anglo-American Studies who make up the ESSE Board, or their nominees.

The pilot survey brought home dramatically the problem of anticipating difference. The language in which the questions were formulated was necessarily based on the language we used to describe the realities we knew, and, unsurprisingly, this turned out not to be the best way of uncovering what were in effect the cultural practices of other languages. On reflection, anticipating the appropriate questions for eliciting the information we sought would have implied already to a large extent knowing the answers. Hence, while many of the responses we obtained to the pilot seemed, from our point of view, to have missed the point—in most cases, it was in fact of course our questions which had failed to perceive that things are thought differently elsewhere.

Two major difficulties were identified. The first was that of specifying common units on which to base comparisons. What, for example, is the basic unit for the delivery of a degree scheme—a 'course', a 'paper', a 'module', a given number of 'credits', a given number of hours?<sup>1</sup> This is not only a matter of accounting

for comparative purposes, but equally an issue of how the study of 'English' is organised in a particular educational system.

A common 'unit of account' was a prerequisite for discovering how the field of 'English' was divided up and constituted in disciplinary terms, and in what proportions. But the problem was compounded by another issue of language: the terms we used to name possible components of the discipline were shown to presuppose to an extent the very constitution they sought to uncover, thereby generating ambiguities. Thus, although the categories 'Literature' and 'Linguistics' appeared to be universally recognisable, at least in their broad senses, the same was not necessarily true of the other major disciplinary areas we identified, 'Culture/ Civilisation/ Cultural Studies' and 'English as a Foreign Language'. Particularly in the former case, we hoped to capture the various ways in which this element was configured in English Studies—as background, or as a field in itself, based on institutional or critical approaches, as a historical or as a contemporary object—and to track the inroads made (or not) by 'British Studies' or 'Cultural Studies' on traditional models (where they existed). However, the persistent ambiguities of these terms, added to the on-going diversity of the 'units of account', again proved troublesome—but not, as I shall argue, by any means useless.

Similar problems of vocabulary, corresponding to very diverse realities, also bedevilled attempts to understand the career structure in different systems, including issues of seniority and of job security.

The successes and failures of the pilot scheme led to a major revision of the questionnaire, including adjustments provoked by the second major discovery: it is often not wise to provide academics with open questions. Amongst many other changes, the pilot was revised to include as many questions of the 'less than half' / 'more than half' and 'yes/no' variety as possible, as well as to cater for the situations where 'it depends' was a practical, as well as a typically 'academic', response to the question. Indeed, from the point of view of marshalling the data, I was somewhat disappointed in my expectation of inflexible state regulation (bred, no doubt, from my own previous experience in Portugal); in

many places there was considerably more flexibility in curricular and pedagogical arrangements than I had imagined (which appears to have increased over time, including in Portugal) and the questionnaire proved of limited elasticity in responding to this. Nonetheless, its failure here does point to the fact that what were no doubt formerly rather more restricted configurations of 'English' were already loosening up.

It is also worth noting that one of the most significant places where 'it depends' was indeed a relevant response was the distinction frequently made by respondents between 'beginning' and 'final' years—suggesting that, in fact, many institutions in Europe already organised their courses effectively in two cycles. It was not, however, always clear whether the division (in a 4-year scheme) was 1+3, 2+2 or 3+1.

A final consideration worth mentioning regarding the questionnaire was that of length. In conducting the survey we were very aware of the surfeit of form-filling that hard-pressed academics have been obliged to engage in over ever larger parts of Europe. Our gratitude for the time given to this by many dozens of respondents should be recorded here. Nonetheless, in theoretical terms, long as the questionnaire is, it is short in terms of the questions one needed to ask.

In conclusion, however, it must be said that, whilst the alterations we introduced in the light of the pilot did make it easier for respondents to reply and for us to manage the responses, many of them necessarily turned the questionnaire into a less refined instrument than was originally hoped, with the result that the full accuracy and transparency of responses cannot be guaranteed. This is not entirely a loss; generally, it is precisely these frustrations that indicate the existence of the real, but hard to imagine and articulate, differences in the way English Studies are conceived, configured, and delivered that I referred to at the opening. Hence, besides providing some useful general information, by stumbling against a number of points of ambiguity or opacity, the survey has the virtue of making some significant areas of difference visible.

Having settled on a questionnaire, which was also reviewed by a specialist appointed by the Council, we asked each of the national

representatives to indicate between 3 and 7 more respondents, depending on the degree of variability in their country. With the exception of countries like Germany and Switzerland, where much is decided on a regional basis, most national associations opted for the lower figure, giving rise to an expectation of a low level of variation within the national context. That, however, did not always prove to be the case.<sup>2</sup>

This creates a problematic tension in the report. It is difficult to do justice at the same time to variations between and within national systems. The attempt to identify differences between national systems irons out internal differences, whilst too much specificity regarding local practices would make it impossible to produce intelligible statements regarding national practices.

For all these reasons, great care must be exercised in reading the data. Although the report will frequently refer to countries, the relevant information is drawn from a small number of case studies in the country concerned—sometimes, from a single case. There are issues where one can confidently extrapolate conclusions that are valid at the national level (like the length of the degree, for example), and others where there is bound to be considerable variation (like class size). The most sensitive problems obviously lie between these extremes—for example, regarding the content or approach adopted within the discipline. Then there are other kinds of data—like contact hours for students—which one cannot be sure are established nationally or by individual institutions. We have sought the views of the national representatives on the ESSE board on the reliability of the generalisations here, but it should always be born in mind that this report offers an *interpretation* of data obtained from the questionnaires.<sup>3</sup>

The revised questionnaire was sent by the British Council in early 2000 to 142 respondents, and, as they came in, the results were input into a database by Dan Smith at the British Council, under Hilary Jenkins' supervision.<sup>4</sup> Seventy-four responses were received in the course of 2000, of varied quality.<sup>5</sup> The responses from one country proved too variable to be managed within the project—that was the United Kingdom, which was to conduct its own survey in 2002, incorporating and adapting much of the ESSE questionnaire.<sup>6</sup>

My own unexpected move from Coimbra to Cardiff in the summer of 2000 interrupted progress on the survey. Nonetheless, a provisional report in 2001 led the British Council, under Alastair Niven and subsequently Margaret Meyer, to support the hiring of a research assistant, Filomena Mesquita, to support me in pursuing the project. I must here register my enormous gratitude to Hilary, Alastair and Margaret for their moral and material support and their patience in relation to the project.

As results arrived, it had become apparent that the questionnaire was still proving somewhat inflexible in relation to a complex reality. As a result, and given the variable quality of the responses, the data proved incompatible with processing through a database. One turned, therefore, from the seductions of dbase queries to those of narrative. Completed questionnaires which had a sufficient amount of useable data were turned into prose accounts, which, where possible, were then returned to the respondents for correction and completion, along with specific questions for clarification. Where contact had broken down or gaps in coverage were identified, further colleagues were contacted. Where responses to our questions were received, the reports were revised accordingly. Even with this, national coverage remains variable, being particularly to lament the impossibility of obtaining any reliable information at all from Latvia or Russia. It also proved difficult to generate much detailed information regarding one of the largest countries for English degrees, France; valuable assistance from Adolphe Haberer, President of ESSE, and from the French association did however allow for the generalisations made below.

The report which follows has been drawn from the revised individual case studies. The final return of individual reports is 70, in relation to the c.130 questionnaires originally sent to non-UK institutions.<sup>7</sup> As a point of comparison, it might be noted that the English Subject Centre received 53 returns from its survey of 135 British departments of English.<sup>8</sup> Nonetheless, I do not consider that the number of returns here, nor the transparency of responses, are sufficient in relation to the universe under consideration for the data to be treated statistically, as in the British case.

One final, and extremely important, caveat is required. As I have observed, the questionnaire proper was launched in 2000 and sought to survey English Studies in Europe on the eve of Bologna; but it was already aimed at a moving target. The implementation of Bologna was already underway in Italy and the Netherlands, whilst many countries in post-Soviet Europe had been reorganising their systems over the previous decade.<sup>9</sup> The longer the survey has taken, the more the reality has changed. The survey remains, basically, an essay on English Studies pre-Bologna, but there are already signs of changes which have since been implemented in the individual reports.<sup>10</sup>

The survey is guided, then, by this simple question: what does it mean, in Europe, to take a degree in 'English'?

We identified the following as key variables:

1. Degree structure: e.g. length of degree; single subject or combined with another subject; in the latter case, the proportion of the degree constituted by 'English'; professional qualifications.<sup>11</sup>
2. The academic composition of the 'English' scheme: the disciplinary components and their contents/ orientation.
3. Working conditions and personnel: e.g. control over structure and content; career structure; staff-student ratios, etc.<sup>12</sup>, and delivery: e.g. forms of teaching and assessment; contact hours and class size; length of academic year; the existence of a 'year abroad'.

## Degree Structure

One of the first problems in the questionnaire was establishing the most basic unit of all, the 'first degree'. For some countries (the Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Poland, Slovakia, Switzerland (Basel), Spain, and Ukraine), the first degree remained a 5-year course of study, leading to a qualification at a level generally regarded as equivalent to a 'masters' degree, where that existed.<sup>13</sup> Of these, Finnish students had the option to take a 3-year BA, whilst Poland offered from the mid-1990s a 3-year degree for teacher training colleges, and Germany had both a 3-year and a 5-year 'Staatsexamen' for different levels of school teaching.<sup>14</sup> Iceland, Denmark and France were the only other countries, besides

the UK (or, more accurately, England and Wales), which had a 3-year first degree, although France also had both a 2-year diploma and 4-year and 5-year advanced degree. **In short, pre-Bologna, university degrees in Europe were predominantly based on 4 years of study** (although, in all cases, in most countries, as with the 5-year schemes, students could and did take longer to complete).

The problems in establishing relations between degrees of 3, 4 and 5 years' duration is exacerbated by the names by which the schemes were known, and the comparability of standards they might imply. Whilst a number of countries indicated that the first degree was a 4-year 'BA', there are other 4-year schemes which were denominated by 'licence' or similar (Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland), the same word also being used to describe a 3-year degree in France and in Poland ('licenciate').<sup>15</sup> Conversely, in Austria, France and Sweden the 4-year scheme is called a 'master', 'maîtrise', or 'magister'—the sort of term given in most other places to 5-year degrees. In the Netherlands, the 4-year degree was called a 'Doctoraal'.

Some of these 4-year degrees (e.g. Bulgaria, Portugal) had been reduced at some point in the recent past from an earlier 5-year cycle of studies (in the case of Estonia, 6 years), which previously corresponded to a master's award.

With one or two exceptions, the survey failed to fulfil its ambition to sample the arrangements for English in institutions that were not primarily dedicated to English Studies—departments or faculties of translation, business studies (e.g. Vienna University of Economics and Business Studies), science and technology, or dedicated language-teaching centres (as at Montenegro), for example. This failure reflects the fact that our understanding of University 'English', and the organisation of the institutions that support it, like that of the national associations of ESSE who were the source of the data, are still largely based on a model of 'English' as a unitary literary-linguistic discipline, be it philological or a 'modern language and literature'—a model which may no longer correspond entirely to the reality, and which is certain to be challenged by Bologna. In any case, the following remarks on joint degrees are restricted then largely to

English taught in Departments of 'English', 'Anglo-American Studies', 'Modern Languages' or 'Philology'.

However, **it can be stated with confidence that in the vast majority of countries, students have traditionally studied English in a joint honours scheme alongside another Humanities subject.** At the time of the survey, countries offering only joint honours degrees included Austria,<sup>16</sup> Belgium, Croatia,<sup>17</sup> the Czech Republic, Estonia,<sup>18</sup> Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, and Ukraine. In Greece, English is offered as a major/minor degree in Athens and as single honours at Thessaloniki.

In contrast, English is offered exclusively as single honours only in Cyprus, Poland (5 year), Spain and Serbia—as well as at Vilnius in Lithuania. In France, 'academic' degrees are offered exclusively as single honours, but there is also a strong tradition of degrees in Applied Foreign Languages, where two languages are studied along with a vocational element set up in cooperation with potential employers.<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, **in most institutions where students can choose between a single-subject or joint-honours degree, respondents report that the vast majority (70-80%) opt for single honours** (institutions in Bulgaria, Denmark,<sup>20</sup> Estonia [Estonia Institute], Hungary, Iceland, Lithuania and Slovenia). It should be noted that single honours may of course include a proportion of courses or credits (15-20%) in other related or free-option disciplines. Perhaps in part because of this, of the departments in the survey offering the choice between single and joint honours, only at Zagreb in Croatia did a majority of the students (in this case a vastly overwhelming majority) opt for the joint honours. Although a majority also chose joint honours at Tartu (Estonia), many here took English with American or British Studies, which one might well consider a form of Single Honour (vs. those who take English with Public Relations, Psychology, etc.).

Of the institutions offering joint honours who responded to the questionnaires, the majority offered English with a range of other Humanities disciplines, others restricted combinations to other Languages and Literatures, a few, like Belgium, to Germanic

languages,<sup>21</sup> whilst Athens had only a degree in English and Greek (although students may take this with English as a major). At the Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration, and in responding institutions in Germany, Lithuania and the Netherlands, there were possibilities for studying English with social sciences (Law, Economics, Sociology, Political Science, Business Studies, etc.).<sup>22</sup> Elsewhere, as in Slovenia and Ukraine, English could be studied as part of a degree in Interpreting (although the survey suggests that here English is not necessarily taught by a Department of English).

In these joint schemes, the English component was roughly equivalent to that of the other subject in Belgium (Antwerp), Croatia, Finland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia and Sweden. Alongside such joint schemes, English could be studied as either a major or a minor subject in responding institutions in Austria, Belgium (Leuven), Denmark (3 year), Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Romania and parts of Switzerland. Majors consisted of a little over half the credits to as much as 70-80%; minors were generally around 25-35% of the required credits. There was considerable variation in the amount of 'English' in the degree in Switzerland, where English Studies were often taken with more than one other subject, as was also possible in Norway.

**The survey also confirmed that teaching was the main professional destination of students** in all responding institutions, except for Bulgaria, Denmark (where, nonetheless, a substantial proportion of graduates do still go into teaching), Lithuania, the Netherlands, and Slovenia. Mixed responses were received from institutions in Finland,<sup>23</sup> Germany, Romania, Slovakia, and Switzerland. However, most institutions offered the possibility of taking a teaching qualification. On the other hand, the market for teachers has suffered a recent severe decline in Portugal and Spain, with radical effects on student demand for English.

Qualification for teaching depended largely on taking a greater or lesser number of optional courses in Pedagogy and Language-Teaching Methodology (usually one or two courses from each area, on occasion more), and sometimes courses in Applied

Linguistics, Psychology or Sociology and teaching practice. Graduates are required to sit a state exam to obtain accreditation in France and Germany. In Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal and Switzerland, further training is required after graduation, involving an in-service component in most cases.

### Composition of the degree

For the purpose of this survey, we divided the areas of study into Literature, Linguistics, Culture, Civilisation or Cultural Studies, and English as a Foreign Language. As I observed above, this division, extrapolated from our own experience, did not necessarily correspond to the actual organisation of courses in the institutions, nor necessarily convey their content.

In particular, not all institutions separate 'culture' from 'literature' or 'English as a Foreign Language' from 'linguistics'—whilst others treat English language as an implicit constituent of the entire enterprise of the degree. Some will have stated this; others may well have treated the questions on 'Culture', for example, at the level of contents which may have been delivered locally within another topic. Similarly, the category of 'Culture' may include courses or teaching related to aesthetic history or analysis, or (particularly in France) to the sort of social, economic and political history and analysis associated with 'area studies'. Whilst, then, such categories provide workable distinctions to establish broad patterns, this is an area in which the limitations of the language we were able to use draws attention to the fact that we understand these categories differently and that disciplinary boundaries within 'English' have a potentially high degree of fluidity. The ambiguities here point precisely then to those fundamental theoretical differences which characterise practice in different parts of Europe, without being able, of themselves, to define them. The following remarks should be considered within that perspective.

Although there were a few institutions which offered alternative degree schemes in English (and/or American) Studies or in English Linguistics (e.g. Konstanz in Germany), generally schemes have traditionally centred their courses on

**Literature and Linguistics as the two major parallel disciplinary areas**, and have divided their requirements more or less evenly between the two. This has particularly been the case with respondents in Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Norway, Romania (Cluj and Bucharest) and Spain. Traditionally, the major emphasis has been on **Literature** in Iceland, Italy, Portugal and Sweden, whilst, in some other countries (Germany, Norway, Poland), there are individual institutions which also privilege Literature. **Linguistics** has tended to dominate to a greater or lesser degree in institutions in Macedonia,<sup>24</sup> Romania (Timisoara), Slovenia, Slovakia, and Ukraine. A number provided obligatory core courses in both areas, and then permitted specialisation, particularly in responding institutions in Germany, Denmark, Finland, Greece, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania (Bucharest), and Switzerland, and at some institutions in Hungary. In France, 'Culture', in the form of Area Studies, occupies a similar space to the other two major areas.

Given wide variety both within and between countries, and the much higher degree of choice apparently now given to students, it was difficult to correlate detailed information about the composition of the **Literature** component of degree schemes. As I have observed, the sample is too small to treat this data statistically. Furthermore, in responses to this section of the questionnaire, as elsewhere, it is not clear whether the indication that a topic was 'offered' or 'studied' meant that it was covered within a survey or thematic course, or whether it constituted a course or module in itself. Lastly, the very imprecision of the language by which we describe Literature as a discipline—its lack of strict theoretical definition—makes it difficult to survey the terrain.

The following data should moreover be understood in the context of the scheme of study. The significance of the responses will be quite different in the case of a student taking a 5-year, single-subject, Literature-dominant degree (the nearest to which will be found in Poland), and the more common case of a student taking a 4-year, single-subject degree dedicating more or less equal time to the study of Literature and Linguistics,

alongside, possibly, some Culture, Language and teacher training classes, and the even more widespread case of a student taking a 4-year, *joint* degree, where the English Literature, Linguistics, Culture and Language component is in effect only half the degree. This is theoretically not a matter of 'more' or 'less', but of, potentially at least, fundamentally different orientations towards, and therefore constitutions of, the object of study. The question one wants to ask here is whether a joint degree in English Studies offers a study of English in some way integrated with another discipline (be it another language/literature or some other discipline), or whether the two (or more) components constitute in effect parallel courses of study.

Bearing these major variations in mind, a number of generalisations may nonetheless be ventured. First, far from all courses included a module or course specifically introducing students to literary analysis (respondents in the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Ukraine did not indicate this as a compulsory course, whilst mixed responses were obtained from Estonia, Finland and Greece).<sup>25</sup>

Secondly, most places reported that students studied literary theory in their courses (although not necessarily under the English component of the degree). However, the fact that only our respondents in Austria, Estonia, Norway, Serbia and Switzerland failed to so indicate, and that respondents in Croatia, France, Germany, Greece, Lithuania and Poland gave mixed responses to this item, suggests less the relative universality of the teaching of literary theory than a lack of consensus on what 'theory' means.

On the other hand, one can assert with some confidence that the vast majority of courses in English Literature in Europe would appear to be organised on a combination of rather traditional historical and generic principles, and most contained a compulsory historical survey dimension (only Cyprus and Switzerland failed to respond positively here, whilst mixed responses were received from Croatia, Portugal, Romania and Slovakia). Combined with the relatively few institutions reporting a compulsory introduction to literary

studies-type course, the impression one gets is that the study of English Literature has generally been largely content- and canon-based, rather than skills-based.

The traditionally 'literary' flavour of the organisation of Literature study in Europe is reinforced by the fact that respondents from the following countries indicated that 50% or more of their provision was in pre-twentieth-century literature: Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Italy, Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland and Ukraine. Mixed responses were received from Belgium (between 30% and 60%), Finland (20-70%), France (30-50%), Germany (20%-70%), Lithuania (40%-60%), the Netherlands (30-50%), Poland (25-70%), Slovakia (40-50%) and Spain (25%-60%).

Only nine respondents specified Shakespeare as a compulsory content, but it is likely that Shakespeare would be covered in other compulsory thematic or historical courses—one cannot, of course, say to what extent. On the other hand, no other individual author was mentioned as being compulsory.

The survival of traditional paradigms is also reflected by the fact that, although rarely accounting for more than 10% of the literary component of the degree, Medieval or Old English were offered throughout the survey, except in Belgium, Finland (other than Helsinki), France (except the Sorbonne and a few other places), Portugal, or at Vienna, Zagreb, Timisoara, Presov, and Lulea. One should note however that only minimal values for pre-Renaissance literature (1-5%) were found elsewhere in Croatia, and in Cyprus, Estonia (Tartu), in some universities in Hungary, and in Macedonia.<sup>26</sup>

On the other hand, in, by British standards, less traditional ways, American Literature is offered throughout Europe, and is indeed compulsory in many places. Although, once again, the virtual universality of Anglo-Irish literature may mean either the presence of Swift and Yeats on other courses, or modules dedicated to the study of Irish literature in English, postcolonial literatures in general are very widely available as options and occasionally as a compulsory component.

Similar caveats apply to reading the data from **Linguistics** courses. Nonetheless, one can assert that historical linguistics was

compulsory virtually everywhere (with the exception of only Greece and Norway and parts of Italy and Portugal, where it was optional, and Cyprus, where it was optional). Whilst this may well reflect the philological heritage, that of the 'practical language learning' revolution of Storm, Sweet *et al.* is likewise confirmed by the fact that the study of Phonetics also appears to be compulsory virtually everywhere.

Semantics and Syntax were commonly studied, either as a compulsory element (responding institutions in Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia, Serbia, Sweden, Ukraine, and at the Humboldt in Berlin), or as an option (Vienna and in Estonia, Germany, Greece, Lithuania, Macedonia, Netherlands, and Tromsø). In Iceland and at Oslo, Semantics was compulsory and Syntax optional. Mixed responses were received from France, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, and Switzerland.

Generative grammar would seem to have been dominant in the institutions responding in Cyprus, Iceland, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Sweden, and functional grammar in Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Estonia (Tartu), Finland, Italy, Lithuania, Slovakia, Spain and Switzerland, whilst elsewhere students were apparently exposed to both approaches.

Sociolinguistics was a compulsory element of programmes only in Cyprus, Macedonia, Serbia and Sweden, and in isolated institutions in Croatia (Rijeka), Finland (Abo), Germany (Humboldt), and Switzerland (Zurich and Basel). Elsewhere, it was optional except in France, Romania and Slovenia and at Zagreb and individual institutions in Italy, Portugal, and Ukraine, where it was not offered.

As already suggested, responses to the question relating to the disciplinary area(s) we described as '**Culture/ Civilisation/ Cultural Studies**' drew attention to the instability of conceptions of this increasingly strategic field and made the interpretation of the data a particularly delicate matter. Variations between institutions in the same country may well have been due more to different readings of the questions, than to a major variety of practices—although one does sense that the field has in fact been changing. Here, as elsewhere, different responses may reflect that a given area

is included in the degree scheme, but not necessarily as a separate topic, or in a module labelled as 'Culture', etc. At the same time, the apparently almost universal coverage of 'British Studies' would indicate that, like responses to 'Theory', this term in particular was interpreted in a variety of ways—on many occasions, one suspects, as no more than an indication that Britain was the object of study, rather than an identification with the project of 'British Studies'. On the other hand, the data does confirm the fact that the 'culture' component was still very largely focused on a national object.

Provision in France is distinguished by the growing importance given to an 'area studies' understanding of this component, which has effectively replaced the subordinate 'civilisation' model (formally ancillary to Literature) and now shares a major part of the curriculum with Literature and Language.

Nonetheless, the survey confirmed the impression that, although the amount of provision awarded to the area of 'Culture' varied considerably, it was still generally low relative to the major disciplinary fields. Respondents reported that there was no separate provision of courses in 'culture', 'civilisation' or 'cultural studies' in Cyprus, the Netherlands (until recently), or, as a rule, in Switzerland, and little or none in Belgium (although this may vary between institutions). In Austria,<sup>27</sup> Iceland, Italy, Portugal, Romania,<sup>28</sup> and Sweden, provision was minimal, usually with one background course in the early years largely dedicated to historical, institutional or organisational aspects of Britain. Croatia and Lithuania tend to offer a small number of options in the final years, corresponding to 2-4 hours a week, dedicated to both institutional aspects and contemporary culture/ media studies.

Moderate provision (between a quarter and a half of the provision for Literature or Linguistics) was found at universities in Denmark, Finland (except Helsinki), Germany and Greece. Zaragoza also indicated an above-average offer of courses in this area (an introduction and a number of options), but this reflects the initiative of a particularly active 'cultural studies' group there. Otherwise, one had to look mainly to post-Soviet Europe to find more substantial optional provision—as offered at Sofia (a compulsory introduction and

up to 3 options), Pécs, in Macedonia, at Ljubljana, and at Presov in Slovakia (although the Culture provision was much lower at Bratislava) —a reflection, no doubt, of the investment in British Studies by the British Council in the region in the 1990s. Likewise, albeit no doubt for differing reasons, at institutions in the Czech Republic, Poland and Serbia, and in France and Norway, ‘culture’ was broadly on a par with the other principal disciplinary areas.<sup>29</sup>

Turning to the area of **English as a Foreign Language**, Denmark, Iceland and Norway did not appear to have any specific provision for practical language training, whilst language instruction was offered only in the early years of the degree in most institutions in Hungary. Nonetheless, as in most of Europe, English was the main language of instruction. Only in Portugal and Ukraine was the national language mainly used in teaching and assessment, although there were many places in Italy and isolated cases in France, and Germany where the national language was employed.

Respondents divided fairly equally between those who indicated that British English was the standard used, those who indicated that both British and American standards were employed, and those countries in which different institutions responded either ‘British’ or ‘both’. It is not clear from the survey that this was an issue that greatly concerned people.

In relation to the amount of English language teaching and learning to which students were exposed, arrangements varied a good deal between institutions in Germany and Italy. Elsewhere, of the responding institutions in countries where teaching English is usually the main occupation of graduates, Belgium, France (where English is effectively a single subject degree), Romania and Slovakia generally gave their students around 100 hours of practical language instruction a year. In the former case, students began in large groups (over 30 students), but were taught in smaller groups in later years. In responding institutions in France, Romania and Slovakia, classes were generally below 30 students. Native-speaking language instructors were common in France, but rare in Belgium, Romania and Slovakia. Interestingly, none of the institutions preparing students for teaching indicated that they required a TEFL qualification from staff.

Language provision among respondents in Italy (where English is rarely the language of instruction) was extremely varied, but classes tended to be well over 30, and almost all language teachers were native speakers. At the University of Vienna and responding institutions in Switzerland and Portugal, students had fewer than 100 hours per year, but in the first two cases were taught in small groups, with half or more of the staff being native speakers. Whilst groups were often larger in Portugal, virtually all the language-teaching staff were native speakers.

Students at institutions in Croatia received between 100 and 200 hours in groups of more than 30, with varying numbers of native-speaking staff, whilst Finnish and Spanish students had a similar number of hours in smaller groups, with generally a considerable proportion of native-speaking staff.

Institutions offering the most provision of distinct language instruction (near or over 200 hours/ year) were found in the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary and Poland. Classes usually consisted of fewer than 30 students in the responding institutions in the Czech Republic and Hungary, and more than 30 at the University of Cyprus (although they were smaller at the Cyprus College). Native-speaking staff were common in Cyprus and Greece, but very rare in the post-Soviet nations.

Of the universities where teaching is not the main occupation of their graduates, Ljubljana (Slovenia) required students to spend relatively little time on specific foreign language learning (although students may do more than the c. 100 hours minimum). Some 20% of language staff at this university were native speakers. Bulgaria provides 100-200 hours in small groups, but had very few to no native speaking staff. On the other hand, institutions in Lithuania and the Netherlands generally provided over 200 hours to small groups, with some 80% native-speaking staff in the latter case.

Nowhere are students required to spend a year abroad, as would be the case with modern language students in the UK. However, they are recommended to spend some time abroad (with varying degrees of vehemence) in Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, France, Finland, Greece, Germany, Lithuania, the Netherlands and Spain, in most cases using Socrates-Erasmus exchanges to do so, as is the case also with Italy.

A considerable number of institutions indicated that they taught English language to students of other departments, including respondents in Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, France (except the Sorbonne), Iceland, Lithuania, Macedonia, Montenegro, the Netherlands (not Amsterdam), Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, and Ukraine, along with the Vienna University of Economics and Business Studies, and the Universities of Rijeka (Croatia), and Lublin (Poland).

### **Conditions, personnel, and delivery**

A pertinent issue in the structure and composition of 'English' is the amount of real autonomy departments and individuals have over what they teach—their ability, in short, to introduce change and produce difference. Once again, interpreting the data is not easy. From the responses received, generally speaking, individual departments would appear to have autonomy in determining course structure and content, although responses from Cyprus, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Poland, Portugal and Slovenia indicated that these have to be within guidelines approved by State agencies.<sup>30</sup> One suspects that this may be the case in other countries. Without more detailed questions, it is of course difficult to know the degree of flexibility or prescription here. In France, as we know, content is heavily influenced by the requirements of the State exam giving access to a teaching profession.<sup>31</sup>

In the context of autonomy, one should note that, at the time of the survey, degrees were evaluated every 4-5 years by some form of Ministerial Accreditation Committee everywhere except Denmark, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Norway, Serbia, Slovenia, and Switzerland.<sup>32</sup> Such evaluations existed in Italy, but on a voluntary basis. On the other hand, external review of research output was not a feature of English Studies in Europe. Again, one cannot say to what extent in different places accreditation has a prescriptive effect.<sup>33</sup>

In sum, it is worth bearing in mind that the vast majority of responses indicating that curricula were determined by 'the department', 'teachers' or 'the Faculty' fail to capture either the external State-engendered constraints or the hierarchical structure of these bodies. After all, the relative autonomy

of an institution does not necessarily translate into the autonomy of all its staff—it can simply concentrate power to determine content in the hands of the senior professoriate. Understanding how course structure and content are decided and, more importantly, changed, requires an appreciation of academic authority and career structure in the different educational systems.

The survey looked into this, but again, unsurprisingly, had difficulty in getting at the 'hard' questions, like how course content is negotiated between senior and junior staff, and how dependent the latter are on their seniors for tenure and promotion.<sup>34</sup>

However, it would certainly seem that many systems still relied heavily on a broad base of junior, often (but not always) untenured, staff, which, depending on the relevant career structure, may suggest some concentration of academic power and authority.<sup>35</sup> Although such figures will certainly vary greatly from institution to institution, in terms of the respondents, outside of Belgium, France and Scandinavia, in few did professors (particularly associate and full or equivalent) constitute half or more of the staff (the University of Cyprus, Athens, Pécs, Ljubljana, Milan and Verona, Konstanz, and Vilnius). In around a quarter of the sample, junior or non-professorial staff made up between a half and three-quarters of teaching personnel (this was true of the respondents in Croatia, Finland, Macedonia, Portugal, Serbia and Switzerland, plus Sofia, Timisoara, Uppsala and the remaining institutions in Germany and Norway). In the case of the respondents in Austria, Estonia, Iceland, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Spain and Ukraine, as well as individual institutions in Poland, Sweden and Switzerland, over 80% of staff were below associate or full professorial rank.

In most countries, full professors are expected to teach between 6 and 8 hours a week (9 now in Germany), with 4-5 hours indicated in the case of Cyprus, Finland, Serbia and Sweden. Other professorial ranks are usually expected to carry a similar load, although in the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Slovakia and Ukraine they may be expected to teach up to 10 hours, and in Bulgaria 12. On the other hand, in Austria, assistant or associate professors teach about half the hours of full professors.

Again, in the majority of cases, junior or non-professorial staff teach around 6-8 hours a week, more (10-12) in Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Lithuania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Sweden and Ukraine, and less in Croatia and Switzerland. In their turn, language teachers generally teach 10-12 hours, more (up to 14-16) in Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Poland and Slovakia, and less (6-8) in Serbia, Spain and Slovakia.<sup>36</sup>

In the case of professorial staff, these hours generally correspond to around 4 courses per year, although in some places, like Germany, Hungary and Switzerland, these may correspond to 4 courses a semester. Junior or non-professorial staff often teach not only more hours but on more courses, suggesting that they offer support to courses taught principally by senior professors.

In seeking to make comparisons between these values in terms of conditions of work, one should bear in mind that in a number of contexts, the salary of a university lecturer or professor may not be sufficient to sustain an individual, and the post in question may not be the academic's only employment.

It is no surprise to confirm that English is predominantly a female discipline, especially in terms of student numbers. However, the values here are really very high: virtually all respondents indicated that over 75% of their students were women, with only the Czech Republic, Denmark, Norway, Switzerland and individual institutions in France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden indicating a figure between half and three-quarters. No respondent indicated a female student population of less than 50%.

For most of Europe, it would appear also to be a largely female career, with a majority of women staff in the majority of responding institutions—i.e. institutions in Austria (80% at Vienna), Bulgaria (over 75% at Sofia), Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia (over 75% at the Institute for the Humanities), Helsinki, France, Greece (75%), Hungary, Italy, Lithuania (over 75%), Macedonia, Poland (over 75% at Krakow), Portugal, Romania (over 75%), Slovakia, Serbia, Spain, Sweden (Lulea), Switzerland (Lausanne and Neuchatel), and Ukraine.

However, notwithstanding the gender profile of the students, women staff were in a minority at responding institutions in Belgium, Cyprus,

Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Norway, at the majority of the institutions in Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands, and at individual institutions in France, Italy, Poland, and Sweden.

In relation to the senior professoriate, although women were in a majority in fewer institutions than was the case with all staff, they constituted a majority of full or associate professors in Bulgaria (over 80%), Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Macedonia, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, and Ukraine, and at individual institutions in France, Germany, Lithuania, Poland, and Spain. However, women constituted fewer than a quarter of senior professors in responding institutions in Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark (Aarhus), Estonia, Finland,<sup>37</sup> Iceland, the Netherlands, and a majority of institutions in Switzerland, as well as at individual institutions in France, Germany, Norway, Poland, Romania, and Sweden.

The nature of the subject, its disciplinary structure and its contents, also depend on the sort of training students bring with them. We were obviously not in a position to inquire into the exposure to and competence in English or in literary, linguistic or cultural studies that entering students bring to University. However, the existence and process of selection may be an indicator of the standard, or at least the limits of the institution's ability to affect that standard.

In that context, although *numerus clausus* may apply, a national school-leaving certificate was sufficient to gain entry to University in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France (for the baccalauréat), Germany, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland and Ukraine. A national higher education entry exam was employed in Cyprus, Greece, Hungary, Portugal and Spain. On the other hand, selective departmental exams were used only in Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia and Ukraine.

Analysing student contact hours and course numbers confirms my earlier observation that many countries already operated in effect a double cycle, usually with more hours in the beginning years and usually around 20% fewer in the final years (with bigger reductions in the Czech Republic, Denmark,

Norway, Serbia, Slovakia and Sweden).<sup>38</sup> Those where the number of courses and contact hours remained pretty constant throughout the entire period of study were Bulgaria, Croatia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Macedonia, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Switzerland and Ukraine. Mixed results were obtained for Italy, where hours may be constant, or reduced in the final years.

Contact hours in Continental Europe remain very high in comparison with the UK and Ireland. In most places, students generally spend 25 or more hours a week in classes. This is true of Bulgaria (30), the Czech Republic (26 in the 'beginning' years, 18 in the 'final' years), Lithuania (27), Macedonia (30), Poland (25 in the beginning years, but very few in the final year), Portugal (26) and Ukraine (30+, with a slight increase or reduction, depending on the institution) and at the Estonian Institute for the Humanities (28/16), Joensuu (30/10), Pau (30/15), Passau (25/14), and Cluj (28). Results were mixed for Italy, where some institutions have 25 contact hours a week throughout the degree, whilst others reduce by c.20%.

Respondents indicating 20-24 contact hours/ week came from Austria, from Tartu, Helsinki (reducing to 4-6 in the final year), Valenciennes (20, reducing to 16), the Humboldt and Konstanz, Krakow, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro (Nis: 24, reducing to 16), Slovakia (22, reducing to 8), Slovenia, Spain, Basel and Geneva.

Students have 15-20 contact hours a week in Croatia (except Zagreb), Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden, as well as in areas of France, Germany and Italy. In the cases of Abo, Zagreb, Iceland, Bergamo (Italy) and Lulea (Sweden), students generally have 12 contact hours a week, at least in the early years.

From the information given, I have tried to obtain an idea of staff/student ratios; again one has to draw broad strokes to establish meaningful generalisations. To that extent, one can say that ratios of over 100 are rare but not unknown (individual institutions in Austria, Germany, Italy and Sweden). However, the remaining responding institutes in Germany all recorded figures over 50, as did Zagreb, Italy, two of the four Swiss respondents, one of the Lithuanian universities and one of the Ukrainian

institutions.<sup>39</sup> There are c. 30-50 students per member of staff in Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Macedonia, Norway, Portugal, and Romania, as well as at more than one institution in France. Only Bulgaria, Cyprus, Iceland, Poland, Serbia, and one or two institutions in Croatia, Estonia, Lithuania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Ukraine had figures below 20 students per member of staff.

Classes are consequently usually large across the Continent. Data here is again often difficult to interpret, in part because of problems in distinguishing between individual modules which consist of lectures supported by seminars and entire degrees which are made up of a mix of lectures and seminars (or, given the ambiguity of this term in large parts of Europe, 'small group discussion'). But we also noted a wide variety of responses here from different institutions in the same country, no doubt reflecting the relative level of resources.

Nonetheless, one can say that, generally speaking, large-group lectures dominated in Belgium (Leuven), Greece, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Portugal and Spain, whereas most teaching was delivered in smaller groups in Belgium (Antwerp), Finland, Germany, Poland, Serbia, Slovenia, Switzerland, and Ukraine. All other respondents indicated a more or less even split between the two forms of delivery.<sup>40</sup>

Finally, the nature of the 'English' studied will also be influenced by the ways in which knowledge, understanding and skills are assessed. Eliciting information about assessment practices was complicated for a number of reasons, including the basic issue of whether students accumulate credits or marks on individual modules as they go, or at the end of each semester or year, or whether they are subject (also) to a global examination at the end of their studies (or a combination of the two). This is a major issue, which deserves further investigation: to what extent is students' experience of 'English' integrated, or already to a large extent, parcelled into separate pieces of knowledge?

The data demonstrates that all institutions used a mix of formal written exams, essays done at home, and oral examination, but it was not possible to obtain a precise sense of proportions here. One can, however, safely say that formal written exams dominated

across the Continent, with a heavy reliance also on oral examination in Croatia, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary and Macedonia, whilst oral exams were in fact the principal form of assessment in Italy, Switzerland and Ukraine. Essays written at home and class tests were apparently used almost everywhere, but generally played a minor to negligible role in assessment. On the other hand, a final-year research essay was normally required everywhere except Cyprus, Greece, Macedonia, Norway, Portugal and Spain.

It might also be noted that anonymous submission of written work was extremely rare (Bulgaria, Norway, Ukraine), but some form of double marking was used in Bulgaria, Croatia (sample marking), the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia (final exams), Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Switzerland and Ukraine, as well as at some institutions in Italy, Lithuania and Slovakia.

## NOTES

1. The survey was conducted at a time when the ECTS had begun to be introduced in some countries (as recorded in the reports). However, this is *only* a unit of account; how a credit is actually filled with contact hours, and what resources support out-of-class study time will continue to vary from place to place and system to system.
2. Despite our best efforts to eliminate ambiguities, one should not underestimate the extent to which such variation within a given national system may reflect different readings of the questions.
3. My thanks to the representatives of the national associations of the following countries for their very helpful comments on the draft report: Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, and Slovakia. Thanks also to Adolphe Haberer (France), Michaela Irimia (Romania) and Rick Waswo (Switzerland) for assistance in relation to their countries, and to Tim Caudery for information regarding Scandinavia.
4. Questionnaires were originally sent as follows: Austria 3, Belgium 5, Bulgaria 2, Croatia 5, Cyprus 1, Czech Republic 2, Denmark 7, Estonia 3, Finland 4, France 7, Germany 8, Greece 2, Hungary 1, Iceland 1, Ireland 1, Italy 8, Latvia 3, Luxembourg 1, Macedonia 1, Montenegro 2, Netherlands 5, Norway 6, Poland 7, Portugal 7, Romania 4, Russia 3, Serbia 3, Slovenia 1, Spain 6, Sweden 5, Switzerland 6, Ukraine 7, and UK 13. Further questionnaires were later sent to Hungary (1) and Lithuania (2). Latvia produced 0 returns, and it was decided not to include Luxembourg, since it did not offer a full degree at the time.
5. Unfortunately, two or three hand-written answers and one electronic response seem to have been lost in the transfer of material from the British Council offices to Cardiff.
6. It had proved difficult to obtain responses from the Irish Republic, where similar problems as those found in the UK were anticipated, and so the other Anglophone European state is not included in the survey.
7. That is 70 from which it was possible to produce reports. A further 4 responses were too incomplete for inclusion.
8. English Subject Centre Report Series No. 8, *Survey of the English Curriculum and Teaching in UK Higher Education* (October 2003), available at <<http://www.english.ltsn.ac.uk/resources/general/publications/reports/Curr&Teachmain.pdf>>. The survey employed many elements from the ESSE/BC questionnaire.

## Conclusion

I have repeatedly referred to the 'substantial differences' and variations that lie behind the limited data that a questionnaire like this is capable of eliciting—the differences buried in the 'obvious' or 'natural' and in the ambiguities of the language of the questionnaire itself. But, as I hope to have shown, whilst the questionnaire cannot illuminate those differences, the exercise of designing it and reading the responses is, paradoxically perhaps, peculiarly well suited to making them visible, if only in the form of ambiguities, opacities, obstacles or frustrations. I have sought to indicate some of these along the way, related to the fundamental (and no doubt changing) patterns of teaching and assessment in the particular country, the career and hence power structures of the profession, the implicit understandings of key concepts like 'literature', 'theory', and 'culture', forms of

9. See Mirella Billi, 'University Reform in Italy', *The European English Messenger*, X. 1 (Spring 2001): 10-11.
10. See, for example, the report by Stefania Nuccorini, for Roma Tre.
11. I have used the English terms 'single honours' and 'joint honours' to refer to a university degree in English alone and a degree in English and another subject, respectively. It was not possible to conduct a survey of major/ minor combinations, which are far from universal.
12. The group that drew up the questionnaire hesitated long and hard about questions regarding resources, but concluded that this was both too complex and too delicate an issue for this enterprise.
13. In the cases of Norway and Spain, the situation was even more complicated, with the length of the degree varying between 4 and 5 years, depending on the institution. In Norway, the *cand.mag.* is recognised as equivalent to a BA.
14. To be fully accurate, one should add the 5-year teacher training degree for 'Gymnasiallehrer'.
15. The 3-year 'licenciate' in Poland has been extended from the teacher training colleges to a number of universities as a first 3-year cycle of the 5-year degree.
16. Vienna University informed us that it was introducing a single-subject degree; such a scheme has also recently been proposed in some Portuguese universities.
17. Such a small percentage of students at Zagreb took single honours in English that this option has been discontinued.
18. In the case of Tartu, the combination may amount to single honours. See below.
19. These curricula do not include literature or theoretical linguistics, but share with the academic degrees a strong component of area studies.
20. Government legislation in Denmark has now changed, and students starting their studies from 2005 onward will only be able to take two-subject Bachelor degrees.
21. From 2004-5 in Belgium the combinations of languages has broadened to embrace a wider range of European languages.
22. The case of Romania may be symptomatic of more recent developments here: over the last 6 years or so, new combinations, with Geography, History, Philosophy, as well as Political Science, Business Studies, Economics and Engineering, have been encouraged alongside English with another foreign language.
23. Despite the mixed responses, reflecting the variety of university profiles in Finland, the majority of students do go into teaching, a trend that has become increasingly important in response to a predicted shortage of teachers in the coming future.
24. In Macedonia, Linguistics dominates over Literature along with Culture.
25. There was not a specific question on introductory courses; data here is based on responses to the question: 'Are there any other compulsory courses in Literature?'
26. Medieval literature survives in France largely in optional courses, and more often than not as part of courses in diachronic linguistics. Elsewhere, as in Bucharest, it may play a small role in first-year survey courses or, as for example in Belgium, also exist as a specifically focussed option (e.g. Chaucer).
27. At Vienna University. At the University of Economics and Business Administration, students have the opportunity to take up to 3 optional courses in addition to a compulsory introductory course.
28. In the case of Romania, it should be noted, in the mid-1990s Bucharest put in place a pioneering interdisciplinary MA programme in British Cultural Studies.
29. The list of countries where various understandings of 'Culture' form an increasingly prominent field coincides not only to some extent with many of the countries targeted for the 'British Studies' initiative, but also with the membership of the European Network of British Area Studies, itself reflective in many cases of countries where historical approaches were already implanted. See Eve-Marie Aldridge et al, 'ENBAS: Declaration of Principles', *The European English Messenger*, IX. 1 (Spring 2000): 64 and François Poirier and Slavka Tomascikova, 'ENBAS at ESSE/6', *The European English Messenger*, XII. 1 (Spring 2003): 75-77. At Tromsø in Norway, culture is integrated with literature.
30. Cyprus provides the interesting case of a system with one state and one (now two) private universities. In the case of the latter, courses undergo accreditation by a committee of University of Cyprus and international academics.
31. See Jean-Jacques Lecerclé, 'France is a foreign country: we do things differently here', *The European English Messenger*, IV. 2 (Autumn 1990): 45-47.

32. Denmark is now evaluated on a regular basis.
33. Accreditation will clearly become a major issue under Bologna, and one can expect pressure for the (to my mind) highly problematic practice of 'benchmarking' for purposes of accreditation.
34. We also failed to inquire into the extent that staff recruitment is endogenous to the institution—a practice which is notoriously common on the Continent and often reinforces cultures of professional dependency and patronage (not that obliging people to move after a period of employment necessarily escapes the latter form of economy).
35. Different career structures and therefore different understandings of the categories employed counsel prudence in the interpretation of these figures. Here, perhaps, the survey was occasionally a victim of the Americanisation of English, whereby 'professor' was read as synonymous with 'teachers'. In an attempt to minimise the impact of these differences and ambiguities, I am using a fairly crude measure here by dividing staff between senior professorial and junior or non-professorial staff. There is a large, variable, category below full/associate professor that may or may not be tenured. The position and status of staff charged with language teaching was also not always clear from the responses.
36. No figures were provided for Belgium and France.
37. The situation has changed at Helsinki, where women now occupy 75% of the chairs.
38. No figures were forthcoming for Belgium.
39. The Croatian case is likely to be typical of a number of countries. Zagreb is a very large university, with some 1200 students, whilst the two provincial universities who responded had fewer than 200 each. There are a further two universities in Croatia.
40. In a large number of cases, courses would consist of large or very large lecture groups, supported by often very small (c. 12) seminar groups.

## PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITIES (2000-2002)

### **Austria**

University of Vienna  
Vienna University of Economics and Business  
Administration

### **Belgium**

University of Antwerp  
University of Leuven

### **Bulgaria**

University of Sofia

### **Croatia**

University of Osijek  
Rijeka College of Maritime Studies  
University of Zagreb

### **Cyprus**

Cyprus College  
University of Cyprus

### **Czech Republic**

University Kradec Kralove

### **Denmark**

Aarhus University  
University of Roskilde

### **Estonia**

Estonian Institute of Humanities  
University of Tartu

### **Finland**

Åbo Akademi University  
University of Helsinki  
University of Joensuu

### **France**

Université de Paris IV–Sorbonne  
Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adam  
Université de Provence, Aix-Marseille I  
Université de Valenciennes e du Haut-Cambésis

### **Germany**

RWTH Aachen  
Humboldt University, Berlin  
University of Bochum  
University of Konstanz  
University of Passau

### **Greece**

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens  
Aristotle University Thessaloniki

### **Hungary**

University of Pécs

### **Iceland**

University of Iceland

### **Italy**

Università di Bergamo  
Università degli Studi di Milano

Università di Roma Tre  
Università degli Studi di Verona

#### **Lithuania**

Vilnius University  
Vytautas Magnus University

#### **Macedonia**

Ss Cyril and Methodius University

#### **Netherlands**

University of Amsterdam  
Hague University of Professional Education

#### **Norway**

University of Oslo  
Norwegian University of Science and Technology  
University of Tromsø

#### **Poland**

Kraków Jagiellonian University  
University of Lodz  
Marie Curie Skłodowska University

#### **Portugal**

Universidade de Coimbra  
Universidade Nova de Lisboa  
Universidade do Minho  
Universidade do Porto

#### **Romania**

University of Cluj  
University of Timisoara

#### **Serbia and Montenegro**

University of Montenegro  
University of Nis

#### **Slovakia**

Comenius University Bratislava  
University of Presov

#### **Slovenia**

University of Ljubljana

#### **Spain**

Universidad de Alcalá  
Universidad de Málaga  
Universidad de Zaragoza

#### **Sweden**

Luleå University of Technology

#### **Switzerland**

University of Basel  
University of Geneva  
Université de Lausanne  
Université de Neuchâtel  
Universität Zürich

#### **Ukraine**

Donetsk State University  
Kharkiv National University  
Nizhyn Pedagogical University  
Poltava State Pedagogical University

## **CONTRIBUTORS**

Hélio Alves, Jozsef Andor, Dawn Behne, Teresa Bela, Olga Bessonova, Gerd Bjorhovde, Einer Bjorvand, Karin Boklund-Lagopoulou, Mario Brdar, Jacques Carré, Laura Castor, Tim Caudery, Gagliardi Cesare, Janja Ciglar-Zanic, Gualter Cunha, Ludmyla Danilyuk, Milda Danyte, Julian M. D'Arcy, Kristin Davidse, Leo van der Deijl, Celestino Deleyto, Thierry Demory, Ludwig Deringer, Anna Despotopoulou, Max Duperray, Rolf Eichler, Viera Eliasová, Andreas Fischer, Neil Forsyth, Barbara Frodl, Felipe Furtado, Fernando Galván, Jana Göhrisch, Maurizio Gotti, Ruth Gounelas, Stipe Grgas, Adolphe Haberer, Luc Herman, Pilar Hidalgo, Ton Hoenselaars, Elly Ifantidou, Giovanni Iamartino, Mihaela Irimia, Ljubica Janeshlieva, Branka Kalogjera, Jürgen Kamm, Vesela Katsarova, Aleksandra Kedzierska, Smiljana Komar, Blanka Klimova, Ebbe Klitgard, Stephan Kohl, Slavka Krajcovicova-Tomascikova, Maria Kurdi, Olivera Kusovac, Vesna Lopicic, Dora Macek, Lachlan Mackenzie, Ulf Magnusson, Jacinta Matos, Gerlinde Mautner, Silvia Mergenthal, Krista Mits, Lilo Moessner, Uros Mozetic, Tuula Murros, Stefania Nuccorini, Suzana Onega, Barbara Olsson, Carlo Pagetti, Hortensia Pärlog, Michael Parsons, Gunnar Persson, François Poirier, Raili Pöldsaa, Rob Pope, S. I. Potapenko, Boris Pritchard, Irena Przemicka, Ryszard Rasinski, Emmanuel Roudaut, H. Ringbom, Manuela Rossini, Regina Rudaityte, Jan Rusiecki, Hedwig Schwall, Irina Shevchenko, Christo Stamenov, Virgil Stanciu, Stephanos Stephanides, John A Stotesbury, David Spurr, Gerd Stratmann, Helena Tampierova, Eva Tandlichová, Irma Taavitsainen, Richard Todd, Merle Tönnies, Petra Tournay-Theodotou, Rick Waswo.