The Changing Academy – The Changing Academic Profession in International Comparative Perspective 7

Peter James Bentley · Hamish Coates
Ian R. Dobson · Leo Goedegebuure
V. Lynn Meek *Editors*

Job Satisfaction around the Academic World

Springer

Job Satisfaction around the Academic World

The Changing Academy – The Changing Academic Profession in International Comparative Perspective 7

Scope of the series

As the landscape of higher education has in recent years undergone significant changes, so correspondingly have the backgrounds, specializations, expectations and work roles of academic staff. The Academy is expected to be more professional in teaching, more productive in research and more entrepreneurial in everything. Some of the changes involved have raised questions about the attractiveness of an academic career for today's graduates. At the same time, knowledge has come to be identified as the most vital resource of contemporary societies.

The Changing Academy series examines the nature and extent of the changes experienced by the academic profession in recent years. It explores both the reasons for and the consequences of these changes. It considers the implications of the changes for the attractiveness of the academic profession as a career and for the ability of the academic community to contribute to the further development of knowledge societies and the attainment of national goals. It makes comparisons on these matters between different national higher education systems, institutional types, disciplines and generations of academics, drawing initially on available data-sets and qualitative research studies with special emphasis on the recent twenty nation survey of the Changing Academic Profession. Among the themes featured will be:

1. Relevance of the Academy's Work
2. Internationalization of the Academy
3. Current Governance and Management, particularly as perceived by the Academy
4. Commitment of the Academy

The audience includes researchers in higher education, sociology of education and political science studies; university managers and administrators; national and institutional policymakers; officials and staff at governments and organizations, e.g. the World Bank.

For further volumes:
http://www.springer.com/series/8668

Peter James Bentley • Hamish Coates
Ian R. Dobson • Leo Goedegebuure
V. Lynn Meek
Editors

Job Satisfaction around the Academic World

Springer

Editors
Peter James Bentley
LH Martin Institute for Higher Education
Leadership and Management
Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Ian R. Dobson
Higher Education Governance
and Management Unit
University of Helsinki
Helsinki, Finland

V. Lynn Meek
LH Martin Institute for Higher Education
Leadership and Management
Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Hamish Coates
LH Martin Institute for Higher Education
Leadership and Management
Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Leo Goedegebuure
LH Martin Institute for Higher Education
Leadership and Management
Melbourne, VIC, Australia

ISBN 978-94-007-5433-1 ISBN 978-94-007-5434-8 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-5434-8
Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg New York London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2012947950

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Contents

About the Authors

Timo Aarrevaara is a professor of Higher Education, Organisation and Governance at the University of Helsinki, Finland, where he was awarded a Ph.D. in 1998. He has held a docent's position in Administrative Science at the University of Tampere since 2000. Timo has professional experience in public administration as well as research and teaching. He is a member of the boards of the Finnish Graduate School in Higher Education Administration, Management and Economics and the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers in Finland. He has also chaired and participated in several quality evaluation and auditing projects. He has acted as the principal investigator in the Finnish *Changing Academic Profession* Project (CAP) and has participated on behalf of Finland at CAP consortium meetings and the Finnish associate project of the *Academic Profession in Europe: Responses to Societal Challenges*. He has produced several publications and presented papers at international symposia on this topic.

Akira Arimoto is professor and director of Higher Education at the Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE) at Hijiyama University and professor emeritus of Hiroshima University, Japan. He is an associate member of the Japan Council of Science and president of the National Association of Research Institutes for Higher Education. He is a member of editorial board of the book series 'Higher Education Dynamics'. He was professor and director of the RIHE at Hiroshima University. Akira served as chair of UNESCO's Global Scientific Committee for the Asian and Pacific Region, president of the Japanese Association of Higher Education Research (JAHER) and president of the Japan Society of Educational Sociology (JSES). He was a visiting fellow to Yale University, the Max Planck Institute and Lancaster University and the first Nitobe fellow at the International House of Japan.

Norzaini Azman Ph.D. is an associate professor of Adult and Higher Education at the Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM). She is currently an associate research fellow at the National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN) and at the Institute for Environment and Development (LESTARI), UKM. Her research interests include academia, HE policy and management and sustainability

of higher education. Norzaini has frequently been involved in consultancy work and contract research for Asian Development Bank, UNESCO Paris and International Association of Universities (IAU). She sits on many working committees at the national and ministerial level formulating policies and action plans for Malaysian higher education.

Elizabeth Balbachevsky is an associate professor at the Department of Political Science at the University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil, deputy director of the University of São Paulo's Centre for Public Policy Research (Núcleo de Pesquisa de Políticas Públicas – NUPPs-USP) and fellow at the Higher Education Group in the Centre for Advanced Studies at University of Campinas (CEAv-UNICAMP). She was a Fulbright New Century Scholar for 2005–2006 and Erasmus Mundus Scholar at the European Masters in Higher Education Programme (2009). She attended the masters program on Social Sciences at the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (1982–1985), obtained her Ph.D. in political science from the University of São Paulo in 1995 and had her Habilitation in Comparative studies on Higher Education and Research Policies at the Department of Political Science at the same University (2005).

Alice Bennion is a former research associate, Centre for Higher Education Research and Information (CHERI) at the Open University, United Kingdom. Between 2007 and 2010, she was working alongside William Locke analysing data and contributing to publications relating to the international study of the 'Changing Academic Profession', including chapters for books and journal articles. In addition, she has worked on the nationally funded project 'Higher Education and Regional Transformation' (HEaRT) which investigated the complex relationship between 'disadvantage' communities and their local higher education institutions.

Alice completed her doctorate in 2009 at the Institute of Education, University of London. Her doctoral research examined changing family forms and contemporary family life with a particular focus on the relationship between home and school. This work highlighted the current contradictions which exist within modern family life emphasising the inherent gendered assumptions that surround parenting.

Teresa Carvalho is professor at the University of Aveiro and senior researcher at CIPES. Her main research interests are institutional governance and management, and academic profession and gender in higher education. Recent publications include articles in *Higher Education, Higher Education Quarterly, European Journal of Education, Higher Education Policy, Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, Journal of Management Research, Tertiary Education and Management and Equal Opportunities International*. She is also co-editor of *The Changing Dynamics of Higher Education Middle Management* (Springer, 2010).

Tsukasa Daizen has been a professor at the Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University since 2001. He graduated from the Faculty of Teacher Education in Hiroshima University in 1982 and completed a master's program in Educational Studies, Graduate School of Education in Hiroshima University in 1984. In 1986, Prof Daizen became a research assistant in the Research Institute for

Higher Education in Hiroshima University. He became a lecturer in 1990 and an assistant professor in 1992 in the Faculty of Law and Letters, University of Ryukyus. In 1997, he became a professor in the Research Institute for Lifelong Learning in University of the Ryukyus. His main research areas are the interrelationships between secondary and university education, and faculty development.

Diana Dias is associate professor in ISLA Campus Lx – Laureate International Universities – and in Universidade Lusófona do Porto. She is also a researcher at Centre for Research on Higher Education Policies (CIPES). With an undergraduate degree in psychology and a postgraduate diploma in psychotherapy and guidance counselling, she holds a Ph.D. in Educational Sciences from the Faculty of Psychology at the University of Porto. Besides the exercise as a developmental psychologist, she took along her career several management positions of academic, scientific and pedagogically coordination. Currently, her research focuses on higher education with particular interests in the evaluation of quality, quality assurance, funding systems and access and equality. Recent publications include articles in *Higher Education, Studies in Higher Education Quarterly, European Journal of Education, Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, European Journal of Engineering Education, Quality in Higher Education and European Journal of Psychology of Education*.

Donald Fisher is a professor and head of the Department of Educational Studies and codirector of the Centre for Policy Studies in Higher Education and Training (CHET) at the University of British Columbia, Canada. His research on philanthropy, university education, the social sciences and academic-industry relations is supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. His most recent publication emerging from work on marketisation is a co-edited volume with Adrienne Chan (2008), *The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture* (Vancouver: The University of British Columbia Press). Dr. Fisher is a past president of the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (CFHSS).

Yves Gingras is professor in the Department of History at Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM) and Canada Research chair in History and Sociology of Science. In recent years, he has published in journals like *History of European Ideas, History of Science, Social Studies of Science, Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française Scientometrics, JASIST* and *Research Evaluation*. His most recent book is *Propos sur les sciences* (Paris, Raisons D'Agir, 2010).

Ester A. Höhle is a researcher of sociology and higher education research affiliated to the International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER) at the University of Kassel in Germany. Her areas of research include student careers, careers of Ph.D. holders, the academic profession, sociology of science and technology and gender. She works theoretically as well as empirically, mainly in quantitative surveys but has done qualitative work as well. She spent 1 year as a student in PA, USA, and obtained her master's degree at the University of Stuttgart in Germany. In recent

years, she has worked on a range of sociological projects at the University of Stuttgart, University of Hohenheim and the Technical University of Munich. She has published a number of articles about the topics risk perception of climatic change, freshman study phase in STEM disciplines under gender aspects and several articles about several aspects of the academic profession using the German as well as the international CAP and EUROAC data. Concurrently, she is co-editing the second volume of the series about the international survey in 12 countries in the EUROAC project.

Glen A. Jones is the Ontario Research chair in Postsecondary Education Policy and Measurement and professor of higher education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. His research focuses on higher education policy, systems and governance, including comparative analyses of higher education systems and policy. His research and contract activities have included work for the UNESCO, the Bertelsmann Foundation, the Ford Foundation and numerous governments and government agencies. He is a former editor of the *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* and a past president of the Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education. In 2001, he received the Society's Research Award for his contributions to higher education scholarship in Canada, and in 2011 he received the Society's Distinguished Member Award. His most recent edited books include *Creating Knowledge, Strengthening Nations: The Changing Role of Higher Education* (with Patricia McCarney and Michael Skolnik, University of Toronto Press, 2005), *Canada's Universities Go Global* (with Roopa Desai Trilokekar and Adrian Shubert, Lorimer, 2009) and *Universities and Regional Development: A Critical Assessment of Tensions and Contradictions* (with Romulo Pinheiro and Paul Benneworth, Routledge, 2012).

William Locke is head of Learning and Teaching policy at the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). At HEFCE, he leads on the council's policy on teaching funding, quality, the student experience and the provision of information for prospective students. Between 2006 and 2010, he managed the UK part of the international study of the Changing Academic Profession. At this time, he was assistant director and principal policy analyst of the Centre for Higher Education Research and Information (CHERI) at the Open University in the UK. He has co-edited two books, including Changing Governance and Management in Higher Education: The Perspectives of the Academy, published by Springer in 2011, which won the US Comparative and International Education Society's Award for best higher education comparative book of 2011. William has published and co-written several journal articles on the academic profession, higher education policy and institutional management, book chapters on the impact of ranking systems on higher education institutions, the marketisation of UK higher education and the academic profession, and policy reports on league tables, graduates' retrospective views of their courses, student engagement, excellence in teaching and learning, and the academic profession. He has spoken at international conferences in Australia, China, Japan and North America and throughout Europe. He is a member of the Governing Council of the Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE) and

the Advisory Board of the North American Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) HE Report Series, published by Jossey-Bass.

Maria de Lourdes Machado-Taylor holds a licenciatura in economics from the University of Porto, postgraduate studies in administration and a Ph.D., both from the University of Minho (Portugal). She was head of Administration of the Polytechnic Institute in Bragança (Portugal). She is a researcher at the Agency for Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education (A3ES) and senior research associate at the Centre for Research on Higher Education Policies (CIPES), Portugal. Her areas of research include management, strategic planning, the non-university sector and gender studies. She is the author of books on higher education and other publications in European and American journals such as *Australian Universities' Review, European Journal of Education, Higher Education Policy, Planning for Higher Education, Tertiary Education and Management*, and *Higher Education Management and Policy*.

Mónica Marquina is senior professor at the National University of General Sarmiento, Argentina. She is former head of the Education Department of the Institute of Human Development and current academic secretary of the institute. She has a doctorate in higher education from the University of Palermo, Argentina, and a master's degree from the Boston College Higher Education Administration Program (USA). She teaches on several undergraduate and graduate courses in Educational Policy, Comparative Education, University Governance and Management, and Evaluation and Accreditation. She has authored books on the Argentinean university system and chapters and articles on Educational Policy, Higher Education Policies, the Academic Profession and Comparative Education in local and international journals and books. She holds the post of General Secretary of the Argentinean Society of Comparative Studies in Education (SAECE).

Amy Scott Metcalfe is an assistant professor of higher education in the Department of Educational Studies at the University of British Columbia. Her work explores the intersections between governments, higher education institutions, intermediating organisations and the market, with particular attention towards the production cycles of research. She has recently published in the *Journal of Higher Education*, *Higher Education*, *Critical Sociology* and the *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*. She is currently a coordinating editor of *Higher Education*.

Gabriel Rebello is assistant professor at the National University of General Sarmiento, Argentina, and at the University of Buenos Aires. He is a doctoral candidate on the Doctoral Programme of Education (UNTREF – UNLA – Argentina). He teaches on undergraduate and graduate courses on Educational Administration, Educational Policies, and Education and Development. His current research interests are in higher education and the academic profession. He has collaborated as coauthor on several articles and chapters about these topics.

Kjell Rubenson had the first chair in Sweden in adult education and was the dean of education at Linkoping University before moving to Canada where he is a professor

of education at the University of British Columbia and codirector of the Centre for Policy Studies in Higher Education and Training. He has been the research supervisor for several large national and international projects that have addressed structures, polices and outcomes of adult and higher education. He is the founding president of the European Society for the Study of Education of Adults. He has conducted research and consultancy for a variety of national and international bodies including the OECD for which he was responsible for National Reviews of Educational Policies on lifelong learning, UNESCO and the European Commission, where he was a member of the scientific advisory board of EURYDICE. He was a research consultant to the Swedish Parliamentary Committee on Popular Education and the Swedish Parliamentary Committee on the New Initiative in Adult Education.

Mohd Ali Samsudin is a senior lecturer in the School of Educational Studies, Universiti Sains, Malaysia. He teaches several statistics courses for postgraduate students and conducts workshops with Rasch model analysis and structural equation modelling (SEM). He also leads several community projects in rural areas of Kuala Muda, Kedah, to enhance children's interest in learning science.

Rui Santiago is professor at the University of Aveiro and a senior researcher at CIPES. His main research interests are the institutional governance and management and the academic profession. Rui's recent publications include articles in *Higher Education Quarterly, Higher Education, Higher Education Policy* and *European Journal of Education*. He is also co-editor of *Non-University Higher Education in Europe* (Springer, 2008) and of *The Changing Dynamics of Higher Education Middle Management* (Springer, 2010).

Simon Schwartzman is the president of the Instituto de Estudos do Trabalho e Sociedade in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and was a Fulbright New Century Scholar in 2009–2010. He studied sociology, political science and public administration at the Federal University of Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte (1958–1961); attended UNESCO's Latin American School of Social Sciences (FLACSO) in Santiago de Chile (1962–1963); and obtained his Ph.D. in political science from the University of California, Berkeley in 1973. He is a member of the Brazilian Academy of Sciences and a recipient of the Brazilian Order of Scientific Merit.

Morshidi Bin Sirat is currently the deputy director-general (public sector) of the Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia. He has served as the director of National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN) from 2005 to 2011. He holds a Ph.D. degree from University of Southampton, England; M.Sc. (Econs) in Regional Development Planning from University College of Swansea, University of Wales; and B.A. (Hons) in Town and Country Planning from Council for National Academic Awards/Glasgow School of Art, Glasgow, Scotland. His research interests are in Higher Education Policy and Management, Changing Academic Profession, Changing State-Higher Education Institutions Relationship and in Knowledge Spaces and the City-Region: the Case of Kuala Lumpur city region (constructing knowledge spaces). Professor Dr. Morshidi Bin

Sirat has also authored many publications ranging from books, chapters in books, international renowned journals and conferences.

Iain Snee is a graduate research assistant for the Canadian team of researchers working on the Changing Academic Profession project housed at the Centre for Policy Studies in Higher Education and Training at the University of British Columbia. While pursuing his master's in higher education, he provides technical support for statistical analysis of the Canadian and international survey responses.

Sofia Sousa is a researcher in the field of higher education studies and sociology of science. Trained as an educationalist, she has finished her Ph.D. in 2011. She has used discourse analysis to study the transformation of modes of knowledge production and the academic community in Portugal and in England. Her main research interests are related to higher education research policies, academic community/profession, knowledge production, networks in education, epistemology and methodology in social sciences, and discourse analysis. She has been developing her work, since 2004, at the Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES) at Portugal, and she is involved with several national and international research projects.

Ulrich Teichler is professor and former director of the International Centre for Higher Education Research, University of Kassel, Germany. Born in 1942, he was a student of sociology at the Free University of Berlin and researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Educational Research Berlin. His doctoral dissertation was on higher education in Japan. He has had extended periods of research in Japan, the Netherlands and the USA. For a period, he was professor on a part-time/short-term basis at the Northwestern University (USA), the College of Europe (Belgium), Hiroshima University (Japan) and the Open University (UK). Key research areas include higher education and the world of work, comparison of higher education systems and international mobility in higher education. Ulrich has more than 1,000 publications to his name. He is a member of the International Academy of Education and the Academia Europaea, former chairman of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers, former president and distinguished member of EAIR and Dr. h.c. of the University of Turku (Finland).

Charl C. Wolhuter studied at the Rand Afrikaans University, the University of Pretoria, the University of South Africa, and the University of Stellenbosch, South Africa. He obtained a doctorate in Comparative Education at the University of Stellenbosch. He was a junior lecturer in History of Education and Comparative Education at the University of Pretoria and a senior lecturer in History of Education and Comparative Education at the University of Zululand. Charl is currently a professor in Comparative Education at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North-West University, South Africa. He is the author of various books and articles on the history of education and comparative education.

Julian Weinrib is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. His research interests focus on the internationalisation and globalisation of higher education systems and institutions, with particular focus on the changing role of research and its relation to issues of academic culture and autonomy. His dissertation project focuses on the political sociology of development assistance directed at building research capacity in higher education institutions in low-income countries.

About the Editors

Peter James Bentley is a research fellow at the LH Martin Institute, University of Melbourne. He holds a European Master in Higher Education, jointly awarded by the Universities of Oslo, Tampere and Aveiro under the European Commission's Erasmus Mundus programme. He previously worked with the Norwegian CAP project team at NIFU (Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education). He has also worked in policy and administration for state and territory governments in Australia. His previous research examined gender differences in academic research productivity, time use and popular science publishing.

Hamish Coates is director of Higher Education Research at the Australian Council for Educational Research and an associate professor with the LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management. He conducts research and development across many areas of higher education. Over the last decade, he has led a large number of projects that have influenced research, policy and practice. Dr Coates' publications focus on the definition, measurement and evaluation of education processes, contexts and outcomes. Active interests include large-scale evaluation, tertiary education policy, institutional strategy, outcomes assessment, learner engagement, academic work and leadership, quality assurance, tertiary admissions and assessment methodology.

Ian R. Dobson was a career administrator in Australian higher education institutions from 1971 to 2005, at which time circumstances allowed him to become a freelance data analyst, writer and English reviser. Now based in Finland for much of each year, he is currently working as a research director with the University of Helsinki and works casually as an English language reviser of PhDs, academic papers, policy documents, websites and manuals. He is editor of the Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management (Taylor & Francis) and the Australian Universities' Review (NTEU). His research interests include access and equity, student fees, university funding, the brain drain, academic/general staff relationships and the decline of science in Australian universities. On the latter topic, he recently completed a report on university science in the twenty-first century for Australia's Chief Scientist. In recent times, he has been involved with the CAP project, working with the teams

from Australia and Finland, and on the EUROAC project with the Finnish team. He is also an honorary senior research fellow with the School of Education and Arts, University of Ballarat, Australia.

Leo Goedegebuure is deputy director at the LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management, the University of Melbourne. Prior to his move to Australia in 2005, Leo was executive director of the Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) at the University of Twente, the Netherlands. His interests are in the areas of governance and management at the system and institutional levels, system dynamics including large-scale restructuring policies, university-industry relationships and institutional mergers. He has worked as an expert on governance and management in Central and Eastern Europe, the Russian Federation, Africa, Southeast Asia and South America on projects initiated by the European Commission, the World Bank and UNESCO.

V. Lynn Meek is professor and foundation director of the LH Martin Institute of Higher Education Leadership and Management at the University of Melbourne. Having completed a Ph.D. in the sociology of higher education at the University of Cambridge, he has nearly three-decade experience researching higher education policy issues. Specific research interests include governance and management, research management, diversification of higher education institutions and systems, institutional amalgamations, organisational change and comparative study of higher education systems. He has attracted numerous competitive research grants, is regularly invited to address international conferences and is frequently invited to be a guest editor of international journals with respect to special issues on particular aspects of higher education policy. Professor Meek has published over 30 books and monographs and numerous book chapters and scholarly articles. He is on the editorial board of several international journals and book series and has worked with such international agencies as UNESCO and OECD.

Chapter 1
Introduction: Satisfaction Around the World?

Peter James Bentley, Hamish Coates, Ian R. Dobson, Leo Goedegebuure, and V. Lynn Meek

The initial working title of this book was *I Can't Get No....: Job Satisfaction Around the Academic World. Advice from the CAP Survey*. Intended as a play on the words of the Rolling Stones' classic 1965 hit, the publishers, however, felt that the editors were showing their age and that few readers born after 1960 would get the "joke". Nonetheless, the degree that academics are contented with and committed to their scholarly careers is increasingly becoming a key ingredient in social, cultural and economic well-being everywhere. A vibrant academic profession attracting the best and brightest of the next generation may indeed be what gives a nation a competitive edge in a global knowledge-based economy. Hit tunes may come and go, but the importance of academics' teaching and research efforts in producing highly skilled human capital and enhancement of innovation is an enduring feature of most if not all societies.

Given its importance, surprisingly little at an aggregate level is known about the people who teach and carry out research in universities, about the characteristics of the academic profession or about what is required to ensure its sustainability and future development. We do know, however, that there are a number of characteristics peculiar to the higher education and research sector: authority relationships are loosely coupled (Weick 1976) and goals are multiple and often ambiguous

P.J. Bentley • L. Goedegebuure • V.L. Meek
L.H. Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

H. Coates
L.H. Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), Melbourne, Australia

I.R. Dobson (✉)
Higher Education Governance and Management Unit, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

School of Education and Arts, University of Ballarat, Australia
e-mail: ian.dobson@helsinki.fi

P.J. Bentley et al. (eds.), *Job Satisfaction around the Academic World*, The Changing Academy – The Changing Academic Profession in International Comparative Perspective 7,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-5434-8_1,

(Cohen and March 1974); organisational subunits are fragmented (Clark 1983), and the principal workers – "the academic professionals" – have a strong influence "on the determination of goals, on the management and administration of institutions and on the daily routines of work" (Enders 2006). Whilst acknowledging that there is debate over the degree to which academics constitute a profession in the classical sense and that insofar that there is an academic profession, it is one fractured by disciplinary tribalism (Becher 1989; Becher and Trowler 2001) and paradigmatic allegiance (Kuhn 1962); this book assumes that the academic community constitutes a field or collective worthy of analysis in its own right (Kogan et al. 1994; Graubard 2001; Levine 1997; Farnham 1999; Enders 2001; Altbach 2000). Perkin (1969) goes so far as identifying the academic profession as the "key profession" providing the knowledge base and certification for all other professions.

As higher education itself has grown and diversified in recent years, so has the academic profession. With the massification of student enrolments, universities no longer enjoy the privileges of their former elite status and neither do academics (Levine 1997). Under what Teichler (2003) terms post-massification, academics nearly everywhere are asked to work longer hours for less money relative to salary scales of a couple of decades ago and to that earned by other professional groups (Welch 1998; Ward and Sloane 2000). In many countries, the academic profession is increasingly insecure, more accountable, more differentiated, more internationalised and less likely to be organised along disciplinary lines. In most OECD countries, the academic profession is aging, whilst there is evidence to suggest that the most intellectually talented of the younger generation do not view an academic career as attractive as they once did (Harman 2003). Academics are asked to supplement their traditional functions of teaching and research with those of community relevance and entrepreneurial pursuits, clearly demonstrating to their institutional masters that they earn their salaries (Henkel 2001).

At the same time, they have lost some of their traditional autonomy of control over work time and output (Gappa 2001). "Overall trust in the self-steering capacities of academics as long-standing and deeply socialized professionals that are best left alone and only symbolically represented by institutional and governmental leadership is diminishing" (Enders 2006: 11). Whilst the number of students they each have to instruct rises, the resources per student for doing that task fall. The teaching task itself becomes more "professionalised", requiring training and monitoring. Many of the teaching functions of tenured academics are being outsourced to lower-level casual contract staff (Clark 1997; Altbach 1997). Research is required to be strategic and relevant, whilst the presumed defining characteristic of university teaching informed by research is under challenge in several jurisdictions (Owen-Smith and Powell 2001; Rip 2004). A private higher education sector has become more prominent in many parts of the world, and new approaches to governance and management are evolving in both private and public sectors. Some argue that the very definition of an academic has become ambiguous, as have the boundaries between academic jobs and the jobs of other professionals, both within and beyond the walls of the academy (Askling 2001).

There are complaints that academic professionals are being turned into mere knowledge workers (Newson 1993), that the rise of the entrepreneurial university (Clark 2004) has turned some academics from the values of scholarship to those of academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie 1997) and that the academic profession is an endangered species (Graubard 2001; Delbanco 2005). It is a profession that "seems to have lost some of its political standing and bargaining power with society" (Enders 2006: 4).

With expansion of higher education has come increasing differentiation, increasing expectations from society and an evolution of professional roles that may take academics away from their original disciplines towards new forms of identity and loyalty. At the same time, knowledge has come to be identified as the most vital resource of contemporary societies, and many nations have taken great strides to improve their capacity for knowledge creation and application. This new devotion to knowledge has both expanded the role of the academy and challenged the coherence and viability of the traditional academic role (Rothblatt 1997).

Whereas the highest goal of the traditional academy was to create and transmit fundamental knowledge, what has been described as the "scholarship of discovery", the new emphasis of the knowledge society is on useful knowledge or the "scholarship of application". This scholarship often involves the pooling and melding of insights from several disciplines and tends to focus on outcomes that have a direct impact on everyday life. One consequence is that many future scholars, though trained in the disciplines, will work in applied fields and may have options of employment in these fields outside of the academy. This provides new opportunities for career mobility and knowledge transfer amongst sectors whilst it may also create recruitment difficulties in some areas and especially in fields such as science, technology and engineering. Moreover, pressures on the academic profession need to be seen in the light of the changing nature of work in the knowledge society generally (Gibbons et al. 1994; Nowotny et al. 2001), as well as a wider questioning of professional authority within society (Henkel 2001).

Despite global pressures, national traditions and local socio-economic circumstances continue to play an important role in shaping academic life and have a major impact on career attractiveness. Yet today's global trends, with their emphasis on knowledge production and information flow, play an increasingly important role in the push towards the internationalisation of higher education (Marginson and Rhodes 2002). The international mobility of students and staff has grown; new technologies connect scholarly communities around the world; and English has become the new lingua franca of the international community.

The economic and political power of a country, its size and geographic location, its dominant culture, the quality of its higher education system and the language it uses for academic discourse and publications are factors that bring with them different approaches to internationalisation. Local and regional differences in approach are also to be found (Currie et al. 2003; Amaral et al. 2003). The lucrative international student market puts new pressures on the academic profession. The functions of international networks, the implications of differential access to them

(including student markets) and the role of new communication technologies appear to be internationalising the profession in various ways.

In academic teaching and research, where professional values are traditionally firmly woven into the very fabric of knowledge production and dissemination, attempts to introduce change are sometimes received with scepticism and opposition (Enders and Teichler 1997; Trowler 1998). At the same time, a greater professionalisation of higher education management is regarded as necessary to enable higher education to respond effectively to a rapidly changing external environment. The control and management of academic work will help define the nature of academic roles – including the division of labour in the academy, with a growth of newly professionalised "support" roles and a possible breakdown of the traditional teaching/research nexus. New systemic and institutional processes such as quality assurance have been introduced which also change traditional distributions of power and values within academe and may be a force for change in academic practice.

In summary, then, over the last few decades a host of complex but mostly interrelated factors have brought pressure to bear on the academic profession in all countries. Beside some anecdotal evidence, however, little is known about how the academic profession is responding to the pressures and changing environmental conditions outlined above, particularly from a comparative perspective. To this end, this book examines the academic profession internationally focusing on the organising concept of "career satisfaction".

Researchers from 11 countries accepted an invitation to participate in this project, using data drawn from their participation in the recent international survey of the Changing Academic Profession – or CAP survey. CAP involves a common survey of academics in 18 countries from 5 continents. CAP national experts from the following countries contributed to this book: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Finland, Germany, Japan, Malaysia, Portugal, South Africa and the United Kingdom.

Taking academics' impressions of their job satisfaction as the focus, contributors were asked to address a number of dimensions that may influence satisfaction, such as:

- For those countries with a binary system of higher education, is there a difference in academics' attitudes from either side of the binary divide?
- Are there different levels of satisfaction based on seniority?
- Are there different levels of satisfaction based on gender?
- Are there different levels of satisfaction based on both seniority and gender?
- Does the discipline have an impact?
- Do academics with a preference for teaching over research have different opinions?

The national experts were asked to build their analysis around the job satisfaction questions from the CAP survey and the variables that lead to lower or higher job satisfaction in their country. Where relevant, the contributors were asked to consider a number of composite indices based on the relevant CAP survey questions (these are specified in the individual chapters as appropriate).

The following country chapters examine the nature of academic job satisfaction and the role it plays in academic attitudes about their profession in each of the countries.

The concluding chapter attempts a comparative analysis of the data present in each country-specific contribution.

The country chapters begin with Argentina. The academic profession in Argentina shares some common characteristics with other Latin American countries, such as low salaries and high levels of part-time staffing. Therefore, most teachers do not conduct research in addition to teaching. The low teaching salary levels have been another feature of Latin American university conditions. The academic profession in Argentina, in the context of Latin America, is a profession at the periphery, dependent on the main centres of knowledge and scientific networks worldwide.

The Argentina CAP survey comprised all academics in public universities, i.e. those teachers in any position and time devoted to work, as the target population. Satisfaction in this chapter is measured by considering responses to 33 questions grouped into eight items, based on overall satisfaction, physical infrastructure, service provision, teaching- and/or research-related issues, influence, support and the "would I do it again" question.

Compared with other countries, Argentina has an overall satisfaction value similar to the international average, and it is significantly above that average when considering career improvement. The Argentina data suggests that the closer environmental and career conditions are to international standards, the greater is the satisfaction with academic work.

Studies of job satisfaction in Australian universities have routinely offered a somewhat depressing image of life in the academy, calling into question the sustainability of an industry reliant upon autonomously motivated knowledge workers. For universities to reverse the despondent outlook of their academic staff, one must pay attention to their primary sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the factors associated with job satisfaction amongst Australian university academics, with reference to Hagedorn's (2000) conceptual framework.

Satisfaction tends to be higher amongst those who have recently been promoted and lower amongst mid-career academics. And Australian higher education has experienced profound change over the last 15 years in all areas that matter to its primary functions of teaching and learning and research: financial resources, competition, volume of students and the diversity of the student body, accountability, regulation and governance.

At the same time, the core issues identified in this chapter are not new. The degree of satisfaction has been an issue for concern since the early 1990s, and academic time spent on nonacademic activities and the perceived inability to spend sufficient time on research have been persistent factors contributing to these relatively low levels of satisfaction. It would be very difficult to ignore management responsibility for "cumbersome administrative processes" as it would be equally difficult to deny institutional management and academic leadership responsibility for both a reasonable work-life balance and a reasonable workload distribution that reflects both institutional/departmental needs and staff interests and abilities. There are persistent issues that look unlikely to be resolved in the very near future. This, first, raises the question of what this means for Australian academe in the coming

years and second, what the implications are for the governance and management of the university system and its institutions.

Brazilian higher education is a known case of extreme diversity with 89% of its more than 2,300 institutions being private. Institutions range from small, family-owned, professionally oriented schools to huge research universities with budgets of more than two billion dollars a year. This diverse institutional environment creates differences in opportunity and expectations amongst academics and is relevant to understanding variations in the general satisfaction academics hold towards different aspects of their professional life.

One would expect that job satisfaction of academics would vary according to the type of institution in which they work. Surprisingly, in Brazil satisfaction tends to be uniformly high regardless of the institutional setting. Moreover the patterns of distribution of answers to questions that cover different aspects of job satisfaction tend to be the same, regardless of the huge differences in contracts and working conditions.

Each kind of institution is marked by a particular environment and promotes different values. So, for academics working in different types of institution, job satisfaction is linked to different dimensions of academic life. Satisfaction is related to specific strategic dimensions that vary from one type of institution to another and define the institutions' place within the country's higher education system. Brazilian academics generally expressed a great degree of satisfaction with their job conditions, and it appears that academic institutions in Brazil continue to be successful in attending to their academic staff's core expectations.

Full-time academics working at Canadian universities reported high levels of job satisfaction. In responding to a direct question on job satisfaction, approximately 74% of academic staff indicated very high or high levels of satisfaction, and less than 10% reported low or very low levels of satisfaction with their current job. The vast majority of respondents also reported that they were pleased with their career choice. Approximately 77% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "if I had to do it over again, I would not become an academic", whilst just over 11% of respondents agreed with the statement and roughly the same number provided a neutral response.

High levels of satisfaction with their current position were tempered by less positive responses to questions focusing on change over time, job strain and perceptions of the future. Almost 40% of respondents indicated that the overall working conditions in higher education had deteriorated over the course of their careers, and only 23% reported that working conditions had improved (with 38% providing a neutral response). When asked whether "this is a poor time for any young person to begin an academic career", almost 45% of respondents disagreed, whilst 35% provided a positive response. Approximately 42% of academics indicated that their job was a source of considerable personal strain, whilst 31% disagreed with the statement. In terms of overall job satisfaction, Canadian academics are satisfied with their jobs, but some believe that working conditions are not what they used to be and there are concerns about the future.

Finland's higher education system is a binary one, built around institutions known as the "university" and the "polytechnic". In contrast with recent higher

education history in other countries, the Finnish binary system was a recent creation, with polytechnics having just reached their twentieth anniversary. The polytechnics now refer themselves as "universities of applied sciences" but were established to provide vocationally oriented education and training. They were established primarily as teaching institutions, and in contrast with university academics, polytechnic teachers must hold a formal teaching qualification. However, no Finnish higher education institutions are "teaching-only", and they are increasingly the source of applied research. Academics from both sectors were included in the CAP survey.

This organisational dichotomy might seem to be an important backdrop to academic job satisfaction in Finnish higher education, not the least because of the different orientation between teaching and research. At Finnish universities, 20% of academics indicated a preference for teaching, compared with 78% of polytechnic academics. However, in spite of this major sectoral difference, overall job satisfaction of academics turned out to be quite similar. Around two-thirds of Finnish academics, whether from universities or polytechnics and whether their personal leanings were towards teaching or research, announced that their overall job satisfaction was very high or high. Lower proportions of teaching- or research-oriented university academics would become an academic again, compared with their polytechnic counterparts.

"German academics are not among the most highly satisfied academics in comparative perspective", so starts the conclusion of the German chapter. In fact, their satisfaction corresponds with the average of the 18 participating countries in the original CAP survey. However, this result averages out differences within German universities, universities of applied sciences and research institutes, from whence the sample was drawn. Both senior- and junior-ranked academics from public research institutes were clearly more satisfied than academics from the other two groups.

There were gender-based variations in the sample, with women being less satisfied than men, but academics with a preference for research and spending a relatively high proportion of their time on research tended to be more highly satisfied than those with academic jobs with a teaching emphasis. Employment conditions per se did not seem to have a strong influence on overall satisfaction.

The Japanese study produced a number of variables that seemed to lead to higher levels of satisfaction. Women who represent only 18% of the academic population in Japan and only 9% of the Japanese CAP survey sample tended to be less satisfied than their male colleagues, as did older academics. This latter fact matches with academic rank, and about 78% of senior academics reported being very satisfied or satisfied, compared with 59% of junior academics. There was little difference in satisfaction whether academics' preference was for teaching or research. About 70% of both groups reported being very satisfied or satisfied.

Malaysian higher education has been going through a period of change, with developments that are parallel to those in other parts of the world. Malaysian universities are increasingly emphasising the control of academic work, through the advent of "low-trust" managerialism and managerial styles. Increased workloads and stress are reportedly having an impact on job satisfaction. Dissatisfied staff are

more likely to withdraw from being active in the workforce and to disengage from decision-making, and they avoid mentoring junior colleagues.

The Malaysian study has brought out a number of correlations built on binary subpopulations, such as that there is a ten percentage point difference between the job satisfaction experienced by women (about 60%) and men (about 70%). A gender-related gap exists in higher education and research institutes. Gender-based differences occur across most of the variables that relate to physical infrastructure, teaching-related services and research-related services, with women reporting lower satisfaction levels.

Female academics' perceptions of influence also differ from their male colleagues' opinions, with fewer women thinking they have influence in shaping key academic policies. They also rate communication from management and rate management attitude to teaching and research as being lower. Overall, however, Malaysian academics reported being satisfied, despite dissatisfaction with aspects of infrastructure and service provision.

Like Finland, Portugal has a higher education system that includes universities and polytechnics, and these can be differentiated by their goals, degrees and research orientation. However, Portugal also has public and private institutions, leading to a system of considerable diversity. Whereas academics in public institutions are public servants, the private sector has no regulations for "private" academics. Portuguese academia is also becoming increasingly feminised, with women comprising over 43% in 2010.

In terms of overall job satisfaction, Portugal ranks towards the bottom end on the international continuum, even if more than 51% claimed to be very satisfied or satisfied. Portuguese male academics are more satisfied than their female colleagues, and only female academics from the United Kingdom reported lower levels of satisfaction.

The overall job satisfaction of South African academics (aggregate) tends to be moderately high on average. Job satisfaction increases with rank, but at management level (director) it decreases again. Academics who are more interested in teaching are more satisfied than those who are more inclined to research. Female academics are more content than male academics. Job satisfaction decreases with age (the reversal of this trend for the 61-year-plus group might be ascribed to the fact that many of those in this group are emeriti who voluntarily stayed on after retirement age, in positions and assignments of their liking). No correlation could be found between years of employment in higher education and overall job satisfaction.

The academic profession in the United Kingdom consists of a diverse range of academic staff both in their demographic profile and in the roles they undertake. Often treated as a homogeneous entity, individual academics are positioned within much of the existing literature on the United Kingdom governance and management as rational actors, performing largely similar roles and operating on the basis of a core of common academic and collegial values. The UK chapter argues that academics differ in their responses to the changes and new influences in higher education. With the expansion of the United Kingdom higher education system,

there has been an increase not only in the number of young people entering the profession via the traditional route but also in the numbers of staff entering the profession at a later stage in their working lives, having already pursued a career in another profession. Analysis of "the academic profession", therefore, needs to take into account at least these disparate groups of academics.

Compared with other countries participating in the CAP study, job satisfaction amongst the United Kingdom academics appears to be low, with only 45% of respondents describing their overall satisfaction with their current job as high or very high. However, young academics appear to be the most satisfied and the least dissatisfied, whilst the group of older, established academics appear to be the least satisfied and the most dissatisfied.

The conclusion to this volume examines job satisfaction from an international comparative perspective for the 11 countries presented in the previous chapters, plus the USA. The analysis draws upon Hagedorn's (2000) Conceptual Framework for Academic Job Satisfaction and uses the CAP data to examine whether this framework (developed from an American context) is applicable to other countries. The results suggest that, whilst academics in English-speaking countries differ in their mean responses to the state of the academic profession and their individual job satisfaction, they share similar conceptions for how job satisfaction is related to job-related personal strain, the prospects for young academics and their choice to become an academic. By contrast, in other countries, such as Japan, self-reported job satisfaction is unrelated to personal strain or other views on the state of the profession. Taking a restricted definition of job satisfaction, a single question for self-reported satisfaction, the OLS linear regression results suggest that Hagedorn's framework is more applicable to the USA, the UK and Australia, and to a lesser extent Brazil, Canada and Germany. Despite the weakness of the model in explaining variation in job satisfaction in the remaining countries, some common international patterns emerge from the results. Satisfaction with institutional resourcing is strongly associated with job satisfaction across all 12 countries. As a group, a combination of environmental variables (e.g. perceived student quality, personal influence on departmental decision-making and satisfaction with administrative processes) explains the greatest proportion of variance in job satisfaction in most countries. The variability across countries indicates that job satisfaction contains many culture-specific elements which are difficult to capture through a standardised international survey.

Academic job satisfaction, or more specifically, many of the factors influencing satisfaction, appears to be, at least in part, culturally and contextually determined. This for years to come will remain a rich area for research on job satisfaction generally and that of the academic profession specifically – an area in which this book makes an important contribution. That said, the global characteristics of the profession need emphasising as well. From the very beginning, the academic profession was by necessity internationally mobile as its members tramped between Paris and Bologna for higher learning and a bit later to Oxford and Cambridge. Now, academe is one of the most internationally mobile of all professions, and the most rapidly growing area of investment in research and innovation is in global research networks.

Universities wishing to be internationally competitive must attract and retain the best brains in the world, and as the chapters in this book consistently stress, their leaders will be wise to listen carefully when their staff hum the tune "I can't get no satisfaction".

References

Altbach, P. G. (1997). An international academic crisis? The American professoriate in comparative. *Daedalus, 126*(4), 315–338.

Altbach, P. G. (2000). *The changing academic workplace: Comparative perspectives*. Boston: Center for International Higher Education.

Amaral, A., Meek, V. L., & Larsen, L. (Eds.). (2003). *The higher education management revolution?* Dordrecht: Springer.

Askling, B. (2001). Higher education and academic staff in a period of policy and system change. *Higher Education, 41*, 157–181.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines* [Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2001) second addition]. Bristol: Open University Press.

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The higher education system*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R. (1997). Small worlds, different worlds: The uniqueness and troubles of American academic professions. *Daedalus, 126*(4), 21–42.

Clark, B. R. (2004). *Sustaining change in universities: Continuities in case studies and concepts*. Bletchley: Open University Press.

Cohen, M., & March, J. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Currie, J., DeAngelis, R., de Boer, H., Huisman, J., & Lacotte, C. (2003). *Globalizing practices and university responses: European and Anglo-American differences*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Delbanco, A. (2005). Colleges: An endangered species? *The New York Review of Books, 52*(4).

Enders, J. (2001). A chair system in transition. *Higher Education, 41*, 3–25.

Enders, J. (2006). The academic profession. In J. J. F. Forest, & P. H. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 5–22). Dordrecht: Springer.

Enders, J., & Teichler, U. (1997). A victim of their own success? Employment and working conditions of academic staff in comparative perspectives. *Higher Education Policy, 34*(1), 347–372.

Farnham, D. (Ed.). (1999). *Managing academic staff in changing university systems*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gappa, J. (2001). Academic careers for the 21st century: More options for new faculty. In J. C. Smart & W. G. Turner (Eds.), *Higher education – Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XVII, pp. 425–475). New York: Agathon Press.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge*. London: Sage.

Graubard, S. R. (2001). *The American academic profession*. Somerset: Transaction Publishers.

Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. In L. S. Hagedorn (Ed.), *New directions for institutional research* (Vol. 2000, pp. 5–20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harman, G. (2003). PhD students satisfaction with course experience and supervision in two Australian research-intensive universities. *Prometheus, 21*(3), 317–333.

Henkel, M. (2001). *Academic identities and policy change in higher education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Kogan, M., Moses, I., & El-Khawas, E. (1994). *Staffing higher education: Meeting new challenges*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of the scientific revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Levine, A. (1997). How the academic profession is changing. *Daedalus, 126*(4), 1–21.
Marginson, S., & Rhodes, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education; A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education, 43*, 281–309.
Newson, J. (1993). Constructing the post-industrial university. In P. Altbach & B. Johnstone (Eds.), *The funding of higher education*. New York: Garland.
Nowotny, H., Scott, P., & Gibbons, M. (2001). *Re-thinking science: Knowledge and the public in an age of uncertainty*. Malden: Blackwell.
Owen-Smith, J., & Powell, W. W. (2001). Careers and contradictions: Faculty responses to the transformation of knowledge and its uses in the life sciences. In S. Vallas (Ed.), *The transformation of work: Research into the sociology of work* (Vol. 10, pp. 109–140). Greenwich: JAI Press.
Perkin, H. (1969). *A history of the A.U.T.*. London: Routledge and Palmer.
Rip, A. (2004). Strategic research, post-modern universities and research training. *Higher Education Policy, 17*, 153–166.
Rothblatt, S. (1997). The "place" of knowledge in the American academic profession. *Daedalus, 126*(4), 245–265.
Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism*. Baltimore: John Hopkins.
Teichler, U. (2003). The future of higher education and the future of higher education research. *Tertiary Education and Management, 9*(3), 171–185.
Trowler, P. (1998). *Academics responding to change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
Ward, M. E., & Sloane, P. J. (2000). Non-pecuniary advantages pecuniary disadvantages; Job satisfaction among male and female academics in Scottish Universities. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy, 47*(3), 273–283.
Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 1–19.
Welch, A. R. W. (1998). The end of certainty? The academic profession and the challenge of change. *Comparative Education Review, 42*(1), 1–14.