American Faculty and Their Institutions: A Multinational Comparison

By Martin Finkelstein

Martin Finkelstein is professor of higher education at Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey. After receiving his Ph.D. from the State University of New York at Buffalo in 1978, he taught at the University of Denver and Teacher's College, Columbia University. He was also a visiting scholar at the Claremont Graduate University, and the Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University, Japan, and a visiting professor at the University of Hong Kong. As Fulbright senior specialist at the University of Hong Kong, he studied Hong Kong's transition from a three-year to a four-year baccalaureate degree.

Finkelstein served as the executive director of the New Jersey Institute for Collegiate Teaching and Learning from 1989 to 1997. He is the author of The American Academic Profession *(Ohio State University Press, 1988),* The New Academic Generation *(Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998, with Robert Seal and Jack Schuster), and* The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers *(Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006, with Jack Schuster). Finkelstein and Schuster are preparing a sequel to* The American Faculty, *scheduled for publication in 2013. His latest book is* Scholars in the Changing American Academy: New Contexts, New Rules, and New Roles *(Springer, 2012, with William Cummings). Finkelstein and Cummings co-directed the U.S. component of the* Changing Academic Profession Survey (CAP, 2007–08), *which examined the conditions of academic work in 19 countries.*

Despite its many challenges, American higher education is still the premier destination for foreign faculty—and for students, especially at the graduate level. We continue to draw our teaching staff from among the professorial refugees of other national systems. These colleagues perceive their home system as academically inferior, as offering fewer opportunities for fashioning an academic career, or both.[1]

But what is the status of the U.S. academic profession? What are its prospects? Americans often express concern about the "fall of the faculty."[2] They often place that decline in a specific historical context: the phenomenal post-World War II rise of the U.S. academic profession that preceded its precipitous "crash."[3]

This essay does not compare the current status of the American academic profession to conditions in a purported golden age, some

40 years ago. Instead, it reports on the 2007–08 *Changing Academic Profession* (CAP) international survey of the academic profession that compared the current conditions of academic work and careers in 19 nations, including 13 developed countries.

Comparative knowledge about academic professionals and their working conditions gives Americans a perspective within which to interpret national developments.[4] What can we learn from examining commonalities and differences? How does our "fall" resemble the experiences of colleagues elsewhere? How does it differ? After showing how the U.S. differs from other national systems of higher education we compare the structures of academic careers and working lives.[5] Last, we report on our data source: the CAP survey.

U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION: DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

The organization of American higher education differentiates our system from other countries. American colleges and universities are independent, self-governing corporations chartered by state governments to act for the public good.[6] Consistent with their charters, they function autonomously from government authority. Universities in most other countries are branches of national governments administered by national education ministries. They are almost entirely funded by national and/or regional governments. Institutions in the U.S.—especially those in our large private sector—maintain diverse revenue streams, including student tuition, gifts, endowment income, grants and contracts, and auxiliary enterprises.

Many defining features of academic work and careers in the U.S. flow from this organizational fact. Boards of trustees give the campus president and central administrators substantial authority and power. European and Asian administrators, in contrast, are faculty elected and are relatively weak "pass throughs" between individual faculties and education ministries. Their status as employees of corporate entities—not civil servants of the national government—makes American faculty members vulnerable to corporate action. Conversely, the corporate character of academic employment in the U.S. insulates faculty members from direct government intervention. Unlike their colleagues in centralized systems, they are free to define course content and requirements for a major or concentration in their field.[7]

The historic prominence of market forces in the American system also flows from this organizational fact. Colleges and universities have competed for students and faculty for three centuries. This competitive culture—one observer calls it "responsiveness"—and ability of colleges to establish their niche in the marketplace gave rise to two characteristics of the U.S. academic career: (1) a competitive marketplace for faculty talent, and (2) the autonomy to use compensation in that competition.[8] By segmenting compensation by academic discipline, colleges and universities can compete with business, industry, and government to attract faculty in fields with significant non-academic employment prospects.

Related to this market orientation is the extraordinary institutional differentiation in the U.S. when compared to other national systems. The American system had spawned an array of distinctive institutional types with different missions, expectations, and resources long before the onset of massification in the 1950s and the 1960s. Describing and analyzing diversity in the faculty role—the balance between research (if any) and teaching, or variance in academic and personal credentials, for example—requires considerable nuance. A professor is not a professor is not a professor in the U.S.—professors may have different backgrounds, job expectations, and career trajectories.

In contrast, a university has traditionally been a "university" in Europe and Asia—all institutions look like each other. Other nations only diversified their national systems in the last 20 years—and then mainly by opening

technical or vocational institutions as a single alternative to the university, or by spawning a private sector in heretofore-public systems.

We highlight a final distinctive characteristic of the U.S. system. Thanks in large part to the corporate character of higher education and to the "Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure" (1940), issued by the American Association of University Professors, academic careers are structured in terms of timing and sequence. A probationary period culminates in a high-stakes evaluation that in turn leads to permanent appointment as faculty move through a sequence of ranks. Careers are *institutionally anchored*. National disciplinary committees conduct national competitions to fill vacancies in Germany, France, and other European systems. The most highly rated candidates in specific fields are offered the vacancies—even if the candidates do not meet the needs of the academic unit. A faculty member applies for a promotion at the national level, and often must change institutions to advance academically.[9] Academic careers are neither institutionally anchored nor structurally defined.[10]

Identifying these key differences—the greater diversity of settings and work roles; the relative curricular and pedagogical autonomy; the institutional locus of academic careers and the highly structured timing and sequence of career milestones—enables us to introduce the CAP survey, and then to report results of the data analysis.

THE CHANGING ACADEMIC PROFESSION (CAP) SURVEY

Participating Countries

Nineteen countries conducted surveys during 2007–08, using a common sampling frame and instrument: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Finland, Germany, Hong Kong, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, South Korea, the United Kingdom (U.K.), and the U.S.[11] Each national study included a contextual paper and a survey of the academic profession, sometimes supplemented by interviews.[12]

The CAP Sample

The CAP survey reference population includes teaching professionals working at least half time in public institutions of higher education offering a baccalaureate degree or higher, and in private institutions where they are a significant component of the national system. The reference population also included scholars in public institutes focused on basic research.[13] Project participants decided on a minimum effective sample size of 800 returned questionnaires with most items answered. Table 1 provides the number and the distribution of respondents by type of institution and by country.

Developing the Survey Instrument

Designers of the survey instrument sought to include questions related to each of the three major themes of the CAP project: (1) managerialism, (2) internationalization, and (3) relevance. The designers consolidated all items on managerialism in one section of the survey. These items included faculty perceptions of the power and influence of internal and external constituencies in governance, budgeting policies and practices, and evaluating academic personnel, teaching, and research. The managerialism section also measured faculty perceptions of their own power and influence in their academic units and institutions.

The survey distributed the items related to faculty internationalization among several sections of the survey. These items gauged faculty teaching and research activities, career history and mobility, and demographic background, including citizenship and education. Items related to "relevance" appeared in the sections on teaching, research, and career history.[14]

They survey also aimed to assess *change over time* on many dimensions of academic work and of faculty careers. We identified at least three approaches to assessing change:

Table 1. The Changing Academic Profession (CAP) Sample

Country	N	Percent Employed in Universities	Percent Employed in Other Institutions of Higher Education
Argentina (AR)	915	100%	0%
Australia (AU)	1,377	100	0
Brazil (BR)	1,147	49	52
Canada (CA)	1,159	100	0
China (CH)	3,640	85	15
Finland (FI)	1,372	76	24
Germany (GR)	1,196	89	11
Hong Kong (HK)	586	100	0
Italy (IT)	1,711	100	0
Japan (JP)	1,126	21	79
Korea, Republic of (KR)	909	18	82
Malaysia (MA)	1,225	80	20
Mexico (MX)	1,973	35	66
Netherlands (NL)	1,209	34	66
Norway (NO)	970	93	7
Portugal (PT)	1,369	40	60
South Africa (SA)	750	99	1
United Kingdom (UK)	1,074	96	4
United States (US)	1,109	76	24

Sources: CAP Data Set 2011; CAP Survey Audit, 2008.

1. Questions about changes since the respondent's initial entry into full-time academic work;
2. Word for word replications of questions asked in the 1992 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's *First International Survey of the Academic Profession*, which would allow for direct comparisons between years;[15]
3. Disaggregating responses to 2007 survey items by career age (stage) to allow for generational comparisons.[16]

Cross-tabulating perceptions of change with respondent career age (stage) allowed us to align level of perceived change with years of professional experience. Taking verbatim items from the 1992 Carnegie Foundation survey allowed for temporal comparisons across countries. Finally, we sought to apply a generational analysis to the assessment and interpretation of change.[17]

The comparative focus of the project led us to develop common metrics and equivalencies across national systems. After posing questions that respondents could answer by referring to their own system, we created variables encompassing their idiosyncratic responses. Thus, for example, we allowed each team to specify its own national system for academic rank. We

then used these designations to create categories such as "senior rank versus junior rank," and "full professor versus lesser rank."

We also considered survey length. Circulating an instrument requiring more than 30 to 40 minutes for completion could seriously depress response rates. We therefore cut out non-essential questions. But each country could supplement its instrument with questions deemed critical or relevant. The U.S., Canada, and Mexico teams, given the ratification of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and North American Free Trade Agreement, included questions on cross-boundary academic collaboration.

DATA CODING AND ANALYSIS

Coding the Data

A research team at the International Center for Higher Education Research at Kassel University in Germany created a codebook for the core survey. Attaining international comparability of the data files required accommodating differences in terminology. As noted, the team collapsed academic rank categories to senior (associate and full professor in the U.S.) and junior (assistant professor and other in the U.S.). The survey also dichotomized institutional type variables, despite the high level of institutional differentiation in systems like the U.S.[18] The resulting two categories were:

1. University—Research I and II universities and Ph.D. Granting I and II universities in the traditional Carnegie Foundation scheme;
2. Other four-year first degree granting institutions.[19]

Cleaning the Data

The Kassel team and the CAP methods group reviewed basic frequency and crosstabs for data incongruities, and engaged in a two-stage data cleaning process. First, they asked country teams to prepare "data quality" reports and to answer specific questions based on apparent incongruities or missing data. A second review then led to more questions for country teams. The methods group developed a final data-cleaning proposal based on these reviews. The national teams approved, and the Kassel team executed the proposal. The final dataset was released in September, 2011.

Weighting the Data

The Kassel team solicited data on the national distribution of faculty by institutional type, academic field, gender, and rank from each of the 19 CAP countries. The team used this data to weight the sample values to reflect these population parameters.

THE CURRENT STUDY

Institutional anchorage is a distinctive—almost defining—characteristic of American professors and their academic careers. How faculty members perceive their organizational life is perhaps more critical to their career prospects and satisfaction in the U.S. than anywhere else. This report describes those perceptions by examining several aspects of institutional life:

1. The faculty role in institutional governance, including:
   a. Influence at the institutional, school or college, and departmental levels across several decision areas;
   b. Perceptions of administrative leadership, communication, and support for academic freedom;
2. The role of key constituencies in evaluating their teaching, research and service work;
3. The locus of faculty loyalties—to their discipline, their department, and their institution. Our data permits cross-sectional comparisons to identically constructed self-reports in 1992;
4. Self-reported career and job satisfaction.

We compare the situation and views of American faculty to three groups:

1. Faculty in other predominantly English-speaking systems, including Australia, the United Kingdom, and Canada;[20]

2. Faculty in Continental Europe: Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, and Finland in the north, and Italy and Portugal in the south;
3. Faculty in the economically advanced countries of Asia: Japan, South Korea, and Hong Kong.

We first compare the composition of the American professorate to faculty elsewhere along these dimensions: institutional affiliation, disciplinary distribution, gender composition, family status (spouse's employment), age, and academic rank. This data provides the context within which to interpret the difference and similarities between the U.S. and foreign colleagues in the area of governance.

DEMOGRAPHICS

American professors are less likely to be located in research-intensive universities than counterparts in most CAP countries (Table 2). The exceptions are Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, and Portugal.[21] Given that institutional mission and type shape academic work and careers, it is therefore no surprise that American professors show greater diversity in the work they do and the careers they pursue.[22] Reporting a lower research orientation, they are more focused on teaching and instructional duties.

American professors are more likely to be found in the humanities and arts, and conversely less likely to be located in the professions than their counterparts in all countries except the U.K. and Norway. But the differences may be declining: most new U.S. hires have been in the professions and applied fields—the areas of primary growth in recent decades. But we can expect continued aggregate differences between American and foreign academics insofar as disciplinary venue and institutional location shape academic work and careers.[23]

The American professorate shares a key demographic with its global counterparts outside East Asia—the rapidly increasing presence of women. That said, the U.S. still trails Australia, Finland, Norway, Portugal, and the U.K. in the proportion of women faculty. The U.S. shares a related demographic: a high proportion of faculty who are married to other academics—the dual career academic couple. In several other countries (Germany, Italy, and the Asian countries), women are much more likely (by a factor of two-to-one) to report their spouse is an academic. Despite a smaller proportion, this status shapes academic careers for both men and women in the U.S. to a greater extent than elsewhere.

One complication stereotypically associated with dual career couples is depressed job mobility. But our data suggests that American professors are more mobile. This finding may reflect the instabilities involved in locating good jobs for both spouses, which frequently require several moves prior to settling in. It also reflects the more robust academic job market in the U.S., and the "enforced" mobility attending the "up or out" tenure decision—a distinctive mark of academic careers in the U.S.

The American faculty is much more fully represented in the age 55+ category than other developed nations—except for Italy and Japan—by a two-to-one factor. Two-fifths of U.S. academics are 55+ compared to barely one in five elsewhere, and one in ten in Korea and Portugal. Conversely, only one in five is 40 or under—the lowest proportion anywhere except Japan. This higher age profile does not translate directly into senior rank. About half of American faculty members have achieved the associate and full professor level. Two-thirds or more are at those levels in Canada, Italy, Japan, and Korea. This age profile reflects the absence of a mandatory retirement policy in the U.S. and Canada. It also reflects differential timing in the massification of higher education systems. The U.S. system expanded, along with a concomitant hiring explosion, at least a decade earlier than most other nations. Given our knowledge of the developmental stages of an academic career, we expect that American professors will continue to show a large cohort in the latter stages.

Table 2. The Demographic and Career Characteristics of Faculty in 13 Developed Countries, 2007

	Country												
	US	CA	AU	UK	NO	FI	GR	NL	IT	PT	JP	KR	HK
Percent University	76%	100%	100%	96%	93%	76%	89%	34%	100%	40%	21%	18%	100%
Percent Heavily Oriented or Leaning Toward Research	43	69	70	68	83	65	65	50	76	47	71	68	61
Disciplines													
Percent Professions[1]	37	47	55	33	34	49	56	56	47	66	64	55	50
Percent Arts and Humanities	19	17	15	17	15	16	12	10	10	7	15	23	17
Gender (Percent Female)	38	34	57	46	40	45	33	36	32	43	17	18	35
Family Status													
Percent with Academic Spouse (All)	43	39	22	31	66	40	30	–	18	31	6	24	24
Percent Males with Academic Spouse	41	37	23	28	65	43	23	–	14	30	3	20	19
Percent Females with Academic Spouse	46	44	21	34	68	37	44	–	25	33	30	42	35
Distribution by Age													
Percent 40 Years and Under	18	33	31	40	45	55	47	36	22	57	15	21	31
Percent 41 to 55 Years	42	47	47	43	33	32	36	46	43	36	49	70	54
Percent Over 55 Years	40	22	22	17	23	13	16	18	34	7	35	9	15
Percent Senior Rank	51	64	22	32	44	21	21	50	62	11	79	69	34
Percent with Two or More Jobs Since Highest Degree													
In Higher Education	63	53	55	55	51	–	36	49	27	35	54	61	46
Outside Higher Education	18	9	12	22	13	–	8	14	14	7	3	3	8

Source: CAP Kassel International Survey, 2009.

[1] "Percent Professions" includes these disciplines: Medicine, Engineering, Law, Business Administration, Economics, Education, and Agriculture.

Compared to their counterparts in 12 other developed nations, the American faculty works in a more diverse array of institutional settings. A smaller proportion works in the professional fields; conversely, a higher proportion works in the humanities and arts. American faculty members are older and often attain higher ranks. These characteristics complicate the work life of dual-career couples, but they also bring greater career mobility.

Given this portrait, what is the role of American faculty in governing their workplace *vis-à-vis* their foreign colleagues?

THE AMERICAN FACULTY: ITS ROLE IN GOVERNANCE

Table 3 shows faculty perceptions of the *primary* decision maker in five areas across the 13 countries.[24] About three-fifths of U.S. respondents report a decisive faculty role in appointments and promotion of academic staff. This proportion is on a par with most surveyed nations, but significantly lower than Canada or Japan. Less than one-tenth of U.S. faculty members report a decisive faculty role in selecting administrators and in establishing budget priorities; about one-third report a decisive role in establishing new academic programs.

In contrast, faculty members in Canada, Japan, the U.K., and Germany report a more powerful role in administrator selection. Colleagues in Japan, Australia, and several European countries report a more muscular role in establishing budget priorities. The decisive role of U.S. faculty in academic appointments and promotion is thus largely shared with

colleagues in other developed countries. But U.S. faculty members have a less vital role in selecting administrators and in establishing budget priorities and new academic programs.

Another perspective emerges when we compare the percentage of faculty in each nation who report that they are the most influential actors in each decision area (Table 4). U.S. faculty members are in the middle of the international distribution in faculty appointment and promotion—about 50 to 60 percent report primary influence—the area of their greatest perceived influence. They are more influential than faculty in Australia, Germany, Hong Kong, Korea, the Netherlands, Norway, and the U.K., where about two-fifths report that faculty are the prime "deciders." They are on par with faculty in Finland, Italy, and Portugal. But they are not nearly as influential as faculty in Canada and Japan, where about 70 to 80 percent report primary influence.

U.S. faculty members are at the bottom of the international distribution in the area of their lowest influence: selecting administrators and determining budgetary priorities. Slightly below Canada and Germany, they are well below faculty in Australia, Japan, and the U.K. U.S. faculty also rate themselves at the lower end of the distribution in establishing new academic programs. Just over a third of U.S. faculty members report a primary decision role here. Two-fifths of respondents in Australia and Canada and about three-fifths in Japan and the U.K. say these decisions are primarily theirs. Germans report slightly less influence than U.S. colleagues.

The survey tallied weekly hours spent in governance and administration, and examined

Table 3. Percent Rating Various Constituencies as Influential or Very Influential (Have the Primary Influence) on Selected Decisions, by Country, 2007

	Country												
	US	CA	AU	UK	NO	FI	GR	NL	IT	PT	JP	KR	HK
Selecting Key Administrators													
Faculty Bodies	8.4%	34.7%	18.5%	29.0%	17.6%	22.1%	25.3%	1.5%	10.3%	24.6%	43.8%	8.2%	21.1%
Central Administration/External Stakeholders	70.9	46.7	65.1	55.2	61.4	68.7	49.8	66.2	74.9	41.3	38.6	82.7	45.3
Deans/Chairs	14.7	13.7	14.3	13.7	19.6	6.2	15.7	10.5	8.9	30.7	16.3	8.5	13.9
Choosing New Faculty													
Faculty Bodies	61.4	85.3	42.9	54.0	52.1	66.9	46.7	42.6	60.2	60.8	83.1	44.9	35.5
Central Administration/External Stakeholders	5.5	3.3	7.9	15.9	23.8	17.9	26.1	5.1	4.2	5.8	8.8	26.5	13.1
Deans/Chairs	33.1	11.2	30.8	29.1	22.6	14.8	23.0	51.5	32.7	32.9	7.8	28.4	48.2
Making Faculty Promotion and Tenure Decisions													
Faculty Bodies	51.1	65.8	50.8	52.4	37.5	56.2	38.4	24.2	56.1	50.4	75.6	40.2	33.8
Central Administration/External Stakeholders	18.4	12.1	33.2	30.2	39.4	32.4	23.6	6.5	4.3	22.6	16.4	46.4	22.5
Deans/Chairs	30.5	21.6	15.9	16.8	20.4	11.3	35.7	68.7	35.6	24.4	8.0	13.1	42.2
Determining Budget Priorities													
Faculty Bodies	2.3	6.9	22.2	29.5	22.7	37.0	13.0	9.0	27.5	5.8	35.5	8.1	19.5
Central Administration/External Stakeholders	53.1	57.9	55.4	52.0	51.7	49.0	62.8	35.5	40.4	50.7	45.9	77.7	33.1
Deans/Chairs	42.4	31.9	20.5	14.9	23.4	10.2	18.9	53.1	30.2	35.4	18.4	12.8	42.4
Approving New Academic Programs													
Faculty Bodies	35.6	40.3	46.0	60.8	–	36.1	28.2	40.5	75.1	61.8	64.8	32.5	56.2
Central Administration/External Stakeholders	31.9	36.2	39.5	41.1	14.0	33.8	44.7	10.2	7.9	33.0	17.3	44.0	17.1
Deans/Chairs	15.9	16.5	12.9	16.6	16.5	6.0	18.5	45.5	14.3	20.4	16.8	21.8	21.5

Source: CAP Kassel International Survey, 2009.

Table 4. Percent Reporting that Faculty are Influential or Very Influential (Have the Primary influence) on Selected Decisions, by Country, 2007

	Country												
Decision	**US**	**CA**	**AU**	**UK**	**NO**	**FI**	**GR**	**NL**	**IT**	**PT**	**JP**	**KR**	**HK**
Selecting Key Administrators	8.4%	34.7%	18.5%	29.0%	17.6%	22.1%	25.3%	1.5%	10.3%	24.6%	43.8%	8.2%	21.1%
Choosing New Faculty	61.4	85.3	42.9	54.0	52.1	66.9	46.7	42.6	60.2	60.8	83.1	44.9	35.5
Making Faculty Promotion and Tenure Decisions	51.1	65.8	50.8	52.4	37.5	56.2	38.4	24.2	56.1	50.4	75.6	40.2	33.8
Determining Budget Priorities	2.3	6.9	22.2	29.5	22.7	37.0	13.0	9.0	27.5	5.8	35.5	8.1	19.5
Determining the Overall Teaching Load of Faculty	11.0	21.0	37.5	39.4	27.4	62.6	0.0	32.5	52.4	53.3	68.0	24.4	26.2
Setting Admission Standards for Undergraduates	21.6	38.5	32.1	50.4	45.3	49.1	32.1	40.0	57.8	45.7	66.9	22.2	48.5
Approving New Academic Programs	35.6	40.3	46.0	60.8	–	36.1	28.2	40.5	75.1	61.8	64.8	32.5	56.2
Evaluating Teaching	27.3	23.2	33.1	50.7	35.5	47.6	29.1	48.4	39.4	33.6	39.6	9.9	21.1
Setting Internal Research Priorities	43.1	51.9	44.6	53.3	39.8	59.4	63.9	37.9	77.8	58.6	42.3	35.8	41.1
Evaluating Research	53.1	56.9	39.7	41.7	46.7	39.7	40.7	39.6	56.1	45.0	41.4	61.8	34.1
Establishing International Linkages	41.4	51.3	51.4	56.2	76.4	68.5	62.2	36.3	77.0	40.7	36.4	18.2	37.5

Source: CAP Kassel International Survey, 2009.

faculty perceptions of their influence at the departmental, school/college, and institutional levels. U.S. faculty members are at about the middle in weekly time spent on governance—about three hours weekly (Table 5). Faculty report more than four hours weekly in the Australia, Hong Kong, and U.K.; faculty in the eight other nations averaged about two hours weekly.

American academics see themselves as more influential at each organizational level than do most other academics. Only the Netherlands, and, to a lesser extent, Canada, Germany, and Korea are on par at the departmental level; two-thirds answered "very" or "somewhat" influential. But the absolute values are low at levels beyond their departments. Only in Korea and the U.S. do the proportion showing a high level of institutional influence approach one-fifth. The proportion hovers at around one-tenth everywhere else. These results confirm the findings of the only other recent surveys of faculty governance in the U.S.[25]

Only about one-third of U.S. faculty members describe administrative leadership at their institution as competent. The results for most developed nations range between one-third and two-fifths; the proportion reaches a majority only in Germany and Hong Kong (Table 6). About two-fifths of American faculty report they are kept informed about developments at their own institution—about average for the 13 nations. The U.S. is one of only five nations where fewer than 40 percent agree that a lack of faculty involvement is "a real problem here." About 40 percent of U.S. faculty members agree that "administrators support academic freedom." That proportion is significantly lower than the two-thirds reported for Canada and Hong Kong, and the 55 percent for Finland, Germany, and Norway—a relatively creditable, but absolutely disturbing picture.

EVALUATING FACULTY WORK

Faculty evaluation of teaching, research, and service is an essential component of academic work life. In the United States, the American Association of University Professors, and disciplinary and professional associations worked to ensure "peer review" of faculty work as a key norm. But to what extent do peers dominate the evaluation of faculty work in the U.S.? And

Table 5. Faculty Involvement (Mean Weekly Hours) and Perceived Personal Influence at Each Organizational Level, by Country, 2007

	Country												
	US	CA	AU	UK	NO	FI	GR	NL	IT	PT	JP	KR	HK
Involvement													
All Faculty (mean hours weekly)	3.0	3.4	4.4	4.5	2.0	2.2	1.4	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.4	3.9
At the Department Level													
Percent Influential	33.1%	41.8%	32.1%	28.7%	29.0%	35.6%	40.5%	45.1%	34.8%	37.6%	42.2%	45.0%	26.6%
Percent Very Influential	33.5	20.3	13.4	12.6	9.6	10.7	21.3	35.7	7.6	8.4	7.4	16.4	13.1
At the Faculty and School Level													
Percent Influential	32.5	22.2	15.5	15.9	11.5	19.1	20.0	32.7	18.5	17.0	25.1	28.0	14.4
Percent Very Influential	10.3	6.3	3.5	5.0	2.2	2.9	5.8	7.1	3.2	3.3	4.2	3.4	3.2
At the Institutional Level													
Percent Influential	15.8	9.9	6.7	8.0	9.4	11.3	9.3	9.5	5.3	9.0	11.4	17.6	5.6
Percent Very Influential	3.3	2.6	0.9	1.0	1.9	1.7	2.1	0.4	1.5	4.5	2.6	4.9	2.0

Source: CAP Kassel International Survey, 2009.

Table 6. Percent Agreeing that Administrators are Competent and that Faculty are Institutionally Engaged, by Country, 2007

	Country												
	US	CA	AU	UK	NO	FI	GR	NL	IT	PT	JP	KR	HK
Top Level Administrators are Providing Competent Leadership													
Percent Agree	31.5%	37.8%	34.3%	30.2%	29.0%	31.5%	42.3%	23.3%	37.0%	33.3%	33.1%	24.7%	41.4%
Percent Strongly Agree	3.9	7.0	6.5	5.1	7.3	8.0	15.0	4.4	7.6	6.8	12.3	2.6	10.3
I am Kept Informed About What is Going On at This Institution													
Percent Agree	38.8	42.8	40.6	40.9	34.1	40.3	27.9	38.0	42.3	34.1	26.6	39.3	39.6
Percent Strongly Agree	7.4	9.0	7.5	10.6	5.5	10.4	3.9	3.9	7.4	8.0	8.7	2.6	9.1
Lack of Faculty Involvement is Really a Problem Here													
Percent Agree	22.1	27.4	26.0	34.1	27.4	31.4	31.1	32.7	27.4	30.2	32.7	29.9	21.5
Percent Strongly Agree	15.9	14.5	10.7	15.1	14.4	14.6	13.4	8.5	10.4	8.7	23.5	13.8	11.8
The Administration Supports Academic Freedom													
Percent Agree	34.1	48.3	20.8	33.1	39.9	40.6	42.8	46.1	32.7	26.8	30.0	38.3	48.6
Percent Strongly Agree	7.0	19.3	3.1	6.1	15.5	16.1	15.3	5.6	8.5	6.3	7.7	5.1	19.4

Source: CAP Kassel International Survey, 2009.

how does the role of peers in the U.S. compare with that in other nations?

Table 7 shows how faculty members perceive the locus of evaluation in teaching, research, and service. The data reveals three striking, if not surprising findings. First, students play a powerful role in the U.S. and nearly everywhere else, save for Japan and possibly Portugal, in evaluating teaching.

Second, faculty and faculty bodies (peers) play a pervasive role as well in the U.S. Half of U.S. faculty report peer involvement, second only to the U.K. (64 percent) and significantly higher than the other English-speaking and Asian countries, and all of Continental Europe except the Netherlands.

Third, deans and chairs also have a significant role: four of five U.S. faculty attest to their all-encompassing involvement, significantly higher than Canada, Australia, and all the European and Asian countries, except Hong Kong. The relatively greater role of central administration—chief academic officers and provosts—buttresses the role of academic "middle management." In the U.S., 33 percent report central administrative involvement—roughly on a par with Canada and the Asian countries, but significantly greater than Europe, except Portugal. This finding reflects a broader pattern: the ascent of "decentralized managerialism" in the U.S.[26]

Deans and chairs also play a decisive role in evaluating faculty research: nearly two-thirds of American respondents report their involvement. This pattern is replicated in Australia, Canada, Finland, Hong Kong, the Netherlands, and the U.K. Faculty committees and peers are the next group likely to be involved in

Table 7. Percent Faculty Reporting Involvement of Stakeholders in Evaluating their Teaching, Research, and Service Performance, by Country, 2007

	Country												
	US	CA	AU	UK	NO	FI	GR	NL	IT	PT	JP	KR	HK
Percent Indicating who Evaluates Teaching													
Percent Government/External Stakeholders	7.9%	7.9%	5.9%	31.5%	11.0%	11.2%	4.3%	23.0%	8.7%	44.5%	9.0%	4.3%	24.9%
Percent Central Administration	33.4	28.7	17.0	9.0	17.2	11.3	11.1	15.0	2.7	32.3	32.1	31.0	30.5
Percent Deans/Department Chairs	81.2	69.8	67.2	50.5	25.6	54.2	16.9	57.0	32.6	41.8	30.0	23.5	71.1
Percent Faculty Committees/Unions	50.7	34.6	32.9	63.8	25.4	34.7	21.1	51.1	20.1	41.1	20.2	21.4	38.5
Percent Individual Faculty	41.1	38.7	52.5	56.6	31.2	38.5	46.3	29.5	40.0	54.7	20.7	47.8	24.1
Percent Students	90.7	91.5	85.6	92.1	87.6	82.4	76.5	90.6	86.0	59.8	49.6	80.1	92.7
Percent Indicating who Evaluates Research													
Percent Government/External Stakeholders	38.5	59.8	55.1	62.3	37.3	52.3	37.1	50.5	43.2	23.7	14.6	35.7	56.7
Percent Central Administration	30.8	31.1	21.8	21.2	9.5	16.1	18.6	15.8	2.9	12.9	38.0	42.5	37.5
Percent Deans/Department Chairs	64.6	60.9	70.3	63.5	30.1	67.0	17.1	56.1	31.1	11.5	31.1	19.7	78.8
Percent Faculty Committees/Unions	40.8	41.3	34.9	46.5	52.3	50.5	46.6	39.7	37.8	20.4	17.3	29.1	36.4
Percent Individual Faculty	37.2	35.6	43.4	50.7	26.5	41.1	48.0	26.2	42.9	49.1	28.6	45.4	23.8
Percent Students	2.7	2.7	4.0	5.4	4.9	3.0	3.0	4.9	2.3	54.8	2.2	3.1	2.4
Percent Indicating who Evaluates Service													
Percent Government/External Stakeholders	6.5	7.7	6.6	12.1	7.8	14.4	5.6	18.1	4.9	8.9	10.2	12.5	8.5
Percent Central Administration	36.9	30.8	23.2	24.4	22.7	20.9	16.3	9.6	6.4	34.0	34.2	42.9	35.3
Percent Deans/Department Chairs	72.8	70.1	75.8	67.6	22.1	56.8	13.3	52.3	14.6	27.5	25.5	18.2	77.1
Percent Faculty Committees/Unions	45.3	42.5	26.8	34.2	19.2	27.3	31.8	33.5	12.5	49.0	11.0	13.9	29.8
Percent Individual Faculty	30.6	31.2	38.3	47.6	25.1	33.4	40.5	16.3	33.4	44.1	18.9	42.7	11.0
Percent Students	4.7	3.8	10.7	21.0	9.1	9.7	10.4	33.3	5.0	26.4	0.7	1.5	3.9

Source: CAP Kassel International Survey, 2009.

evaluating faculty research in the U.S. This order typifies most CAP counties save for Asia, especially Japan. The federal government and other external stakeholders are almost as involved (40 percent) as faculty peers. But all CAP countries, except for Japan and Portugal, report a considerably smaller proportion. The central administration is more likely to participate (nearly one-third) in the U.S. than elsewhere except Asia and Canada. Students are notably absent, as they are everywhere except Portugal.

The data for evaluating faculty service replicates the findings for research: deans and chairs dominate; faculty and central administrators follow. Government, external stakeholders, and students are relatively absent.

American faculty members are strongly involved in evaluating faculty work, but deans and department chairs are even more involved. Central administration plays a larger role in the U.S. than in other non-Asian nations. Conversely, the role of government and external stakeholders tends to be less pervasive in the U.S. than almost anywhere else.

THE LOCUS OF FACULTY LOYALTIES

Table 8 compares the proportion of academics expressing a strong commitment to their disciplines, their departments, and their institutions, respectively in 1992 and again in 2007. More than nine of every ten U.S. academics indicated a strong or moderate sense of commitment to their discipline in 1992 and in 2007. But the proportion of U.S. faculty indicating a strong or moderate sense of institutional loyalty declined from nine in ten in 1992 to six in ten in 2007, among the lowest proportions in the latter year and among the largest reductions between these years. In short, U.S. faculty influence and energy is departmentally focused; institutional interests and involvement are attenuated.

CAREER AND JOB SATISFACTION

We have compared the demographic profile of American professors to their counterparts in other developed economies, considered their place in their institution—the anchor of U.S. academic careers—their role in steering the ship, and their perception of leadership and feelings of loyalty. But how do the career and job satisfaction of American academics and their colleagues elsewhere compare? The CAP survey queried agreement to the statement, "If I had to do it over again, I would not become an academic." Three of four academics from

Table 8. Percent Rating their Commitment to their Department, Institution, and Discipline as Strong: Eight Countries, 1992, 2007[1]

	Country							
	US	AU	UK	GR	NL	JP	KR	HK
Discipline								
1992	96%	94%	93%	91%	–	96%	99%	93%
2007	92	89	81	90	88	93	89	90
Department								
1992	89	74	66	52	–	85	88	87
2007	78	67	56	51	73	69	89	72
Institution								
1992	90	87	84	34	–	80	97	78
2007	61	51	38	51	50	63	74	60

Source: CAP Kassel International Survey, 2009.

[1] An earlier version of this table first appeared in Cummings and Finkelstein, 2011.

the U.S., Canada, Italy, and Korea disagreed or strongly disagreed with that statement. This finding suggests a relatively high level of career satisfaction (Table 9).

In contrast, only two-thirds of U.S. faculty expressed satisfaction with their *current job*. That proportion placed American faculty members in the middle of the pack along with Germany, Italy, and the U.K. The defined academic career structure in the U.S. and Canada tends to bolster satisfaction with career choice over the long-term. But working conditions in a more market driven system may leave the American faculty members more vulnerable in their current institution than colleagues working under more uniform (for good or ill) conditions abroad.

CONCLUSION

These analyses reveal an overarching contradiction. The data suggests a relatively circumscribed role for American faculty in institutional governance. Faculty members in Canada and Japan surpass Americans in their area of greatest influence—academic personnel. They rank low in selecting administrators, budgeting, and establishing new programs. But American faculty rate themselves relatively high when asked general questions about steering their departments, schools, colleges, and even their institutions. Their meager influence appears greater than the influence wielded by colleagues elsewhere. How can that be?

These dualities may directly reflect the organizational situation of the American faculty. As employees, they are subject to corporate authority and are subordinate to senior executives especially in financial matters. But they exercise considerable power in academic affairs, the limited domain of their expertise.[27] The significance of their institution as a career anchor may lead faculty to overestimate their influence or to express frustration at their limited actual influence. In any case, American faculty influence is largely concentrated in their academic departments and, to a lesser extent, in their larger discipline-related academic units.

These data establish the pervasive role of middle managers—department chairs and deans—in the areas of academic personnel, budget, new program development, administrator selection, and evaluating faculty work. Peer review continues to play a role in teaching, research, and service, especially in personnel processes. But middle management and even central administration play a more pervasive role in the U.S. than elsewhere.

Faculty responses to queries about loyalty and job and career satisfaction reflect their ambiguous, circumscribed, and fragile institutional role. Between 1992 and 2007, American faculty members demonstrated a greater decline in loyalty to their employing institutions than colleagues elsewhere. This result is troubling in a nation where the careers of faculty members are closely tied to these institutions. American

Table 9. Faculty Career and Job Satisfaction: 13 Developed Countries, 2007

	Country												
	US	CA	AU	UK	NO	FI	GR	NL	IT	PT	JP	KR	HK
Would Not Become an Academic Again													
Agree/Strongly Agree	10.4%	11.2%	21.4%	25.3%	16.2%	15.7%	17.9%	14.3%	11.2%	22.7%	12.4%	7.6%	15.6%
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	75.1	75.9	58.2	54.6	65.2	64.4	67.6	68.1	77.8	56.1	54.7	80.0	63.8
Overall Satisfaction with Current Job													
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	64.2	74.8	54.8	45.7	68.1	66.6	56.3	73.9	64.2	49.5	68.3	75.6	62.9
Unsatisfied/Very Unsatisfied	10.3	8.7	19.9	17.9	9.0	9.8	15.7	9.4	6.7	23.0	13.3	3.8	11.3

Source: CAP Kassel International Survey, 2009.

respondents express greater career satisfaction than their counterparts, largely because of their structured academic careers. But their level of satisfaction with their current job places them in the middle of the global distribution.

Americans assume they have the most productive, best compensated, and most powerful academics in the world. But the CAP data indicates a relative absence of organizational power and influence. Canadian, German, and Japanese faculty members report a more prominent role in steering their institutions. Academic managerialism is more decentralized, prominent, and decisive in the U.S. American academics appreciate a relatively well-developed infrastructure for their careers. But they are no more likely than professors elsewhere to be content with their jobs and with their place in their universities.

NOTES

[1] Clotfelter, 2010.

[2] This is the title of a new book by Ginsberg, 2011.

[3] Reflected in Jencks and Riesman, 1968.

[4] A loose confederation of academics sponsored this survey. They participated as country leaders in the first International Survey of the Academic Profession (1991–92), sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and led by Philip Altbach and Ernest Boyer.

[5] Many readers may find this background unnecessary, but we include it to provide a common point of departure.

[6] This is true even for public institutions in the U.S., which are chartered as "public" corporations, with their own boards of governors.

[7] Subject usually, of course, to the prescriptions laid down by their peers in disciplinary or professional associations.

[8] Johnstone, 1999.

[9] Musselin, 2009.

[10] Institutions may "tether" their graduate students and retain them as faculty members in several Asian nations, most notably Japan but also China. Such inbreeding links faculty members to their institutions in a personal—rather than an organizational, career-structural—fashion.

[11] Nine of these 19 countries had participated in the first international survey. Hong Kong, then a British protectorate, had participated in the original survey. The CAP survey invited it to participate again in 2007, despite its change in status to a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China in 1997. The survey treated Hong Kong as a separate country, given its distinctive history.

[12] U.S. researchers conducted no interviews.

[13] Type A of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) classification, or Level 5A of the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED-97), sponsored by UNESCO. The survey included part-time faculty in several Latin American nations with large proportions of part-timers by historic design.

[14] The survey defined "relevance" in economic terms: the role of the university in workforce preparation, applied research, and technology transfer.

[15] Boyer et al., 1996.

[16] Such differences may, of course, reflect different values and perceptions between historical generations, not differences in actual descriptive conditions.

[17] Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster, 1998.

[18] Reflected historically in the nine-step classification of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the myriad missions of institutions carrying the label of university in the U.S. Most other national systems use a clear, singular definition of "university."

[19] Carnegie Foundation, 1994. The survey included a third category for two-year institutions granting the associate's degree or less, but we excluded that category from this analysis.

[20] Canada, of course, has two official languages: French and English.

[21] Treating "type of institution" as a binary variable—"university" or "other four-year institution"—tends to hide the diversity within the research, Ph.D.-granting, and comprehensive university sectors in the U.S. Most other CAP developed counties have binary systems with uniform university and vocational-technical sectors.

[22] Clark, 1987; Schuster and Finkelstein, 2006.

[23] Clark, 1987.

[24] The question listed a series of decision areas and asked respondents to select the primary decision maker in their institution from a list of stakeholders. The list included government agencies, central administrators, middle management, faculty (individuals or designated bodies), and students.

[25] Kaplan, 2002; Tierney and Minor, 2003.

[26] Finkelstein, Ju, and Cummings, 2010.

[27] We distinguish between influence over establishing new academic programs, which nearly always involves a major commitment of institutional resources, and ongoing curricular supervision.

REFERENCES

Boyer, E., P.G. Altbach, and M.J. Whitelaw. *The Academic Profession: An International Perspective*. Princeton, N.J. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1994.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1994.

Clark, B.R. *Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987.

Clotfelter, C.T. *American Universities in a Global Market*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Cummings, W.K. and M.J. Finkelstein. *Scholars in the Changing American Academy: New Contexts, New Rules, and New Roles*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2011.

Finkelstein, M.J., M. Ju, and W.K. Cummings. "The United States of America: Perspectives on Faculty Governance, 1992–2007." In W. Locke, W. Cummings, and D. Fisher, eds. *Changing Governance and Management in Higher Education*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2010.

Finkelstein, M.J., R. Seal, and J.H. Schuster. *The New Academic Generation*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Ginsberg, B. *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why it Matters*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Jencks, C. and D. Riesman. *The Academic Revolution*. New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Johnstone, D.B. "The International Comparative Study of Higher Education: Lessons from the Contemplation of How Others Might See Us," 1999. http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/FFPFP0303.pdf.

Kaplan, G.E. *Preliminary Results from the 2001 Survey on Higher Education Governance*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 2002.

Musselin, C. *The Market for Academics*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Schuster, J.H., and M.J. Finkelstein. *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Tierney, W.G., and J.T. Minor. *Challenges for Governance: A National Report*. Los Angeles: Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, University of Southern California, 2003.