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The collaborative project that served as the basis for this volume is an important outcome of the Fulbright New Century Scholars Program. In a joint effort to expand and build on the strengths of the traditional Fulbright Scholar Program, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State and the Council of International Exchange of Scholars created the New Century Scholars Program. It holds at its core the tenet that has informed the Fulbright Program from its beginnings in 1946—a deep belief in the importance of sharing knowledge from different cultural perspectives through academic exchange to build mutual understanding between nations and their citizens. As a new dimension of the Fulbright Program, New Century Scholars, established in 2000, seeks to move beyond bi-lateral exchange to multilateral engagement as well as to multidisciplinary research collaboration in order to examine topics of global significance.

The main idea behind New Century Scholars is that the major challenges facing humankind warrant global attention and can benefit from the ideas and experience of experts from many countries. To this end, New Century Scholars work in close cooperation to advance the state of human understanding on a chosen topic of global salience. In its first three years the program addressed three major topics: The Challenges of Health in a Borderless World, Ethnic and Sectarian Conflict Within and Across National Borders and The Global Empowerment of Women. In its fourth year, it turned its attention to global higher education.

The decision to focus on higher education as a field of collaborative study was a natural choice for the New Century Scholars given the Fulbright Program’s longstanding role in sponsoring the movement of students and faculty among most of the world’s institutions of higher education. Under its auspices, the program has supported hundreds of thousands of exchanges and is considered the largest program of governmental sponsored academic exchange throughout the world. Perceived and real strengths and weaknesses of institutions and systems of higher education around the world are one of the key elements affecting the nature of academic mobility. While the spirit of the Fulbright Program is the same for everyone—shared knowledge, mutual respect and understanding—the home and host institutions supporting the academic exchange reflect widely varying conditions.

Demand for higher education around the world is escalating rapidly. As a consequence, higher education is one of the “growth industries” of the 21st Century. Trying to keep up with demand for its services across the world, in developed and developing countries alike, is increasingly a daunting challenge. In
developing countries that have been successful in promoting basic literacy and greater access to K-16 levels of education, the demand for access to higher education is becoming overwhelming. This in turn, not only prompts outward mobility when demand cannot be met but leads to a host of problems internally. Lack of adequate funding, significant overcrowding, low quality of academic programs, poor working conditions for faculty and administrators all combine to challenge the ability of institutions to produce graduates who are well educated and can contribute to national development.

These problems notwithstanding, the quality of higher education institutions and their support for the development of human capacity and civil society will play increasingly critical roles. The existence of high quality and accessible institutions of higher education in any country is one of the key predictors of national progress as well as the ability of a nation to claim a leadership role in the community of nations.

Reflecting the importance of higher education as a global issue, in the Fall of 2005 thirty-one New Century Scholars gathered to address the topic Higher Education in the 21st Century: Global Challenge and National Response. Led by Philip G. Altbach as Distinguished Scholar Leader, they organized themselves into six working groups: the Academic Profession in the Age of Globalization, Access and Equity, Higher Education and Social Cohesion, The Private and Public Mix in the Development Process, the Dynamics of Student Circulation and the Emerging Global Model for Research University.

The Professoriate in the Age of Globalization has special relevance not only to the New Century Scholars initiative but also to the future of higher education. We chose the academic profession as one of the main foci for NCS precisely because no institution of higher education can be a success without an effective and highly motivated professoriate. This book is especially relevant because it has as a key focus how the professoriate engages with globalization. As the sociologist Burton Clark once wrote, professors work in “small worlds, different worlds.” They operate in the context of their disciplines, their departments and faculties, and in increasingly bureaucratic universities. They are also increasingly affected by the global academic and scientific environment.

There is now an international labor market for highly skilled academics—it is common for scholars and scientists to work outside their own countries, and even more common for them to be trained abroad. International mobility is commonplace, although the flow is mainly from the developing countries of the south to the industrialized nations of the North. Knowledge has always been an international commodity, and the Internet has speeded up the flow and expanded the scope. English, increasingly the international language of science and research, further accelerates the pace.

The case studies included in this book tell a multifaceted story, and by and large one that is not particularly optimistic. The pressures on the academic profession are immense, from global forces as well as local and national environments. The impact of massification has tended to lower academic standards and create financial and other shortages at the same time that there are increasingly pressures
for greater productivity and accountability. Working conditions in some of the countries analyzed in this volume are difficult and perhaps deteriorating.

This book presents something of a contradictory story—recognition in all of the countries that the academic profession is a central part of the success of any university, and at the same time there are a plethora of problems. In all of the chapters, academics themselves speak through interviews and surveys to express their views and reflect on their roles in an increasingly globalized environment.

Philip G. Altbach
Monan Professor and Director
Center for International Higher Education
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
USA

and

Patti McGill Peterson
Executive Director
Center for International Exchange of Scholars
Washington, D.C.
USA
IN THE CURRENT PERIOD of intense economic, technological, and social processes of globalization, the university is emerging as a site that mirrors all three globalizing forces. These changes are profound as they range from increased student enrollments to new organizational structures (Rhoades, 1998; Ibarra Colado, 2001; Levy 2006b) to a redefinition of knowledge (Cowen, 1996), and to generally institutional missions and functions for the university (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Giroux, 2001; Currie & Subotzky, 2000; Parmenter, 2000).

Universities are moving inexorably from elite to mass institutions (Welch, 1998; Altbach, 1980), a phenomenon affecting both industrialized and developing countries. In the U.S. higher education experienced tremendous growth in the 1950s and 1960s creating a favorable job market for faculty whose salaries outpaced the cost of living by about 65 percent. The phenomenon of growing enrollment has been occurring particularly through private universities and is most vigorous in Asia and Latin America. Greater enrollment is also occurring at graduate levels, and thus new fields and specializations are emerging; this growth, however, is still in the hands of public institutions. In the case of Latin America, the private sector grew from 6,000 students in 1955 to over 1 million by 1975 (Levy, 1985), but the largest expansion occurred between 1970 and 2005 (Levy, 2006b). In terms of overall enrollment in the region during that period, Venezuela and Chile represent the most dramatic cases, with a growth factor of 7 and 5, respectively (Papadópulos & Radokovich, 2005).

Much attention has been devoted so far to documenting the numerical expansion of universities, particularly that of private universities. Some attention has also been given to financial issues, notably the decreasing budgets among public universities. Yet, because of the broad scope of globalization, many other changes have occurred as well. These changes—some obvious, others less visible—have prompted many social scientists, many of whom are educators, to take themselves and the role of the professoriate as an object of study.

This book seeks to examine some of the most crucial aspects of the professoriate in a time of change. The compression of time and space brought about by new technologies, the impetus of the free market, and concomitant social expectations has produced a “major shift in the nature of academic institutions and academic
work” (Altbach, 2002, p. 3). Two major globalization forces affecting higher education are the flows of international students, scholars, and scientists from the South seeking better opportunities in the North, and the constant advances in information technologies (Altbach, 2002). But also present in these sea changes are neoliberal economic policies that have restructured the labor market and reduced the role of the state in social areas, bringing in their wake the emergence of private universities, the marketization of research, and the relentless search for “world-class” university status.

These global trends are affecting higher education institutions’ missions and situations and these institutional changes are affecting core aspects of academic work, such as the relative weight of teaching and research, the modes of delivering instruction, the patterns of rewards and incentives, and the practice of accountability (Marginson, 1996, cited in Blackmore, 2000). Ongoing shifts in university organizational structure and functioning are affecting the role of the academician as a professional and his/her identity as an individual who works not only in the area of knowledge production and transmission, but also in the area of social improvement. How universities respond to global forces depends on national culture, individual institutional missions, and structural features of the national higher education system (Currie & Subotzky, 2000). Nonetheless, some common patterns are emerging across countries.

This introductory chapter comprises two distinct parts. The first constitutes an exploration of the professoriate that relies on the existing literature, which is more abundant for universities in the U.S. than other countries. There is, however, an emerging body of research pertaining to the professoriate in developing and middle-income countries (Altbach, 2002). This literature review, therefore, combines findings from the U.S. with those of other countries. I proceed in three parts: first, I examine the various globalization dynamics affecting universities, then zero in on specific angles of the academic profession, and finish the paper by discussing salient dilemmas affecting the professoriate function and challenges contained in the new forms of knowledge. The second part of this chapter presents the structure of the book, elucidates the conceptual framework that orients it, and introduces the six national studies.

PART I. GLOBALIZATION DYNAMICS AFFECTING ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS

Since professors are embedded in institutions, we must perforce refer to those institutions before addressing the emerging professional identities and conditions of the professoriate. The rapid expansion of higher education as well as the role of the private sector in this expansion have contributed both to increased competition among universities as well as to the development of new norms guiding their performance. In particular, the introduction of such business-like norms as competitiveness, accountability, quality-control, and marketing, has quickly moved from private universities to permeate the entire set of higher education institutions.
Institutional and Individual Competition

Globalization has imposed the driving force of competition, a process that calls for external and internal competition. The argument favoring competition is that it unleashes creativity and innovation; those who are successful are rewarded with increased resources. Externally, there is a growing sense of urgency to compete with other universities, a need that has required the development of links with other agencies outside the university, such as industry, business, and research councils (Cowen, 1996). Internally—within the university—competition results in hierarchies among departments and in the creation of blocs within the university and the marginalization of disciplines that are perceived as not central to competition processes. The most extreme case of internal competition regarding faculty seems to be China, where differential performance, as evaluated by some predetermined assessment instruments, have resulted in salary distinctions as high as 17 times among professors (Chen, 2002). In the case of public universities, the state defines the rules for competition and thus limits the rewards (Cowen, 1996); however, the norms of competition are also strongly felt there, particularly through the determination of faculty salaries. In several countries steps are being taken in to delink academic employment from civil service status, such as has happened in Malaysia (Lee, M. 2002). In the U.S. context, faculty are reported to face authority erosion from increased budgetary controls, increasing demands for accountability, and periods of financial stress (Williams et al., 1987).

Several measures of prestige exist and vary according to world region. A widely recognized measure of prestige in the U.S. is the U.S. News and World Report, an annual publication from a non-academic source. The rankings are determined by measurements of research output, student numbers and selectivity, among other indicators. According to its criteria for ranking, 25 percent of a ranking is based on views of academic reputation provided by presidents, provosts, and deans of admission, which suggests the interpersonal and subjective nature of the exercise. These rankings are used by some students to select the university they will attend. Most often, the rankings are used to differentiate research from non-research universities, and thus by the institutions to acquire a competitive edge vis-à-vis other institutions in the process of endowment procurement and the awarding of research contracts. In universities of the U.K., similar rankings are utilized by which the universities compete with each other on measurements of research output, student numbers, and ultimately measures of teaching quality (Cowen, 1996).

Universities as Prestige Maximizers

An emerging literature demonstrates that in the same way that business firms function as profit maximizers, non-profit higher education institutions act as prestige maximizers (Melguizo & Strober, 2006; Brewer et al., 2005). In the context of the U.S., universities try to maximize prestige directly by increasing the size of their endowment (grants given to them by philanthropic institutions or
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private donors), hiring “star” faculty that can transfer their reputations to the new institution (and, presumably away from a competitor), increasing the numbers and value of their research grants and contracts, developing cutting-edge academic and research programs, and—at a more anecdotal level—by controlling professional associations in certain disciplines.

These activities increasingly foster the separation of teaching and research activities; they also call for the distinction between serving as an academic and serving as an administrator and strategic planner. Not surprisingly, universities are registering increases in their administrative staffs greater than the increases in their academic personnel. The determination of faculty salaries, a reward given for enhancing employer prestige as well as a reward for increases in productivity, today constitutes the single most important measure of prestige at the individual level.

**Diversification of Institutions and Offerings**

To speak of privatization in higher education is to speak of diversification of institutions. Numerous models of universities and other institutions of higher education are now in evidence. In Asia, the considerable variety among institutional offerings include: advanced standing programs, external degree programs, distance learning program, credit transfer programs, twinning degree programs, and joint programs (Lee, 1999). External and twinning programs are facilitated by English as the most common medium of instruction, and therefore more likely to happen in English-speaking countries (e.g., Malaysia). Concomitantly, many private universities—particularly those that are low-cost and hence low-prestige—concentrate on the provision of few fields of study, those that are relatively inexpensive to offer, namely, those in practical occupations such as hotel management, accounting information systems, and teaching, or those in law and commercial services.

The diversification brought by expansion has also produced strong differentiation and segmentation among institutions of higher education; in other words, the enormous expansion has sometimes occurred at the expense of quality. A case in point is China, where of over 2000 private institutions, only 20 are allowed to grant diplomas and none to offer academic degrees (Chen, 2002, p. 123). The diversification of institutions, which is greatly accelerated by privatization policies, varies across countries. Rates of change seem to be highest among countries trying to insert themselves in the global economy such as Malaysia and Singapore and slowest in countries that are making a transition from Soviet models of centralized planning to free market systems; thus, in Russia, the private experience is so new that the term “non-state institutions,” entered the country’s vocabulary only in 1992 (Smolentseva, 2002).

Liberalization of criteria for establishing institutions of higher education will have further consequences on the academic environment. As more and more universities award doctoral degrees under different norms and standards of scholarships, they will similarly produce new academicians of greatly varied
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quality (Altbach, 1980). A discernable consequence of the massification of higher education is that new students joining these institutions may seek a more instrumental education and thus the knowledge provided by universities is becoming increasingly connected to practical applications.

The Academic Profession

Interrogations that precede the examination of the academic profession consider: What’s the role of the university? Is it to supply the needs of industry? Is it simply a place where intellectuals gather or an institution with social responsibilities? Or, as Allen puts it (2005, p. 23), “Should the university be the soul of the country?” Should it be “charged with visioning and modeling society’s ideals”?

The term professoriate implies a coherent and definable community, and some will argue that such a thing does not exist. Altbach (1980) notes that, since the academic profession is divided by specialization, then to some extent there is a myth regarding the “community of scholars” (see also, Shore, 1992). Further corroborating this view, Clark (1985, 1987) maintains that the academic profession represents a wide array of disciplines, a large set of subject affiliations, and “a host of subcultures that speak in strange tongues.” It should not be surprising, therefore, that the idea of the university as a community of self-governing scholars varies by discipline. In the same vein, it has been noted that academics occupy two simultaneous roles: “professionals and employees of large bureaucratic organizations” (Altbach, 1981, p. 226). In Clark’s view (1984), specializations and disciplines, and whole colleges and universities could serve at most as mediating institutions that tie the individuals and small groups into the whole of the system. Observing that the professoriate is becoming increasingly complex in task and structure, Clark (1987, 1997) contends that their integration could not come about by a common socialization and shared values, but rather through the “bit-by-bit overlap of narrow memberships and specific identities.”

There is consensus that with mass education, there has been a loss of prestige among the professoriate, with the emergence of a secondary academic labor market that is non-permanent and non-tenured. As early as 1980, Altbach recognized the decline of the academic community propelled by the increasing diversification of the profession, frequent attacks on academic freedom and tenure, and the solidification of a process that incorporated new hierarchies. These events happened not only in the U.S. but also in the U.K, where the notion of tenure was eliminated, and in Austria and Japan, where the professoriate shifted het regent en onweert from being civil servants to private employees (Musselin, n.d.).

There are, however, several organizational venues where academicians continue to exercise professional autonomy. An early survey by Jencks & Riesman (1968) found that faculty in modern universities in the U.S. enjoyed considerable authority, especially through the informal acceptance by governing boards of the professional competence of faculty members. A study 20 years later by Williams et al. (1987), focusing on a single institution, found that 57 percent of its faculty rejected the notion that faculty should not administer but rather concentrate on
teaching, research, and public service. But the same study found also that 71 percent of the faculty agreed that there were too few rewards for faculty to become involved in faculty government. Today, faculty engage in substantial research, but those who do tend to have less time and interest in governance (Levy, 2006a). The current high expectations for research productivity lead faculty to consider service in administration and advisory committees as second priorities.

Beyond institutional changes, there are several trends affecting individual performance and recognition. In these days of intense competition, the understanding of successful or efficient performance seems to be increasingly limited to the procurement of research contracts and grants.

Explicit Indicators of Productivity and Performance

“Performativity,” or the emphasis on increasing a system’s performance-efficiency, is common discourse used in business and management. More recently, it has been extended to university norms. In some countries, such as France and Germany, the concept of the university as an institution strongly focused on efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity has so far not been adopted. Yet, in most other national situations, there is an unstoppable shift toward such criteria.

To accomplish the aim of productivity measurement, many quantitative instruments have been designed and are being actively implemented. Many evaluation instruments are calibrated to reward research activities much more than teaching and to reward research conducted under large contracts more than research done with small contracts, grants, or minor external support. Typically, evaluation instruments give salary premiums to principal researchers with large grants. Based on a representative sample of U.S. universities, Melguizo & Strober (2006) found that being in a research institution (as opposed to a less prestigious institution) does result in higher salaries and that being a principal investigator in a research institution results in annual salary increases of 14 percent in the sciences (both natural and social) and 11 percent in the humanities and the arts—evidence that reflects the hierarchies across disciplines today. Melguizo & Strober report two additional findings of considerable significance: (a) spending more time on teaching did not result in salary increases (regardless of institutional type), and (b) research institutions do not reward faculty better than comprehensive higher institutions (i.e., universities whose principal mission is training rather than research) for publications in a refereed journal. The latter finding suggests that it is not knowledge per se that counts, but the fact of attracting research money for knowledge production.

Data from middle-income countries such as Korea and Singapore indicate that faculty evaluation systems are sometimes excessive, involving several layers of evaluation and demanding large amounts of time (Lee, S., 2002; Lee, M., 2002). Greater accountability demanded by state, higher education bodies, university, and departments has also been reported in less industrialized countries such as South Africa (Koen, 2002).
The Narrowing Foci of Intellectual Pursuits

Some observers contend that the university is becoming a place for a narrow epistemology—one that centers on the advancement of science and technology. Since links with business, industry, and the state are now unavoidable and, in fact, must be actively pursued, it follows that many initiatives and developments center on what is perceived as immediate problem-solving. This problem-solving, however, does not address all problems of importance but rather those whose solution may generate a profit through the sale of a given product or service.

Indications of the narrowing of fields comes from recent developments in South Africa, where some fields are now growing in enrollment and funding—those in business, commerce, science engineering, and technology—and others becoming peripheral—those in arts and humanities (Koen, 2002; Johnson, 2006). The restructuring of fields has consequences for faculty, because those in the less popular disciplines may be laid off or do not find academic jobs. In the case of South Africa, given the concentration of both students and faculty in arts and humanities in Historically Black Universities, these groups are expected to be negatively affected (Koen, 2002).

As attention is paid to practical problem-solving rather than to knowledge and reflection that are not produced for sale, it may be asserted that research focusing on knowledge for truth and critique has been significantly curtailed. Within universities, the determination of crucial knowledge is becoming less predicated on autonomous and internal definitions of what is important and relevant, and more on external definitions of what will sell. In schools of education, for instance, what are appearing with increasing value are knowledge issues regarding leadership, innovations, cutting-edge pedagogies, and financial efficiency, with a corresponding decline in the examination of such issues as social inequalities, racism, chronic student failure, tracking, and social reproduction in schools. In fact, in a sizable number of schools of education, specializations such as history and philosophy have been replaced by those dealing with educational leadership, educational technology, and public policy implementation.

Cowen, who has investigated U.K. universities closely, holds that we are facing an “attenuated university” (1996, p. 256). He sees a reduction of functions emerging at three levels: becoming spatially attenuated as the university serves as a mere base from which to develop links with industry and provide consultancies and entrepreneurialism to survive; pedagogically attenuated, as professors increasingly become “instructional designers” of pre-prepared modules for distance education; and quality attenuated because the definition of the system’s quality is heavily located in the hands of experts outside it.

The Growing Presence of Detached Academics

Due in part to the job flexibility demanded by private institutions and in part to the fiscal austerity that public institutions face, many academicians today have a precarious link to the university in which they work. Some of the major changes in
the U.S. professoriate concern the large increase in the part-time faculty. The proportion of part-time faculty nearly quadrupled from 11 percent in 1970 to 40 percent by 1993 (Rhoades, 1998). By 2005 only one-third of the American professoriate held full-time, tenure-track appointments, while approximately one half held part-time appointments (see also Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

Even in countries where there are strong models of state protection and thus academic self-governance, such as Germany, there are incipient distinctions between executive, administrative forms of leadership (presidents) and the more collegial rectors, with the president not having to come from an institution of higher education or be a former professor (Pritchard, 2006).

The increased percentage of part-time professionals “cuts to the heart of faculty self-governance and their professional position” (Rhoades, 1998, p. 7). This growing segment of the university teaching force is paid less than the regular ranks, faces unclear grounds for promotion, is not expected to engage in research, and has limited possibility for professional development (as they are not funded to attend professional conferences). Moreover, they cannot provide service to students because many have neither campus offices nor paid office hours. Data from a 1978 nationwide survey of post-secondary U.S. faculty found part-timers to represent a very heterogeneous group, from semi-retired persons to “full-mooners” (defined as those who hold a primary job elsewhere of at least 35 hours per week). This survey found that 28 percent of the sample held a primary job elsewhere. A later survey, conducted in 1988, found that 50 percent of the part-time faculty held another job and that working conditions were deplorable (only 17 percent of the part-time faculty received subsidized medical insurance compared with 97 percent of the full-time faculty; retirement coverage was provided for only 20 percent of the part-timers) (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Not surprisingly, the 1988 survey found part-time faculty to be dissatisfied with their second-class status, and angry and frustrated with their work loads, salaries, benefits, and lack of appreciation for their efforts (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

In developing countries, there are opposing patterns regarding faculty employment. In countries that are eagerly moving into the adoption of the research university, as is the case of Mexico, there has been a shift toward hiring more full-time professors (even though the majority of the academic force remain part-time) as well as a shift toward hiring academicians with a doctorate degree (Gil-Antón, 2002). In many other countries, however, the privatization of higher education institutions is bringing with it short-term and part-time contracts for the academic staff. The consequences of these changes on academic identity and governance have not received significant attention.

The growth of part-time and temporary faculty—variously known as clinical faculty, adjunct faculty, or instructors—is slowly but tangibly changing the profile of the professoriate by creating a distinction between full citizens (those who in some measure participate in governance) and second-class citizens (those who work on a tight contractual basis) in the academic environment. In several countries, the low pay and part-time status for professors has led professionals to seek better-remunerated occupations elsewhere (reported for Argentina, Marquis,
2002; for Korea, Lee, S., 2002). Conditions of constant evaluation at multiple levels are also leading potential scholars to see the professoriate as a less attractive profession (Lee, S., 2002; Lee, M, 2002).

How the presence of part-time professors affects student learning has been the object of limited studies. The existing research documents a negative correlation between high rates of temporary faculty and student graduation rates. There is also evidence of the negative impact of standardization and rationalization of course content (which is one of the main characteristics of e-learning) on students’ graduation rates (Musselin, n.d.).

As universities expanded and shifted from being elite institutions to mass institutions, they opened their doors to all social classes, minorities, and women, both as students and as faculty. However, Turner et al. (1999) found severe underrepresentation of Afro-Americans, Native-Americans and Latinos (compared to the nearby population mix) among the faculty in the U.S. Minority faculty members were also underrepresented when their numbers were compared to the “qualified pool population” (those in same age range and with the same degrees). In the U.S., faculty of color, who represent about 10 percent of the total faculty, have expressed feelings of isolation, lack of mentoring, occupational stress, and a devalued “minority” research status (Turner et al., 1999). These authors attributed their findings to the presence of a chilly climate regarding the quality of respect and support for minority faculty, even though minority professors have gained access through policies of affirmative action.

The number of women professors has increased, helped by both widely diffused notions of gender equality and, in a few countries, by anti-discriminatory and, in a few cases, affirmative action legislation. While women are still far from having equal positions in the university, their numbers in the teaching staff are increasing. Policies to favor women and minorities have been active in countries such as the U.S., the U.K., and South Africa. In the mid-70s in the U.S. the majority of women faculty were in four-year colleges and about one-third of them were in community colleges. Women faculty were found to be least represented in universities and less likely to be tenured. They were also found concentrated in a small number of fields (Hornig, 1980). The same study found that the proportion of men achieving tenure exceeded that of women by 5 to 20 percent, depending on the field. Male faculty salaries were found to exceed women’s by about 20 percent, partly due to different patterns of distribution between men and women among institutional types, fields, and ranks; but even when these variables are held constant, men’s salaries exceed women by up to almost 15 percent. Men tended to teach fewer hours per week and to teach more graduate courses, leading the researchers to conclude that, “The positions women have, regardless of their abilities, do not give them effective access to the tools of research, neither the facilities nor the graduate students they need” (Hornig, 1980, p. 123). Gappa & Leslie (1993) found, based on nationwide surveys of postsecondary faculty in the US, that women comprised the majority of part-time faculty. By 1995, women represented 47 percent of those in academic positions and they held the majority of part-time positions in community colleges and both public and private universities.
Women remained underrepresented as full professors as only 47 were tenured compared to 70 percent of men; they also remained underrepresented in the hard sciences and engineering faculties (Bae et al., 2000; see also Musselin, n.d.). Men and women are subject to the same institutional norms but those norms favor men, given the added personal responsibilities women continue to face. These findings suggest that universities are not egalitarian places in the treatment of academics and even raise doubt about the role of academicians as intense practitioners of social justice.

An Expanding Administrative Layer

A classic study by Cohen and March (c1986) of the U.S. university president found that high levels of organizational inertia and weak information bases characterized university decisions; they found further that most issues had low salience for most people in the institution so that decision-making was seen as a fluid phenomenon with people leaving and entering the decision-making process as their time and interest dictated. The U.S. university structure of 2006 bears little similarity to that description. Administrators play an increasing role in decision-making and they represent a growing proportion of the university. Managerial practices, conducive to executive prerogative and greater control by executive officers and upper-level administrators, have been reported in the U.S. (Rhoades, 1998; Musselin, n.d.), Australia (Blackmore, 2000), and South Africa (Johnson, 2006). Zemsky et al. (2005) observe that in the U.S. administrators grew more than 60 percent between 1975 and 1985, while professors increased their numbers by 6 percent. Further, most of the administrators (95 percent) work full-time (Rhoades, 1998). Top-level university administrators today enjoy high status and command greater salaries than comparable faculty, a development observed both in industrialized and developing countries (Johnson, 2006). It should be noted that a number of administrators come from faculty ranks. To some extent, therefore, changes in the university environment make it necessary to acquire managerial skills. Faculty who are better able to adopt to new conditions of commercialization and marketization in higher education fare better than those who cannot adjust, a pattern emerging in such different settings as Russia (Smolentseva, 2002) and the U.S. and Australia (Currie, 1998; Mollis & Marginson, 2002). For a variety of reasons, more women than men academics are being able to engage in entrepreneurial behaviors, so women face new barriers to academic promotion at present.

Most observers recognize that a division of labor is evident today: university administrators decide and manage; faculty concentrate on research and teaching. Studies of the university in the United States reveal that within for-profit institutions, faculty and other insiders have little if any influence over the strategic choices made by administrators. Brewer et al. (2005), for instance, documents that because profit and, concomitantly, growth are their motives, administrators in these institutions must identify and serve a reasonably lucrative set of customers. Currie (1998) found that academics in both US and Australia felt that decision-making at the university was becoming increasing top-down and managerial. The
implementation of strategic plans requires time, and their direct access to potential customers gives administrators the justification that they are better placed to decide. The degree to which faculty encounter a diminished role varies according to the university’s prestige: faculty working in high-ranking universities have been able to preserve more control over their own work than faculty in mid- and low-prestige institutions.

**Fundamental Issues in Governance**

Governance is the institutional framework for making policy decisions, setting priorities, and allocating resources. It is generally agreed that in the U.S. context, “since 1900 the academic department has been the principal arrangement by which faculties participate in the governance of higher education” (CFAT, 1982, p. 5). Generally, fundamental issues in governance involve such issues as choice, funding, decision rights, and regulatory frameworks. Translated into governance in higher education, these issues imply: professional autonomy, funding, institutional decision-making, accountability, and accreditation. As we examine each of these issues, it is clear that bodies outside the academic peer group and even outside the institution are guiding the professoriate.

The extent of faculty participation in decision-making at the university level varies a great deal. In some countries, higher education is greatly under the control of the government, especially in countries deeply committed to joining the global economy such as Malaysia and Singapore (Lee, M., 2002). In Latin America, several layers of actors play roles in university governance: the government (by providing funding), the inter-university council, the university administration, the university council, and schools or departments (Winkler, 1990). Some inter-university councils, composed primarily of representatives of both public and private institutions exist; often, there are separate councils for public and private institutions. Even in countries where state protection and thus academic self-governance (e.g., Germany) is strong, there are incipient distinctions between executive/administrative forms of leadership (presidents) and academic rectors—with the president not required to have come from an institution of higher education or to have been a former professor (Pritchard, 2006).

Latin American universities are guided by the principle of university autonomy. Until a decade ago, the public university in Mexico prevailed over the government in setting higher education policies and budgets (Winkler, 1990). Given public budgetary constraints and a reduced role for the state in the funding of university education, this situation is today considerably weaker. University rectors in Latin America reportedly tend to have more power relative to the government than in Europe but less than in most U.S. public institutions of higher education because rectors are frequently elected by the university community, which means they are often more responsive to internal political pressures (Winkler, 1990).

As the number of full-time professors declines in the U.S. and other countries, their de-facto governance role becomes weak and limited to an increasingly smaller segment of faculty. The increasing presence of university administrators is linked
to new organs of decision-making that bring together the university executive, key administrators, and a few senior academics into a stronger governance, subtly shifting power to the central administration. The main element of this governance is linked to the design and implementation of a strategic plan, around which many changes in structure and function are orchestrated. In some countries, South Africa for example, this shift has been accompanied by features such as “decentralized budgeting [in which a block sum is allocated to units and serves often as an incentive to carry out the strategic plan], closer collaboration with industry and commerce, technology as an integral part of management, and explicit training program for managers and administrators” (Webster & Mosoetsa, cited in Johnson, 2006, p. 65).

What affects universities as organizations certainly affects the professors who inhabit them. Although research is still incipient on this matter, anecdotal reports indicate that professors are losing autonomy on several fronts: governance of their institutions and even of their own programs, decisions about current and new programs, course development and delivery, student selection at the graduate level, evaluation of their work, and selection in the hiring of other academicians.

What does it mean to be a professional? Four core features come to mind: (a) having a complex and advanced knowledge base, (b) developing expertise in a particular subject, and (c) exercising the right to determine and evaluate the way one’s work is performed, and (d) having the autonomy to determine what is important and should thus receive priority. According to Light (1974), university professors as members of a profession have:

- exclusive powers to recruit and train its members
- exclusive powers to judge who is qualified
- responsibility for regulating the quality of professional work
- high social prestige
- an esoteric and complex body of knowledge (pp. 10-11).

All of these attributes imply autonomy for action and involvement in academic decisions and governance in general. A key and long recognized feature of the academic profession refers to academic freedom in both teaching and research, which has been protected through the principle of tenure—a practice well accepted in the U.S. In addition to the core features listed above, supporting activities include administrative duties and community service.

Academic governance traditionally has included decisions on student admissions, faculty appointments, determination of student program completion, and design and provision of academic programs. But, with increasing faculty concerns for research productivity and administrators’ concern for greater sources of revenue, these academic functions are becoming a small part of a larger set, which comprises new program development, decisions to establish links with industry nationally and internationally, measures to increase the competitiveness of the university, and efforts to secure major contracts and grants. It appears that the traditional governance parameters are increasingly reduced to issues of curriculum and teaching than to issues of institutional performance. Structural changes in a
number of universities are resulting in the loss of departments and their department chairs. This phenomenon, reported in the U.S. and in South Africa (Johnson, 2006), is said to contribute also to the loss of an intellectual space, traditionally managed by department chairs who played a role in fostering debate around their discipline and considered disciplinary matters as well as the selection of new professors.

In the U.S. context, about 44 percent of full-time professors are unionized, mostly those working in public universities, and thus their labor union represents them in dealing with university administrators. On the other hand, the large number of part-time professors are not unionized, which therefore excludes them from exerting leverage at negotiation time (Rhoades, 1998).

Dilemmas in Traditional Professoriate Functions

Four dilemmas have become salient under globalization time. They pose substantial challenge to old identities and to the formation of new ones.

Intellectuals or Market Agents?

Since the identity of the professoriate is per force linked to the role of the university, it can further be asked: Is the university an institution indispensable to the larger life of its society? Is it a national asset? (Lewis & Ryan, 1976). In other words, it would seem essential to the identity of the professoriate to be able to conceive of the university as occupying a special place in society, where not only new knowledge is produced and transmitted but also where the sense of national purpose is considered and debated. If the university loses that particular role, there is little argument for unique responsibilities and privileges for the professoriate. Discussing the U.S. situation, Wise (1970) holds that in this country there is a tendency to see the professoriate entirely in relation to teaching and research functions, thus resisting their political functions. Today, indeed some academicians define autonomy as the autonomy to do research and only research.

The need for universities to rely on substantial sources of income, beyond that of student tuition, has promoted growing linkages between the university and industrial firms. In the U.S., where universities account for 50 percent of basic research in the country, Levy (2006a) finds that marketization has affected mostly graduate-level programs and that the fields most touched have been biomedical and biotechnological, followed by engineering. As the 21st century moves toward interdisciplinarity as the main vehicle for technological innovations, and as universities continue to maintain the most complete set of disciplines housed in a single institution, universities will continue to play an enormous role in the industrial development of countries. So the situation has become not whether universities will commercialize or not, but rather how they will enter this process. How this process of increasing science and technology for sale will affect the university is still a developing issue (Geiger, 2006). What seems to be the case is that the modern university has always housed different cultures, as some
disciplines (e.g., engineering, medicine, the natural sciences in general) tend to be less concerned with political issues and thus less with faculty governance in the university, while other disciplines (particularly those in the social sciences and the humanities) are more attuned to power conditions and shifts, including those in their own place of work. Will this be a mutually supportive, dynamic relationship or the beginning of a very instrumental approach to knowledge and thus to the role of the university in society? With entrepreneurial priorities increasingly characterizing the university, it is likely that these cultures will become more polarized than in the past. It is also likely that governance will gradually shift to administrators and managers and that the most powerful faculty in the universities will be those more inclined to accept the ongoing changes and promote the ranking of the university.

The dynamics of organizational survival in the market are affecting private, and to a less extent public institutions, and leading to the increasing adoption of marketing roles by faculty. In Korea faculty in less prestigious institutions must participate in the recruitment of students and make changes in the curriculum, academic management, student services, and scholarship provision to attract more students (Lee, S., 2002). Among the most prestigious universities, such as a leading institution in Chile, professors are encouraged to participate in commercial activities through measures that decentralize the departments and give deans freedom to manage budgets, hire and fire staff, set salary policies, create incentives, define workloads; moreover, faculty are allowed to keep all profits, except for a 10 percent overhead fee (Bernasconi, 2005).

Is there a conflict between serving the market and pursuing autonomous research? Should academicians try to look for the truth—which may necessitate considerable distance from sponsored research—or should they use their expertise to produce whatever is demanded by the market, or more precisely by influential business firms? Is it fair or even possible to apply the “truth” mission to all disciplines, or is this mainly applicable to the social sciences and the humanities? Can engineers today, for instance, afford to concentrate on the pursuit of interesting problems or must they address those felt by potential clients?

Growing emphasis on research has altered the balance between the professions, not only because research activities are now considered as being crucial indicators of scholarship, but also because sponsored research has gained greater importance than research that is not supported, for instance, by a governmental contract (which usually provides large overheads). It is well known that sponsored research addresses immediate problems, sometimes of a social nature but most often of an economic or technological nature. The pressure to obtain research contracts thus shapes the research topic. This preference for sponsored research indirectly erodes faculty autonomy. It must be recognized that different disciplines and specializations enjoy different levels of prestige, and that this prestige is strongly linked to their ability to secure research contracts and attract the interest of the business and industrial environment.

All academics today are now encouraged to publish books and articles based on their research. A further trend in the contemporary world is to publish in English,
the global language of science and technology and that in which most prestigious academic journals are published. Consequently, research done through large contracts comes linked to certain topics and to certain publication outlets. Such a preference directs attention to certain topics and to the dismissal of others, thus indirectly affecting the autonomy of academicians to engage in research. Some observers (e.g., Giroux, 2001) fear that areas such as critical theory, philosophy, literature, feminism, environmentalism, postcolonialism, and even sociology may suffer in the near future.

Professionals or Employees?

Thinking of academicians as professionals implies that they are affiliated full-time with a single university. Tenure exists only in a few countries but it is being questioned in some of them (e.g., Poland, as reported by Kwiek, 2002) and attempts are being made to shift academics into renewal short- and medium-term contracts. Across the world, there are clear trends for new faculty to be part-time and non-tenured. Especially in private universities, where “flexibility” is one of the traits, this usually means a quick response time to offer new courses or to cancel old ones. The ability to provide courses with high demand is a fundamental reason for the success of many private universities. This strategy in turn is predicated on hiring part-time instructors and on having scripted curricula that can be offered simultaneously by several instructors—something particularly relevant to the case of distance education programs where large classes necessitate assessments by multiple instructors on the basis of pre-established course content.

For reasons of cost control, administrators prefer to hire cheaper part-time teachers and untenured professors. In the 1980s about 65 percent of the U.S. professoriate was tenured compared to 58 percent in the 1990s; the growth of part-time faculty and the solidification of them as merely university employers, leads Rhoades (1998) to term today’s professoriate “managed professionals.” The fact that part-time faculty are not unionized further weakens their voice and sets them apart as merely salaried individuals. One of the fastest growing universities in the U.S. is the for-profit University of Phoenix (UOP). Apollo Group, the parent company of UOP, has been doing extremely well economically, as its stock rose 500 percent over a six-year period. UOP has now about 57,000 online students and 84,300 in physical classrooms. UOP is notorious for the poor payment of its professors, who reportedly earn about $900 for a three-course load, which compared to salaries of regular U.S. faculty is really very low.

In the past, private universities were able to hire part-time instructors who drew their principal salaries from public universities or state bureaucracies. Today, many part-time instructors have no other identities but that of working to deliver instruction. In many universities, including research universities, the percentage of non-tenured faculty members equals or exceeds those in tenure-tracks. On the other hand, tenure does not exist in some countries and is not clearly defined in most places (Altbach, 1980). But in most countries, those who work in public universities are public servants, who enjoy career stability and a regular set of
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pension plans and salary structures, albeit these are determined by the state and tend to be very low in monetary terms.

In the case of Latin America, the share of government spending per capita in higher education has declined severely since 1980. These reductions have resulted in lower faculty salaries, smaller outlays for supplies and equipment, and perceived losses in the quality of instruction and research. (Winkler, 1990). Declines in faculty income have also taken place in the U.S. This can be deduced from the fact that about 85 percent of faculty earned supplemental income in 1975, most often (39 percent) in summer teaching, consulting (29 percent), and teaching elsewhere (12 percent). There is a positive relationship between research production and income, in terms of both base salary and supplemental income, which suggests that professors have depended on research productivity to augment their salaries for at least two decades now.

“Performativity” or Self-Monitoring Norms?

Do faculty members have special obligations to the institution in which they hold appointments? What responsibilities do they have for the vision and the mission of their university, ensuring that not only their individual and institutional interests are protected but also those of society (Wise, 1970)? What responsibilities do they have for ensuring the quality of teaching? Further, what responsibilities do faculty have in protecting academic freedom and due process not only for themselves but also for students? And for ensuring that students reflect on alternative views and ideologies?

These are serious concerns that in the past were seen as trusted to the self-evaluation of academicians as autonomous professionals. But as university governance moves to administrative spheres and entrepreneurialism demands constant monitoring in order to establish a university, especially a research university, monitoring of performance is becoming both more intensive and more externally driven. These monitoring mechanisms distance themselves from procedures of self-regulation that in the past took place through collegial decision-making and peer support and review. In the U.S. today most of the 50 states have enacted legislative mandates requiring annual comprehensive accountability reports on public colleges and universities (Bogue & Aper, 1999), which implies that self-evaluation or intrinsic motivation for good performance are no longer assumed. In an expanding number of countries, public universities are subject to national rules for measurable efficiency and effectiveness. Ongoing developments in Malaysia and Singapore reflect the application of managerial practices such as performance indicators, benchmarking, and management by objectives, and the widespread use of “personal performance contracts” to assess faculty productivity (Lee, 2002). Similar practices have been reported in South Africa (Adams, 2006; Johnson, 2006).

There is consensus that managers perform on the basis of control, not shared decision-making. A managerialist governance model gives responsibility to the manager, a single individual, who then uses economic rationality over other
dimensions of university life. These practices affect professional autonomy and place academicians on the same plane as workers in other fields. The existence of a correlation between close accountability and performance is mostly assumed rather than empirically proven. The South African study conducted by Adams (2006) finds no clear evidence that productivity increases; in fact, he observes that it tends to replace faculty commitments to their institution by feelings of alienation following tight control measures.

The extension of managerial logic to university functioning creates questionable conditions. Let us explore two examples: First, the concept of terminal efficiency (i.e., the institution’s ability to graduate those who enroll) ignores the human element, which may include difficulties by some students to cope with the material to be learned). Under the terminal efficiency concept, the burden is totally on the institution. This filters down to the faculty level; in many institutions, faculty are being told to ease their grading of students and to lower requirements for graduation at the master’s and doctorate level by requiring shorter and less complex theses and dissertations. Second, the concept of quality is being redefined. Since performance is judged to be of high quality when it leads to high prestige and since prestige in turn is increasingly linked to competition along scientific and technological research endeavors, performance evaluation is designed to detect and reward large research contracts and grants in the scientific fields to the detriment of other disciplines. Contributions in the fields of medicine and engineering are highly rewarded. Developments in information technologies, new industries such as microelectronics, biotechnology, new materials and renewable energies—these are all inventions that stand to benefit society. It is less clear, however, whether rewards and recognition are being proportionally assigned to examinations of environmental problems human beings create through their consumption, to studies of chronic disease affecting poor countries (and thus unlikely to generate profit from their solution), and to considerations of even less profit-dependent inquiries such as the development of solidarity and global citizenship. Quality, therefore, becomes synonymous with marketable rather than crucial knowledge.

*International or Domestic Models for the Academician?*

A core feature of globalization is the compression of time and space (Held et al., 1999). This means that people travel frequently and great distances, that technologically assisted communication is extremely fast, and that ideas move easily across national borders. Through Internet in the North, many of the ideas about the 21st century university come also from the North and shape the South in a reactive and imitational manner. In the face of this scenario, Altbach remarks that the international academic system links the academic profession in a “web of inequality” (1980, p. 5).

Some countries in the South are able to provide their universities with the resources needed to conduct research. Others either do not have these funds or depend on external sources of support for research. In Latin America, the weakening of the state has meant less support for social research (Gomáriz, 1996).
Today in this region between 50 and 75 percent of the funds for social research come from abroad. This implies that limited social science research takes place and what does occur is based on a narrow number of issues.

In the U.S., a classification of institutions of higher education by the Carnegie Foundation prevails. According to this classification, universities comprise nine categories by order of prestige: research universities I, research universities II, doctoral universities I, doctoral universities II, comprehensive universities and colleges I, comprehensive universities and colleges II, liberal arts colleges I, liberal arts colleges II, and community colleges (CFAT, 1994). This classification is quite effective in differentiating universities in order to determine prestige and to prioritize the allocation of research contracts and grants by governments and foundations. It will be interesting to observe to what extent this classification becomes more widespread over time, given that globalization has increased the dependence of the South upon the North (Altbach, 2002).

CONCLUSIONS

The increased access to secondary education as well as the collective imagery of the “knowledge society” brought about by globalization have resulted in the expansion of higher education throughout the world. Simultaneously, economic dimensions of globalization have produced a closer tie between the university and the market, as certain kinds of practical knowledge are demanded for production and commercialization.

This review of the literature has focused on transformations affecting the functions and performance of academicians. In terms of global trends, there are still varying conditions across countries, making difficult the attempt to summarize the impact of globalization upon the professoriate. Nonetheless, there is a visible trend toward increased uniformity, something that perhaps will take 10-15 years to achieve. The available data for a few developing and middle-income countries are beginning to signal some of the same conditions visible in industrialized countries. These conditions comprise the explosion of private institutions of higher education and the strong correlation between this type of institution and part-time academic employment; the decreased support by the state of public institutions, often leading to a deterioration of working conditions there; the re-structuring of fields of study, with some clear winners and losers depending on the practical and marketable applications of those fields; and the absence of any clear response by university professors to shifts in governance and professional autonomy.

In the past, the professoriate constituted a key actor in institutions of higher education; today, the picture is more ambiguous. Within the professoriate itself, many internal hierarchies are undergoing reformation as disciplines vie for their respective contributions and rewards. Today with the rapid development of the natural sciences, technology, and the social sciences, we are witnessing increasingly separated academic communities. The strongest links between academicians are their discipline affiliation and often times their primary affiliation.
might not be with colleagues in their own university but with regional, national, and international organizations around particular disciplines, something detected by Clark (1987) about 20 years ago. This separation has become even stronger now. Moreover, the growing numbers of part-time and temporary faculty members may not be conducive to strong professional identities or to the perception of the academic profession as a desirable and prestigious occupation to seek.

PART II. THIS BOOK

The academic profession has four key dimensions that characterize it: teaching, research, service, and governance. The first three of these responsibilities make the academic profession a privileged one, seeking to serve the nation and new generations; the fourth dimension gives the profession the unique notion of collective autonomy.

In the past three decades, economic globalization, technological development, and a pervasive neoliberal ethos are propelling numerous reforms in educational systems throughout the world. As the level linked most directly to scientific and technological development, higher education has been particularly affected and is undergoing significant changes in the way it positions itself vis-à-vis society and the market, the nature of work of university professors, the types of knowledge that receive priority, and the way higher education institutions relate to one another. As Held et al. (1999) observe, globalization processes not only widen financial and commercial exchanges but also create shifts in the sites of power and changes in identities and practices. The perceived urgency to respond to market forces and at the same time become self-reliant, compels universities—both private and public alike—to alter administrative structures so that the political and economic environment may be constantly scanned and responses to external conditions and pressures may occur in short periods of time. This trend in turn is placing increasing demands on the assessment of faculty research to grant monetary value to their work, making it imperative for academicians to secure substantial research grants and contracts, and to constantly update degree programs to meet the needs of the labor force. While teaching and service remain important functions of academic work, greater value is being attached to research activities.

Conceptual Framework

This book takes as a frame of reference the concept of globalization. We define this concept not only as the flows of investments, technology, knowledge, and people, but also as the confluence of economic forces (new patterns of investment, production and trade) and ideological factors (the predominance of the market in contemporary life and the retrenchment of the state in its political, economic, and social functions) in ways that profoundly impact contemporary society.
Today, there is an expectation and hope that knowledge, even more than capital and labor, will guide the most advanced and thus competitive economies. Knowledge at its most complex and sophisticated level is produced and transmitted at the tertiary level of education; thus, in our globalizing times, higher education becomes a key element in the transformation of society. The impact of globalization upon the university system is felt in many ways: the expansion of higher education leading to the creation of new types of institutions, the concomitant emergence of a global market for higher education, closer links between education and the market; an increase in “brain drain” from developing to industrialized countries; incorporation of non-traditional students; competition for prestige, research funds, and other financial resources; competition for students; and the expanding use of technology at classroom and institutional levels. The diversity of higher education has led to a new term: as reference to the “university” fails to capture the wide array of institutions, the concept of higher education institutions (HEIs) is now in greater use.

The increasingly dense connections between the university and economic actors are facilitating the invention as well as rapid utilization of numerous scientific and technological innovations in universities in industrialized countries. In developing nations these connections are more recent and depend on the international division of university labor. The competition among and within universities for clients has pushed them into the adoption of such guiding norms as performance, accountability, and cost-containment, which “discipline” the university’s work. At the same time, the close university-industry ties are affecting the nature of the academic profession with both positive and negative consequences. The knowledge that industry requires is often centered on short-term problem-solving, the advancement of technology, and the preparation of well-trained workers (Finkelstein, 2003). This knowledge, quite of course necessary, is also narrow in the context of overall societal needs and its value is measured only in terms of its profitability.

The response of HEIs to globalization forces varies according to national and institutional factors. Among the national factors, one must consider historical trajectories, economic models, the political ethos of particular countries, and the national policies guiding higher education. Among the institutional factors, important features are the prestige and stability of the institution, its particular societal mission, and its degree of support by the state. The impact of globalization, consequently, is not uniform across countries and institutions. And, yet, there are some commonalities and some divergencies worth exploring.

Changes in HEIs affect not only the forms in which education is provided and the ways in which knowledge is created and conveyed, but also the professoriate—central actors in educational institutions. As we look at the academic profession, a globalization perspective challenges us to examine institutional diversification and working conditions, but it also prompts us to go beyond these aspects and to be attentive to how changes in HEIs affect the professoriate’s identities and how transformations in the economy and the political realm introduce new values and norms into professoriate performance.
In the pages that follow, the reader will encounter studies conducted in six different nations—Mexico, Brazil, Peru, Denmark, Russia, and South Africa. As each study was based on its own national context, the authors explore different aspects of the professoriate, but as a whole produce a picture that reveals how various facets of faculty identity and performance are influenced by globalization forces. In proceeding, the studies consider issues previously explored in the literature, such as working conditions and salaries, but it places these features in the context of their potential to change institutional affiliation and governance. The studies also touch on new issues such as the deployment of faculty energies toward internationalization activities, the search for funded research, the juxtaposition of teaching, research, and administrative functions along with the parallel emergence of an administrative layer in universities, the consequences of institutional mergers on academics, tensions connected to racial and gender equality, the segmentation of universities and the professoriate, and the increasing redefinition of academics toward unstable and part-time employment.

Research Objectives

The primary research objectives of this book are: to describe and explain shifts in the academic market and working conditions, including those of female and minority faculty; to analyze the impact of emerging influences such as internationalization, research productivity, and institutional mergers on the professoriate; to probe the relationship between predominant forms of academic employment and institutional governance, institutional mission, and strategic objectives; and to examine the transformation of teaching produced by the increasing presence of instructional technologies in the classroom. Overall, the purpose of this book is to assess the impact of these simultaneous forces on faculty identity, autonomy, status, and functions.

Research Methodology

The studies use quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches. The studies on Brazil, Mexico, and Russia rely primarily on large-scale survey studies and two of them are based on portions of instruments used in previous cross-national research funded by the Carnegie Corporation. These three chapters are supplemented by interview data. The study on Denmark uses a combination of survey and structured interviews, covering six universities. The chapters on Peru and South Africa use case study methodologies; the first treats a single university and the other a merger, i.e., a new university formed from two previous ones.

The quantitative data on the professoriate are analyzed primarily through bivariate distributions, often disaggregated by HEI type. The qualitative data are analyzed both deductively—coding and examining factors established prior to the study—and inductively—considering factors and themes that derive from the study itself, what Strauss (1998) would call “grounded theory.”
Six National Studies

All six studies were undertaken with the support of the Fulbright Commission New Century Scholars Program, which enabled six researchers, located in different parts of the globe, to spend three months of fieldwork and to meet three times during the course of the project; hence, there was ample opportunity to refine our research objectives, discuss our analytical frameworks, and sharpen our conclusions. The studies of Mexico, Brazil, and Russia build on previous work on higher education by their authors. The order chosen for the presentation of the chapters obeys the logic of introducing first the cases having certain similarities (Mexico, Brazil, and Peru), followed by what appears to be a unique situation (Denmark), then the case of a country undergoing a major transition to capitalism and globalization (Russia), and finally a study focusing on a specific dimension of globalization, the notion of efficiency (represented by South Africa).

The chapter by Manuel Gil-Antón, based on nationwide survey data for two time periods and interviews, permits an understanding of the evolution of the professoriate in Mexico over the past decades. It examines in particular the conditions and aspirations of the professoriate working in non-elite HEIs. The study highlights the contributions of deregulation to a rapid and necessary market response but also identifies the challenges deregulation poses to the academic profession. Today, still in the throes of a massive expansion of the private sector in higher education, Mexico manifests a significant segmentation among its universities and institutions, with a very large sector of non-elite, for-profit providers. In these institutions, quality is suspect, given the limited number of professors with advanced degrees. At the same time, working conditions of the professoriate are deteriorating, characterized by lack of employment stability, low pay, no participation in governance, and primarily per-hour wages. Gil-Antón makes a strong case for the establishment of accreditation authorities to monitor both institutional quality and professoriate working conditions.

The chapter by Elizabeth Balbachovsky builds on two major nationwide surveys of the professoriate in Brazil. Within the context of the opening of the Brazilian economy and the process of privatization, her study probes the increasing diversification and stratification of Brazil’s higher education system, which separates a few prestigious public universities from a large number of other public and Catholic universities as well as from the growing majority of private institutions that are primarily market-oriented and center on vocational training. A classification of academics into four discrete types is developed to capture differences in terms of their functions, work conditions, and promotion potential.

Nelly P. Stromquist concentrates on a single university, a premier private university in Peru. It examines changes in the professional identity and roles brought about by globalization trends such as inter-university competition, new norms regarding excellence and efficiency, and new information technologies. It compares faculty in disciplines that have benefited under globalization, such as engineering and business administration, with the less market-related disciplines such as the social sciences. It also explores the strong segmentation operating
internally between regular faculty and the growing proportion of hourly wage instructors, which delinks the latter group from any meaningful participation in institutional governance and identification.

Carol Colatrella’s chapter focuses on Denmark, a stable state with a social-democratic philosophy. Her study discusses recent changes in the professoriate and their institutions as a result of Denmark’s embracing of globalization forces, which have imposed changes on faculty in the development of courses, curricula, and research activities. The study explores faculty understanding of career advancement processes, work environments, workloads, and perceptions of success, largely in response to changes in management and increased development of international programs. How these changes are affecting the situation of women academics is a special focus of the study. Due to particular historic and cultural features, Denmark emerges as a country that has been so far successful in facing globalization pressures, including maintenance of egalitarian features among its professoriate, although recently implemented amalgamations might affect this stability.

The chapter by Anna Smolentseva describes several changes in the professoriate as a consequence of Russia’s transition into a capitalist order, the expansion of higher education provision, and an increasingly globalized society. It examines faculty understanding of globalization and internationalization and explores as well how material changes such as the increased amount of part-time work, employment in multiple universities, and growing contact with the West are affecting academic identities. Smolentseva’s study shows that globalization and internationalization forces are felt differentially depending on the status of the university and its proximity to urban and industrial centers.

Reitumetse Obakeng Mabokela in her chapter on South Africa presents the case study of a university that is the product of a merger between a historically white university and a historically Black university. While mergers are advocated throughout the world as key mechanisms to foster efficiency, they also have adverse effects. Her chapter documents conditions for the professoriate along racial and gender dimensions regarding recruitment, retention, and competition for promotion and research opportunities. The study also explores consequences of the merger on the professors’ fears and uncertainties derived from the new institutional culture produced by the merger. Given the legacy of systematic discrimination, it becomes crucial to her analysis to investigate how historically marginalized groups—Blacks and women—navigate the academic landscape to create successful professional lives. During the decade since the election of a democratic government in South Africa, the country has become a regional economic hub attracting foreign nationals from the rest of the African continent. Mabokela’s chapter examines how academics at the new university negotiate the increasing impact of globalization and internationalization on their professional experiences.

The concluding chapter by Nelly P. Stromquist synthesizes the key findings of the six national studies, explaining possible causes for the commonalities and differences in the six national studies. It underlines the book’s main contributions
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to the current theoretical and empirical debate on the link between globalization and higher education. Finally, it develops policy recommendations aimed at a diverse set of governmental and institutional actors.

It is our hope that the findings of this comparative study may help provide a basis for alternative institutional models and inspire individual and institutional action to enhance the contributions of the academic profession to the societies in which it functions. In our increasingly global world, it is imperative to have a broader understanding of education issues as understood and manifested in other social, political, and cultural contexts. If this is accomplished, our book will serve as an important benchmark in the assessment of complex and interrelated issues affecting the professoriate and may help to inform policies that establish institutional processes and structures to protect and strengthen this noble profession.

NOTES

1 Nonetheless, I could locate only one book directly on the subject (Clark, 1987), a work that explores the academic profession in the U.S. and several European universities. The academy has been an object of study through large national surveys only since the 1970s. Mexico represents an exception to this pattern as the professoriate has been an object of study since 1992.

2 Business Week ranks academic programs in business administration on an annual basis. The National Research Council ranks the professional fields of business, law, and medicine every 10 years.

3 Especially in industrialized countries, there has been an explosion of “corporate” universities—those set up by large industrial firms and designed to train their staff in skills directly linked to their production. “Corporate” universities do not offer academic degrees (Allen, 2004), so, in a knowledge-based society, where credentials are at a premium, they do not compete with traditional universities.

4 The study used data from the 1999 U.S. National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. The sample comprised 960 public and private not-for-profit degree-granting postsecondary institutions and 28,576 faculty and instructional staff.

5 Tracking refers to within-school procedures in the U.S. by which students are placed in classes with different levels of intellectual demand, ranging from general courses to advanced-level courses. At times, schools have been found to provide for five different levels of academic rigor.

6 The meaning of “full time” receives different definitions in different countries. For many years, the term in Mexico at a state university meant 20 hours a week, in part to enable faculty to have a second job to improve their income (Gil-Antón, 2002).

7 By 1995, Afro-Americans represented 12 percent of the U.S. population but only 4 percent of the doctorate degrees awarded.

8 This study was based on national statistics on full-time instructional faculty during 1975-76 and various statistics sources for 1978. There have been improvements since then but significant gender disparities remain.

9 The findings were based on a 1976 survey of professoriate conducted by Ladd and Lipset (cited in Marsh and Dillon, 1980).
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