
1. Introduction to the *Research Handbook on Academic Careers and Managing Academics*

Cláudia S. Sarrico, Maria J. Rosa and Teresa Carvalho

RATIONALE FOR LOOKING AT HOW ACADEMICS ARE MANAGED

The academic profession used to be classified as a key profession in society (Perkin, 2018 [1969]); its specific status within society led authors such as Guy Neave to identify it as an ‘Academic Estate’ (Neave, 2015). In the old higher education systems of Western Europe, most academics were either considered public servants or their employment was closely aligned with public administration. In Anglo-Saxon systems, they typically enjoyed tenured status. Their protected status from dismissal assured the academic autonomy and freedom essential to develop academic work.

Along the same lines, Kogan, Moses, and El-Khawas (1994) prefer the expression ‘academic community’ to ‘academic profession’ to highlight that although relevant differences were evidenced within the group, they all share a unique set of common values and norms related to knowledge production and dissemination.

Nevertheless, in the last three or four decades the dominant perspective of academics being an elite profession has been questioned. The current situations of casualization, precarity, division between the haves and the have nots, long hours, surveillance, austerity, erosion of pay, exacerbated competition, work overload, and harmful power relations are the manifestation of these transformations (OECD, 2021).

These trends are transforming the ‘Academic Estate’ into academics as ‘managed professionals’ (Rhoades, 1998), who are managed as any other workers in traditional industrial working relations (Musselin, 2013), questioning their long-established autonomy and freedom (Aarrevaara, 2010; Carvalho & Diogo, 2018a).

There is a sense that the globalization of the academic labour market, and the digital transition, accelerated by Covid-19, has exacerbated these developments. However, there is actually a scarcity of knowledge about how academics are managed at system and institutional level and the impact that has on individuals. There is also a need to better understand how academics’ characteristics, such as gender, age, and position in the academic career, influence or are influenced by the way academics are managed.

There are a lot of sweeping statements and generalizations, regarding how neoliberalism, managerialism, and new public management have influenced the way academics are managed, but these can and are contested; they do not develop in the same way in different systems and institutions. Individuals, institutions, and countries make choices, negotiate change under different contexts, and the results are not the same everywhere. Nonetheless, most analyses on academics’ management are Eurocentric or take a global perspective, without considering the differences between higher education systems.

2 Research handbook on academic careers and managing academics

The negative narratives tend to be more prominent, focusing on the deterioration of working conditions in academia and how the profession is becoming less attractive (Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016; Altbach, Reisberg, Yudkevich, Androushchak, & Pacheco, 2012), reaching beyond the academic literature and into mainstream media (see Table 1.1). Notwithstanding, people still choose to enter and, more importantly, remain, in academia (Cardoso, Carvalho, & Videira, 2019), and their levels of satisfaction often remain high (Bentley, Coates, Dobson, Goedegebuure, & Meek, 2013).

Table 1.1 Portrayal of the academic profession in the media

Publication	Title
<i>Inside Higher Ed</i>	<i>So much to do, so little time.</i> New research finds professors spend considerable time in meetings and on administrative tasks, and much of their time alone, by Colleen Flaherty, 9 April 2014
<i>Nature</i>	<i>The busy lives of academics have hidden costs – and universities must take better care of their faculty members,</i> by Hilal A. Lashuel, 5 March 2020
<i>The Chronicle of Higher Education</i>	<i>Florida law will require public colleges to survey for ‘intellectual freedom’ and ‘viewpoint diversity’,</i> by Emma Pettit, 23 June 2021
<i>The Conversation</i>	<i>Survey of academics finds widespread feelings of stress and overwork,</i> by M. Erickson, C. Walker, and P. Hanna, 28 February 2020
<i>The Guardian</i>	<i>Academics, you need to be managed. It’s time to accept that,</i> by Anonymous Academic, 21 August 2015
<i>Times Higher Education</i>	<i>Professor: End ‘myth’ of marginalised early career researcher.</i> Staff who enter higher education in mid-career without a PhD are academia’s ‘proletariat’, not ‘privileged’ young researchers, by Jack Grove, 16 February, 2021
<i>University World News (Africa Edition)</i>	<i>Academics protest against poor pay, working conditions,</i> by Wagdy Sawahel, 18 March 2021

While change is inevitable, and the call for the good old days extemporaneous, the way that change is managed is consequential. We need to analyse and discuss the way academics are managed beyond dystopian generalizations to address important issues such as the changing nature of academic work and academic labour markets, issues of power, leadership, ageing, gender matters, human resource management practices, and mobility.

The true evolution of the academic profession is certainly more continuous and nuanced than what the headlines would suggest. In looking more in depth at current narratives of managing academics, the aim of this handbook is to have a scholarly look at the issues and set an agenda for research on managing academics and explore how that can inform practice. The volume seeks to explore the issues faced by the academic workforce. Academia is changing in important ways, and we argue that we need research to help us better understand those changes across the world and how that knowledge can inform policy and practice. There are many challenges that need addressing.

The book provides a state of the art to a wide audience – students, academics, higher education professionals, policy makers – to help them better understand the academic and professional theoretical and empirical literature in the field, from a variety of disciplinary perspectives and levels of analysis.

FACTORS AT PLAY IN MANAGING ACADEMICS

Managing academics is a pressing issue in higher education. The expansion of higher education in some systems, and the contraction in others due to demographic shifts along with the increase in the number of doctorates awarded, raises the question of matching the demand and supply of academic staff. In addition, the diversification of the student body, the concurrent diversification of the educational offer and its delivery, raises questions not just about the numbers of academic staff. It also questions the profile of academic staff (field, category, age, gender, ethnicity, qualifications), how it changes in line with student demand, and the diverse missions of higher education institutions, in terms of teaching, research and engagement with the world of work, government and the social sector.

The employment status of academics is also changing in many higher education systems. In some, tenure or civil servant status has been abolished, or the share of academics covered by those arrangements reduced. Some have been moved to continuous employment contracts, but others increasingly face fixed-term appointments, which are often part-time, or are even paid an honorarium by the hour. The balance of stability of academic contracts versus the flexibility sought by institutions to respond to changes in the market for their services and changes in the way they are funded is giving rise to dual academic labour markets (Cavalli & Moscati, 2010; Fanghanel, 2012; Ylijoki & Ursin, 2013; Pinheiro, 2016; Aarrevaara, Dobson, & Wikström, 2015; Santiago & Carvalho, 2008; Carvalho & Diogo, 2018b). There is a marked difference between academics in the career, often research active and full-time, and casual academic staff, often part-time, in teaching-only contracts, or research-only fixed-term contracts associated with project funding for research, and with little prospect of integrating the academic career and progress in the traditional academic ladder from assistant, associate to full professor. The extent to which these changes may interfere with traditional academic values of autonomy and academic freedom in teaching and research is also a topic of debate (Collins, Glover, & Myers, 2020; Carvalho & Videira, 2019; Altbach, 2001).

The design of academic careers, in terms of the recruitment process, remuneration, staff appraisal, staff development, promotion, dismissal and retirement will define the capacity of higher education to attract and retain talent, and the ability of the academic profession to compete with other professions. In some systems, the academic career has become less attractive, especially for young people who often must endure a long period of doctoral and postdoctoral assignments before they are guaranteed a stable academic position (Finkelstein & Jones, 2019). Another issue worthy of consideration is how equal opportunities are assured in the career, and whether diversity and representativeness of the wider population is accounted for (Morley, 2021; O'Connor & O'Hagan, 2020).

The digitalization of higher education, accelerated by Covid-19, potentially changes the nature of academic work, with the possibility of decoupling the tasks of course design and delivery, and student assessment and academic support. Some academic work may change, and staff will need to develop further their digital skills. Some of their work may be replaced by the work of other academic support professionals, or staff adopt 'hybrid' roles or become 'third space professionals' (Schneijderberg & Merkator, 2013; Whitchurch, 2015). Other developments, such as the granting of further autonomy to institutions to position themselves in the market for higher education, accompanied by accountability mechanisms to protect the student as consumer, and to justify institutional public and third-party funding (Sarrico & Godonoga, 2021), generate the need for a cadre of management and administration profes-

sionals within higher education. This has meant that academic staff, in the restricted sense, are now in the minority among staff in some higher education systems (Bossu, Brown, & Warren, 2018), with the possibility for partnership and/or competitive tension between professional groups seeking a voice in higher education.

All these developments make for more diverse and variable academic work, and a more challenging task. Therefore, initial training and continuous professional development are also changing. Doctoral education is now broader, and, in some systems or institutions, academics will no longer start teaching without initial teacher training (Cardoso, Tavares, Sin, & Carvalho, 2020). Professional development, not traditionally embedded in the academic profession, except for sabbaticals, is now more prominent. More training is available on academic writing and publishing, and on teaching in different settings and for different types of students. Academics are also made more aware of the terms and conditions for career assessment and progression and of the link between their appraisal and staff development (Altbach et al., 2012).

An important element of academic staff development is mobility. First, mobility across institutions of higher education and its role in addressing the negative effects of academic inbreeding. Second, mobility between higher education and other sectors, such as the commercial sector, the wider public services, or the social sector, and its role in knowledge exchange. Third, international mobility and its role in research productivity, teaching innovation and regional integration (e.g. European Higher Education Area). International mobility of academic staff also raises the issues of brain drain, brain gain and brain circulation, and the negative and positive effects for those involved (Jałowiecki & Gorzelak, 2004).

Finally, the longevity of the population is reflected in the ageing of the academic workforce. This raises issues of generational renewal and preoccupation with academic productivity and innovation in higher education. Delayed entry into the profession and delayed retirement may be another factor in ageing academic workforces. Flexibility of academic duties with age and the role of emeritus status addresses some of these issues.

All the challenges described above have implications for higher education policies at the system level, which create an environment for institutional practices and ultimately affect the individual academics (OECD, 2020). Theoretical and empirical debates emerge at the three levels of analysis, system, institutional, individual, which are intricately related. This handbook presents the most recent developments and scholarly analysis on managing academics and seeks to explore important debates across the three levels, which will then be a vital basis for further research.

UNDERSTANDING HOW ACADEMICS ARE MANAGED

Changing Context for Managing Academics

This handbook covers a wide range of themes on managing academics at system, institutional and individual levels, and it includes contributions from academics as well as practitioners and policy officials.

Part I of the book presents the changing context for managing academics. It highlights how trends in political economy, the diversification and stratification of higher education systems, the move away from the predominance of collegial governance, and the growing emphasis on

academics' societal engagement activities have influenced the way the academic profession is conceived, organized and managed.

It starts with a chapter by **Pedro Teixeira** where he makes use of political economy for analysing academic labour markets by placing them at the crossroads between economic analysis and political contexts. He looks at the evolution of political economy's views about higher education and the way it should be regulated, and its recent emphasis on the power of marketization. He analyses the evolution of the economic analysis of the labour market and how this influences views on academic careers, by playing down its specificity vis-à-vis a purely economic rationale. Attention is given to pecuniary and non-pecuniary rewards and the extent to which the increasing influence of market forces may shape their evolution and the attractiveness of the academic career, how marketization has been leading to greater differentiation in the reward structure of academics, and the effects from an emphasis on performance management.

Glenn A. Jones and Julian Weinrib discuss how the academic profession has become increasingly fragmented and stratified. They define and describe the horizontal and vertical fragmentation of academic work and the academic profession within institutions of higher education, and then discuss how this fragmentation is further exacerbated by institutional diversity, especially vertical stratification within higher education systems. They conclude by discussing some of the key challenges for academic managers, such as the need to rethink strategies to improve academic mission and the performance of their institutions taking into account the casualization of academic staff. They conclude that the changes in the profession demand an administrative evolution with the emergence of new forms of management and leadership.

Mónica Marquina, Cristian Pérez Centeno and Nicolás Reznik analyse academic institutional power in Argentina within a context of change in university governance, from a collegial to a managerial model. The changes occur in a context of deep transformations of higher education systems in Latin America under the New Public Management paradigm. Using data from the Academic Profession in the Knowledge-Based Society (APIKS) survey, their analysis contributes to the discussion on 'managing academics' by reflecting on how changes in governance have an impact on academic power and institutional control. The new governance models, framed by NPM, do not entirely substitute the collegial model, but academics do perceive them as increasing institutional control over academic activity by a minority group of academics. Paradoxically, those who consider themselves more influential are also those who perceive more institutional control, which reveals a more complex relation between academic and managerial power than is usually assumed. This work questions the idea that new governance models transform academics into 'managed professionals'.

Christian Schneijderberg and Nicolai Götze, originally intending to present the diversity of academics' societal engagement (ASE) and ASE knowledge ecologies, the look into literature made it clear that there are primarily two ASE-activities valued and counted: University–industry linkages and commercial ASE-indicators (e.g. patents, spin-offs, industry funding). To systemize this observation, a bibliometric mapping of science is conducted in the innovation studies journals *Journal of Technology Transfer*, *Research Policy*, *Science and Public Policy* and *Science, Technology and Society*. The epistemic governance-led study tests the hypothesis that the publishing imperative of university–industry linkages and commercial ASE-indicators is a management program for academics by academics. Accordingly, we define university–industry linkages and commercial ASE-indicators as paradigm of global epistemic

socio-economic and -political work, i.e., epistemic governance by and for academics. With exceptions, the findings suggest that academics in innovation studies are a sciento-political college, which globally manages the innovation paradigm of university–industry linkages in correspondence with economic policy, both in developed and developing countries.

The Role of Academics and Other Higher Education Professionals

Part II of the handbook looks at the role of academics and other higher education professionals in the changing context faced by higher education systems and institutions. New leadership and management roles and the need to cope with the multiple functions of teaching and learning, research and scholarship, and engagement with society call for adequate processes of recruitment, induction, and development along the careers of higher education professionals. In addition, new forms of academic work need to be conceptualized, developed and implemented.

Jürgen Enders and Rajani Naidoo discuss research on the emergence of a relatively new staff category in higher education that no longer fits the traditional academic–administrative divide: new professionals who support processes in research, teaching, public engagement, and management. They argue that their rise is tied to the overall rise of management in higher education and to the changing context and conditions for universities over recent decades. As a consequence, national variations regarding the quantitative and qualitative development of this new staff group can be observed. They discuss their roles as hybrid professionals serving in a wide variety of specialized expert roles, their sources of professional legitimacy and power as well as their contestation. As situated professionals, this new staff group is not only embedded in but also dependent on local organizational orders that influence their professional boundary work with academics: reflecting rather traditional academic–administrative divides, third spaces of fluid collaborations, or managerialist disruptions of academic values and powers.

Along similar lines, **Roxana Baltaru** discusses how contested changes in the governance and organization of UK universities have blurred the boundaries between academics and non-academic professionals. Managerial concerns are becoming integral to academic work while the roles of non-academic professionals include ‘academic’ areas of activity. Her chapter shows that the borderlessness between the activities of academics and those of non-academic professionals is being legitimized in the occupational classification framework applied to the UK higher education sector by the national statistics office, encouraging a shift in the conceptualization of higher education personnel irrespective of academic orientation. However, when managing academics, one should think critically about the implications of borderlessness for the academic profession, and challenge taken for granted assumptions about the ways in which human resources should be mobilized to fulfil the complex missions of universities today.

Timo Arrevaara and Raija Pyykkö deal with the research profession working in higher education, government, business enterprise, and non-profit private sectors. Research systems differ significantly in the degree to which their financial instruments are based on competition, in the application of uniform well-established standards and in how evaluation is carried out. In systems based on the Humboldtian tradition, research and teaching are integral university activities, while in the French Napoleonic tradition, separate non-teaching academies have played a significant role. The systems have a significant impact on which institutions the research profession operates in its research and experimental development roles. Researchers

working in innovation systems have the highest level of qualification as academics but develop their work within different contexts, albeit with some similarities. Professions generally seek legitimation of their work from an academic and disciplinary knowledge base that is internationalized. Comparing the working and professional conditions of researchers inside and outside academia improves our understanding of the policies and practices of human resources management within academia.

Maarja Beerkens and Marieke van der Hoek examine academic leadership as universities have grown in complexity and as policy reforms in many countries have strengthened the strategic role of university leaders. The importance of leadership at all organizational levels – the top management, deans and department heads, and curriculum and course directors – is increasingly recognized, alongside their unique challenges. There are some signs of ‘professionalization’ of academic leadership, but the traditional academic norms remain strongly present in the role. Furthermore, contemporary managerial reforms are often seen as confronting traditional academic (leadership) norms. Organizational scholars characterize universities as a unique type of organizations – semi-anarchic, loosely coupled organizations with strong (disciplinary) sub-cultures, and with a distinctive ‘collegial’ and ‘professional’ nature. These characteristics create a unique leadership context. The authors review the empirical literature that identifies a range of approaches and competences that seem to be effective in the specific context of higher education institutions.

Andrea Adam and Natalie Brown discuss the development of the ‘new’ academic, in the context of continual change in higher education in response to societal, government and market forces. There are increasing demands on universities in terms of teaching, research, and engagement with communities. Therefore, the importance of managing human resources in universities, how they are recruited, inducted, and supported in their development, is, more than ever, of interest. Drawing on a growing body of research evidence and better understanding of the diversity of roles and backgrounds of new academics, their professional learning needs are being actively considered by universities. Several different frameworks and approaches to developing academic staff through early career into leadership are now in existence and are being implemented and evaluated across the sector. Evidence-based frameworks, which reflect the complexity of a contemporary academic career, can cater for individualized development opportunities that support academics on a variety of career pathways.

Hamish Coates and Adrianna Kezar conclude the second part of the handbook dedicated to the role of academics and other professionals in higher education, with a reflection on cultivating ‘designed academics’. While critiques of faculty work and roles abound in the higher education literature, less has been said about the established and rapidly entrenching forms of academics which have emerged, and which with intentional design will play an important future role. Their chapter steps beyond prevailing work on academic unbundling, and commercial work on academic ‘re-engineering’, and opens a discussion regarding the formation of ‘designed academics’. It calls for a much more intentional design of future academics. After framing the discussion, they develop the idea of ‘designed academics’, articulate contexts which have led to contemporary circumstances, look at how universities might lead the design of future academics, and examine prospects for further development. The chapter builds a perspective on what can be done to conceptualize, develop and implement new forms of academic work.

Gendered Academic Careers

Part III of the handbook is dedicated to the discussion of gender in academic careers, especially the quest for gender equality and the need to have academic leaders able to promote it. This is a perennial topic which is still relevant even in countries known for active policies and practices on gender equality for some years now.

Helen Peterson and Birgitta Jordansson contend that gender inequality is a serious and complex challenge that needs to be addressed by academic managers and leaders, who should ensure that they facilitate increased gender equality with regards to both formal and informal institutional practices. Their chapter argues for the importance of gender aware and gender competent academic managers and leaders who are willing to be change agents for gender equality and exercise gender equality change management and leadership. They explore the conditions for such successful change agency. The chapter builds on previous research in this area by emphasizing the distinction between formal and informal change strategies, tasks, and responsibilities. These distinctions are illustrated with examples from a study on gender mainstreaming in Swedish higher education where academic managers were interviewed about their implementation strategies. The chapter sheds light on the need to reflect on the specific and distinct gender equality skills and ethos all leaders and managers in academia need to have.

Nicoline Frølich and Rune Borgan Reiling discuss academic career paths and career ladders, focusing on gender, diversity and equal opportunities of academic staff framed within the context of the Norwegian higher education system. The Norwegian case is especially interesting as women, similarly to many other countries, are underrepresented at the top of the academic ladder, despite Norway scoring high on gender equality. Their analysis indicates that there are no gender differences in the probability of career promotions on the lower levels of the academic ladder in the Norwegian academic system. However, there is a statistically significant female disadvantage in the probability of being promoted to full professor in humanities and social science, and in mathematics and natural sciences, but not in medicine and health sciences. Despite several years of equal opportunity policies, the authors' analysis suggests that there is still a gender difference in the career trajectory from associate to full professor in Norwegian academe. They call for further research to investigate the reasons for the disciplinary differences, and the characteristics of the women that succeed in climbing the academic career ladder.

Pat O'Connor argues that managerialism in higher education is reflected in an emphasis on research performativity, i.e. a focus on research output and associated metrics. She departs from Carvalho and Santiago's (2010, p. 399) question of the extent to which the top-level ideological commitment to managerialism 'truly touches HEIs' shop floors'. Her chapter draws on qualitative data from a sample of men and women split between the academic and the research tracks in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) in an Irish case study university. It shows that their responses to research performativity varied, with four categories being identified: Pragmatic Acceptance, Alternative Envisioning, Rejection and Amelioration. The work looks at the intersection of their gendered positioning and their career tracks as academics and researchers. None of them actively embraced research performativity. Each of the categorical responses raises important issues for management, underlining the need for a re-evaluation of the managerialist call for performativity. The chapter highlights the relevance of rethinking performance assessment in managing academics.

The Performance of Academic Staff

Part IV of the handbook delves into the performance of academics and its management, including the development of more sophisticated performance measurement and management systems at macro and meso level and how this influences academic work.

Martin Finkelstein and Qi Li describe the escalating and shifting demands amid resource constraints within which higher education and the academic profession find themselves. They then focus on how scholars have conceptualized the productivity and performance of academics and how they have sought to develop operational indicators to measure it, with a reflection on the US case. They look to the empirical social science literature on the interaction of individual, institutional, disciplinary, and public policy factors that shape the performance of academics. They conclude by identifying the implications of the available research for improving staff appraisal. Further research should include three major concerns: (i) how productivity and performance of academic staff is affected by institutional type, academic field and discipline, as well as type of faculty appointment; (ii) how to manage current tensions between higher education as a public and a private good, teaching and research, societal relevance and market needs, and between the performance appraisal and productivity measurement of academics for reward and sanction purposes and for development purposes; and (iii) more empirical analysis across countries.

Liudvika Leišytė discusses how surveillance capitalism increasingly fosters digital tools for performance management. Performance measurement and management tools in higher education are being digitalized across different higher education evaluation regimes, higher education traditions and types of higher education institutions. She describes the range of actors involved in this process, and the increasingly prominent roles played by EdTech companies and university Human Resources and Information Technologies departments. She presents an overview of how digitalization is permeating performance measurement at the macro level and performance management at the meso level, discussing how far this may influence academic work. She observes a stronger adoption of surveillance capitalism in higher education by the employment of more digital performance management instruments at all levels. This has the potential to significantly increase the control over academic work, raising serious questions about what counts as performance in academia, who decides what counts, and how professional autonomy is experienced by academics in surveillance capitalism. For the author, managing academics in the next decade will be a complex interplay between academics, managers, policy makers, and intermediary agencies, but also an array of professionalized human resources, information technology and other administrative professionals, EdTech corporates, and increasingly smart digital infrastructures.

Peodair Leihy and José M. Salazar describe how theories of academic capitalism, which arose during the 1980s and 1990s, have inspired commentary on expanding academic systems where transactional incentives have greatly informed academic behaviours. Often this transformation has seen not the monetization of academic values, but their squeezing out by more venal operators. In developing academic systems, such as the one they focus on – Chile – that have sought to mimic mature systems in academic career structures, academic capitalism low on real academic capital, which they dubbed academic careerism, can take root. Their chapter illustrates the differences between academic capitalism and academic careerism in a range of dimensions, with examples from the Chilean context, practices and events. A corollary is

to dispel the common misconception in countries such as Chile that the troubled practice of academic capitalism in developed academic systems is just about money and power.

Human Resource Management of Academics

Part V discusses the role of human resource management in relation to managing academics, at regional, national and institutional level. It starts with a focus on human resources management elements in supra-national policies and how they can contribute to the development of higher education systems and institutions. It then looks at how human resources management policies at national level and practices and tools at institutional level are developed and implemented, and how the work of academics is influenced by them.

Attila Pausits, Jussi Kivistö, Elias Pekkola, Florian Reisky, and Henry Mugabi review policies connected to, emphasizing, or affecting human resource management in higher education. They then use the emergent theoretical framework comprising different human resource dimensions and functions at higher education institutions to analyse the European Commission's recent and milestone policies to improve and develop higher education. In addition to cross-referencing and analysing legal and policy documents, the chapter maps the connections among human resource functions and policies. It provides an inventory of European Union policies and explores how the human resource dimensions of these policies could improve and change higher education. They conclude by arguing for more focus and attention paid to human resource management to develop higher education towards intended European policy objectives.

Nina Arnhold, Elias Pekkola, Vitus Püttmann, and Andrée Sursock present the case for reforming academic careers in Latvia. Due to its hybrid higher education tradition that contains elements from different development phases and the close links of its current reforms to European higher education trends, Latvia represents a particularly interesting case of reform dynamics. Based on insights gathered during a succession of advisory services for the Latvian government, their chapter analyses the status quo and recent developments in the areas of the doctorate and postdoctorate, the recruitment and promotion of academics, and remuneration and incentive systems. For each of the three areas, it highlights the complex interplay of reform intentions, traditions within the sector and key framework conditions, specifically the combination of a high degree of institutional autonomy, specific system-level regulations, and the scarcity of funding for the sector.

Karen Vandeveld, Bart Bozek, Marjolijn De Clercq, and Nel Grillaert note that although most scientific Human Resources (HR) theories are developed in academic environments, academic institutions tend to be slow in picking up such insights in their own HR practices. Antwerp University tries to find a balance between the scientific rigour of evidence-based HR policies, on the one hand, and pragmatic choices that gain sufficient bottom-up support, on the other, in an environment of increasing pressures and global competition. Their chapter is a case study of change management in progress focusing on the constantly shifting dynamics of crucial HR processes: selection and recruitment, leadership development and career development in an evidence-based environment. They conclude that since there are few good quality frameworks to support universities in implementing evidence-based and mission-oriented human resources practices in higher education, it is fundamental that a platform is created where academics and practitioners can share insights to inspire and challenge

one another. Institutional change management processes are best implemented by combining the bird's eye view of theoretical insights with the view from the ground.

Tatiana Fumasoli and Giulio Marini investigate the role and practice of Workload Allocation Models (WAM) as managerial devices used at system and institutional level to manage academic work. They draw on data from a survey in five British institutions. WAM appear to be widely known, understood, and used. However, in the perception of academic staff, they do not reflect accurately the allocation of time to academic activities. In this sense, their analysis points to the limits of WAM to manage academic work at institutional level. It shows differences according to employment contracts – combined teaching and research, teaching-only, research-only – and to terms of employment – open-ended and fixed-term contracts. Their findings point to the significant persistence of academic normative frameworks, in which research is considered a key activity for career prospects regardless of job descriptions. Overall, their work illustrates how the tensions between academic and managerial logics play out in the practice of WAM and suggests that a more flexible approach with the bottom-up involvement of academics may improve well-being and satisfaction among staff.

Mobility and Internationalization of Academics

In Part VI of the handbook, the mobility and internationalization of academics is discussed. Attention is given to the themes of inbreeding, both at individual and system level, and its relation to academic mobility, short- and long-term international mobility, and the more recent effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on mobility. The challenges for system and institutional management of academic mobility are addressed including how to foster academic mobility but also how to better integrate mobile and international academics and how to manage academics in a global and international context. Finally, it is discussed how internationality, in relation to various modes of knowledge transfer as well as to the substance of academic work of teaching and research, can enhance academic work.

Andrey Lovakov, Maria Yudkevich, and Viktoriya Kryachko discuss the consequences of inbreeding – the employment by universities of their own graduates – both at individual and system levels. Inbreeding is a puzzling phenomenon: while there is mixed and somewhat controversial evidence of the impact of inbreeding on individual productivity, there is also no consensus in policy circles on whether inbreeding should be supported, banned, or simply ignored in university employment policies. Inbreeding is closely related to a broader phenomenon – academic mobility. The authors discuss the role of academic mobility in the organization of national academic systems and explain why different levels of academic mobility may coexist within one system and what individual characteristics are associated with higher and lower mobility. They conclude by discussing the consequences of low academic mobility as well as some policy measures that may be implemented to improve mobility both at the national and international levels, considering the varied characteristics of academic staff (e.g. gender, family status, age, special needs, etc.).

Jeroen Huisman discusses international staff mobility, the temporal or more structural physical migration of academics across national borders. He explores what the concept of academic mobility entails. Subsequently, he addresses the drivers for mobility and shows how contemporary academic mobility can be seen as being guided by individual motivations, institutional strategies, and national and supra-national policies. The chapter discusses the benefits and impacts of mobility, as well as the downsides and barriers. There are positive impacts of

migration, but potential downsides, barriers and problems should not be underestimated. He concludes by reflecting on the findings, including Covid-19 challenging the need for physical mobility associated with internationalization, and offers some guidance to higher education management based on relevant human resource management literature. He proposes two directions management can take: treat all employees and visiting scholars equally and ensure everyone receives the 'standard' institutional HR support; or develop specific policies and programmes for migrant staff. Either way, institutional human resource practices need to continuously address challenges of acculturation, while mobile academics need to continuously work on emotion regulation.

Futao Huang and Yangson Kim present an overview of international faculty at universities in China, Japan, and Korea, and the main challenges they face. They find that enhancing global competitiveness and promoting internationalization of national higher education have become decisive factors affecting rapid growth in the number of international faculty especially in China and Japan. The implementation of relevant national strategies and projects through a top-down approach has significant impacts on expanding the size of international faculty across the three case countries. International faculty's demographic profiles and work roles have become increasingly diversified. Nonetheless, despite differences in the three countries, international faculty still face many similar challenges, relating to integration into the host country, their participation in governance arrangements and institutional decision-making processes, and worries about their uncertain future careers. These authors' analysis is particularly relevant to reflect on the complexities and specificities of managing academics in a global and international context.

Ulrich Teichler describes how public discourses on changes and reform needs in higher education have contributed to the importance of internationality since the 1980s. Issues of international student mobility and international academic mobility as well as internationalization policies of international organizations, national governments and other umbrella organizations are in the limelight of debates and activities. Less attention is paid to the roles of internationality's various modes of knowledge transfer as well as to internationality in the substance of academic work of teaching and research. As far as systematic information is available, internationality of higher education differs more substantially by country than the international debates suggest. The patterns of academic mobility and of other international activities are so varied that similar thrusts as regards internationality in teaching and research cannot be expected. Many scholars emphasize that an international scope is highly influential for their teaching and research activities, but hardly any systematic information is available on how international thrusts shape the substance and the character of academic work. However, new concepts of internationality in teaching and learning, such as 'internationalization at home' or 'internationalizing the curriculum', are steps towards more systematic reflection on how internationality can be part of academic reasoning. University management can act as a driver towards increased reflection and towards an improved handling of internationality within academic work, in various respects: promoting the international dimensions of curricula as well as teaching and learning, and the design and undertaking of research where internationality is a crucial component.

Age and Generational Gaps in Academic Careers

Part VII of the handbook discusses issues of age and seniority in academic careers and the generational gaps between early career academics and established academics. Attention is paid to the challenges of seniority for academic management, as well as to those related to the early career phase. The challenge of managing different groups of academics, and particularly distinct generational groups is also discussed. A reflection is provided on how far universities' governance bodies, but also senior professors, support and manage (or not) early stage academics and promote mechanisms for their socialization into academe.

Elias Pekkola, Taru Siekkinen, Hanna Salminen, and Emmi-Niina Kujala contend that managing seniority is a pressing, albeit still understudied theme in universities' human resource management (HRM). In many European universities, the academic staff is ageing. They discuss the nature of seniority and consider it from three different perspectives that are interrelated in academic careers: age, level of competence and hierarchy. All three dimensions are significant with respect to organizational HRM in universities, and they relate in many ways to the traditions and practices of academic work and careers in academia in general. The impact of these three dimensions for HRM is seldom discussed. The physiological age should be taken into consideration especially when planning and managing academic work; academic competences and qualifications are also extremely relevant since they are considered as one of the few legitimate ways of managing and steering academic work and performance; finally it is also relevant to look at hierarchy and reflect on the impact of developing management roles for career progression and on the potential negative impact of having a dual career ladder for academics and managers.

Oili-Helena Ylijoki and Lea Henriksson draw on a generational perspective to investigate how senior professors and junior academics make sense of the early career phase at university. Their study is based on focus group discussions of early career academics and individual interviews of established professors in the social sciences in Finland. While juniors describe their ongoing experiences, professors recall their own beginning in academia and compare the past with the present. In this way, the generational lens makes visible the temporal layers of academic career building, tracing both continuities and changes in intergenerational experiences and views. The study shows that despite the generational difference, seniors' and juniors' understandings are embedded largely in shared values and ideals, which collide with the managerial, competitive, and insecure present-day university environment. However, junior academics have different career strategies with distinct relations to managerial control at their disposal, pointing to increasing polarization of career building at this early stage. The chapter shows how challenging managing different groups of academics of distinct generational groups can be.

Rosemary Deem examines how early stage academics (ESAs) are supported and 'managed' in the contemporary university, both formally, by academics, managers, and human resource management practitioners, and informally, through networks and peer support. Her chapter draws on debates about communities of academic practice and managerialism, and tackles issues of precarious academic careers, mental health, and gender and race discrimination in appointments and practices. ESAs cover a broad grouping of those new to academic research and teaching, though they are not necessarily from any specific age group, gender category or ethnic group. They include doctoral researchers, research and teaching postdocs, and permanent or tenure-track lecturers and assistant professors who are within the first couple of years

of their appointment. The chapter concludes that communities of practice are important for ESA development, but often they are unfunded and not all of them support learning, inclusion and diversity. In addition, management of ESAs is frequently more concerned with meeting key performance indicators rather than promoting work–life balance, career-nurturing, situated learning and support which is inclusive and values ESAs adequately.

Lars Geschwind, Jenny Wiklund Pasia, and Linda Barman use Tönnies' twin concepts of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* to analyse the experiences of early career academics (ECA) who were recruited as assistant professors with the prospect of gaining tenure. Based on 19 semi-structured interviews from a research-intensive university in Sweden, their chapter discusses the socialization of these recruits in several areas, including relationships, networking, job performance, and CV building. The results show that Tönnies' famous distinction helps shed light on the challenges and tensions involved in establishing an academic career. On the one hand, early career academics are expected to demonstrate independence and individual excellence, and their individual performance is measured on various scales. On the other hand, they depend heavily on senior colleagues who act as gatekeepers and 'clan leaders' for entry into the academic community, and are expected to take part in collegial activities such as the co-supervision of PhD students and to play key roles in large grant applications. This chapter is particularly relevant since it adds a new perspective to the topic of 'managing academics' by drawing our attention to the political dimension of academia and to the relevance of the symbolic power relations between different actors.

We hope that the multiple accounts and perspectives presented in this handbook will offer the opportunity to look at both how academics are managed and how the management of academics influences their roles and careers. We trust that the set of chapters provides different theoretical perspectives and levels of analysis regarding these topics, while also allowing for broad geographical coverage, not restricting the debate to the usual Western European and Anglo-Saxon locations. The handbook is also envisaged as a point of departure to a debate that is expected to be both enlightening and clarifying in shaping the issues that the shifting frontiers of managing academics pose both for individuals, higher education institutions, and higher education systems. The 'good old days' about being an academic may be gone. But that must not mean that 'good new days' about being an academic are not possible. It may indeed be just a matter of endeavouring to find the most promising and adequate ways to manage academics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was financially supported by the project POCI-01-0145-FEDER-029427-funded by FEDER, through COMPETE2020 – Programa Operacional Competitividade e Internacionalização (POCI), and by national funds (OE), through FCT/MCTES.

REFERENCES

- Aarveaara, T. (2010). Academic freedom in a changing academic world. *European Review*, 18(1), S55–S69.

- Aarvevaara, T., Dobson, I. R., & Wikström, J. (2015). Changing employment and working conditions. In T. Fumasoli, G. Goastellec, & B. M. Kehm (Eds.), *Academic Work and Careers in Europe: Trends, Challenges, Perspectives* (pp. 95–115). Cham: Springer.
- Altbach, P. G. (2001). Academic freedom: International realities and challenges. *Higher Education*, 41(1), 205–219.
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., Yudkevich, M., Androushchak, G., & Pacheco, I. F. (Eds.) (2012). *Paying the Professoriate: A Global Comparison of Compensation and Contracts*. New York: Routledge.
- Bentley, P. J., Coates, H., Dobson, I., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, V. L. (Eds.) (2013). *Job Satisfaction around the Academic World*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Bossu, C., Brown, N., & Warren, V. (2018). Professional and support staff in higher education: An introduction. In C. Bossu & N. Brown (Eds.), *Professional and Support Staff in Higher Education* (pp. 1–8). Singapore: Springer.
- Cardoso, S., Carvalho, T., & Videira, P. (2019). Is it still worth working in academia? The views from Portuguese academics. *Higher Education Policy*, 1, 663–679.
- Cardoso, S., Tavares, O., Sin, C., & Carvalho, T. (Eds.) (2020). *Structural and Institutional Transformations in Doctoral Education: Social, Political and Student Expectations*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carvalho, T., & Diogo, S. (2018a). Exploring the relationship between institutional and professional autonomy: A comparative study between Portugal and Finland. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(1), 18–33.
- Carvalho, T., & Diogo, S. (2018b). Non-tenured teachers, higher education. In P. N. Teixeira & J.-C. Shin (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of International Higher Education Systems and Institutions*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Carvalho, T., & Santiago, R. (2010). Still academics after all. *Higher Education Policy*, 23, 397–411.
- Carvalho, T., & Videira, P. (2019). Losing autonomy? Restructuring higher education institutions governance and relations between teaching and non-teaching staff. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(4), 762–773.
- Cavalli, A., & Moscati, R. (2010). Academic systems and professional conditions in five European countries. *European Review*, 18(S1), S35–S53.
- Collins, H. J., Glover, H., & Myers, F. (2020). Behind the digital curtain: A study of academic identities, liminalities and labour market adaptations for the ‘Uber-isation’ of HE. *Teaching in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1706163>.
- Fanghanel, J. (2012). *Being an Academic*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Finkelstein, M. J., Conley, V. M., & Schuster, J. H. (2016). *The Faculty Factor: Reassessing the American Academy in a Turbulent Era*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Finkelstein, M. J., & Jones, G. A. (Eds.) (2019). *Professorial Pathways: Academic Careers in a Global Perspective*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jałowicki, B., & Gorzelak, G. J. (2004). Brain drain, brain gain, and mobility: Theories and prospective methods. *Higher Education in Europe*, 29(3), 299–308.
- Kogan, M., Moses, I., & El-Khawas, E. (1994). *Staffing Higher Education: Meeting New Challenges*. Report of the IMHE project on policies for academic staffing in higher education. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Morley, L. (2021). Does class still matter? Conversations about power, privilege and persistent inequalities in higher education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 42(1), 5–16.
- Musselin, C. (2013). Redefinition of the relationships between academics and their university. *Higher Education*, 65(1), 25–37.
- Neave, G. (2015). The state of the academic estate. In T. Carvalho & R. Santiago (Eds.), *Professionalism, Managerialism and Reform in Higher Education and the Health Services* (pp. 15–29). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- O’Connor, P., & O’Hagan, C. (2020). The academic career game and gender related practices in STEM. In P. Cullen & M. Corcoran (Eds.), *Producing Knowledge, Reproducing Gender: Power, Production and Practice in Contemporary Ireland* (pp. 25–46). Dublin: University College Dublin Press.
- OECD (2020). Human resources in higher education. In *Resourcing Higher Education: Challenges, Choices and Consequences*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

- OECD (2021). *Reducing the Precarity of Academic Research Careers*. OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers, No. 113. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Perkin, H. (2018 [1969]). *Key Profession: The History of the Association of University Teachers*. London: Routledge.
- Pinheiro, R. (2016). Humboldt meets Schumpeter? Interpreting the 'entrepreneurial turn' in European higher education. In S. Slaughter & B. J. Taylor (Eds.), *Higher Education, Stratification, and Workforce Development. Higher Education Dynamics* (Vol. 45, pp. 291–310). Cham: Springer.
- Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Santiago, R., & Carvalho, T. (2008). Academics in a new work environment: The impact of new public management on work conditions. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(3), 204–223.
- Sarrico, C. S., & Godonoga, A. (2021). Higher education system rankings and benchmarking. In E. Hazelkorn & G. Mihut (Eds.), *Research Handbook on University Rankings*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Schneijderberg, C., & Merkator, N. (2013). The new higher education professionals. In B. M. Kehm & U. Teichler (Eds.), *The Academic Profession in Europe: New Tasks and New Challenges* (pp. 53–92). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Whitchurch, C. (2015). The rise of third space professionals: Paradoxes and dilemmas. In U. Teichler & W. K. Cummings (Eds.), *Forming, Recruiting and Managing the Academic Profession* (pp. 79–99). Cham: Springer.
- Ylijoki, O.-H., & Ursin, J. (2013). The construction of academic identity in the changes of Finnish higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(8), 1135–1149.