

# **FORMING THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION IN EAST ASIA**

---

A Comparative Analysis

Terri Kim

ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS:  
HIGHER EDUCATION



ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS:  
HIGHER EDUCATION

---

Volume 14

FORMING THE ACADEMIC  
PROFESSION IN EAST ASIA

---



# Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# **FORMING THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION IN EAST ASIA**

*A Comparative Analysis*

**TERRI KIM**

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published in 2001 by Routledge

This edition first published in 2019

by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge

52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2001 Terri Kim

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-138-32388-9 (Set)

ISBN: 978-0-429-43625-3 (Set) (ebk)

ISBN: 978-1-138-31594-5 (Volume 14) (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-45595-7 (Volume 14) (ebk)

### **Publisher's Note**

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original copies may be apparent.

### **Disclaimer**

The publisher has made every effort to trace copyright holders and would welcome correspondence from those they have been unable to trace.

Forming the Academic  
Profession in East Asia  
A Comparative Analysis

---

TERRI KIM

ROUTLEDGE

A MEMBER OF THE TAYLOR & FRANCIS GROUP  
NEW YORK & LONDON/2001



# Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

**For my parents:**  
**Professor In Whoe Kim and Professor Ok Sun Choy**





# Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Published in 2001 by  
Routledge  
A member of the Taylor & Francis Group  
29 West 35th Street  
New York, NY 10001

Copyright © 2001 by Terri Kim

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publishers.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available  
from the Library of Congress.*

ISBN 0-8153-4053-2

Printed on acid-free, 250 year-life paper  
Manufactured in the United States of America



# Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# Contents

Foreword by Cowen	ix
Preface	xiii
List of Tables	xvii
 Chapter One: Introduction	 1
 Chapter Two: Ideal Typical Models	
Ideal Typical Models of the University	19
<i>Newman's Idea of the University</i>	20
<i>Jaspers' Idea of the University</i>	22
<i>Confucius' Idea of the University</i>	25
Ideal Typical Models of the State	28
<i>Locke's Conception of the State</i>	28
<i>Confucius' Conception of the State</i>	29
Ways to Think about the Academic Profession	31
 Chapter Three: The Colonial Period	53
The Values and Visions of the State	53
<i>Korea: Values and Visions of the State:</i>	
<i>The Japanese Colonial State's Modernity Projects</i>	54
<i>Malaya: Values and Visions of the State:</i>	
<i>The British Colonial State's Modernity Projects</i>	58
The State's Idea of the University: Struggles over Institutional Forms and Valued Knowledge	62
<i>Korea: The Japanese Colonial State's Idea of the University</i>	62
<i>Malaya: The British Colonial State's Idea of the University</i>	73
The Shape of the Academic Profession in the Colonial Period	81
<i>Korea: The Shape of the Academic Profession</i>	82
<i>Malaya: The Shape of the Academic Profession</i>	89
Conclusion	93
<i>The Shaping of the Academic Profession in Korea and Malaya</i>	94
<i>The Shape of the Colonial Academic Profession:         Japan and Britain Compared</i>	100

<b>Chapter Four: The Postcolonial Period</b>	<b>133</b>
The Values and Visions of the State	134
<i>South Korea: Values and Visions of the State:</i>	
<i>The Independent State's Modernity Projects</i>	134
<i>Malaysia: Values and Visions of the State:</i>	
<i>The Independent State's Modernity Projects</i>	138
<i>Singapore: Values and Visions of the State:</i>	
<i>The Independent State's Modernity Projects</i>	141
 The State's Idea of the University	 145
<i>Korea: The State's Idea of the University</i>	146
<i>Malaysia: The State's Idea of the University</i>	155
<i>Singapore: The State's Idea of the University</i>	168
 The Shape of the Academic Profession	 176
<i>Korea: The Shape of the Academic Profession</i>	177
<i>Malaysia: The Shape of the Academic Profession</i>	183
<i>Singapore: The Shape of the Academic Profession</i>	189
 Conclusion	 194
<i>The Shaping of the Academic Profession</i>	194
<i>The Changing Shape of the Colonial Academic</i>	
<i>Profession: South Korea, Malaysia, and Singapore Compared</i>	201
 <b>Chapter Five: The Conclusion</b>	 <b>261</b>
The changing shape of the academic professions	262
'Ideas of the university' and struggles over institutional forms	263
The social construction of meritocratic principles	265
Cultural identity: Language	266
Cultural identity: Knowledge	267
Cultural importations and adaptations	269
Autonomy and the changing social role of the academic profession	270
 <b>Bibliography</b>	 <b>281</b>
 <b>Index</b>	 <b>331</b>

# Foreword

Robert Cowen

When I was a student, on my second course in comparative education, we had a look at 'education as a profession'. The topic reminded me of some of the ways of learning expected of me as a student in economics or in international law. There was a model, a principle, and the job of the student was to show knowledge of that, rehearse some difficulties, and then arrive at a reassertion of the explanatory power of the principle.

So this comparative education course was ok. Here was a simple model—professions performed an essential public service, the practitioners had esoteric knowledge, based on intellectual principles, a code of ethics, and the practitioners controlled entry to (and exit from) the profession and put service before profit. Here was the answer to an exam question, already half-written. All that was required was to feed in a bit of illustrative material from the United States or France on the situation of school teachers, contrast with the USSR, and serve up in good handwriting.

I still remember what happened later, when as a beginning student at the M.A. level, I suggested that the model was poor history and thus poor sociology; that it was an ideological statement that hid conflict over the control and distribution of knowledge; that it missed out the role of the State in the control of professions. I found myself in the middle of a very brutal fight. My teacher was asking how useful the model was as a measuring device in 'comparative education'. I was asking whether this kind of comparative education was good social science—though I did not realise that at the time and as students often do I lost the fight. I also lost something else. I had moved out from the role of being a good student. Clearly I was now a bit of a nuisance—reading books I should not have been reading. And if I wanted a career in comparative education, then I had clearly been politically very careless. But what I gained was immense—the beginnings of intellectual independence well before I started a Ph.D. I still find it a delight when a student, sustaining an interpretation with clarity and courage and

determination, disagrees with something I had thought of as more or less true. So in this thesis of Dr. Kim's there come together some of the pleasures of university work: those of fresh interpretations and intense discussions and a great deal of lonely scholarship.

Retrospectively the pattern of how this work was created is reasonably clear. In real life as it was lived, we as supervisors were not always sure what we were doing. Nor were we always clear what was being argued by us or by the doctoral candidate. Good theses are often like that, despite what some of the books of advice say about how to get a Ph.D.

However there was a certainty. The future Dr. Kim was sure that this was her topic, a topic for her. She had begun to read and—far more rapidly than I had as a student—had formed a critical view of the existing literature. She then had the courage to outline her ideas on a large canvas, to do a risky thesis, one where a Ph.D. was not being guaranteed by a bit of competent fieldwork. She thought and she wrote. There was a huge excursion into post-colonial literature. There were displays of controlled bad temper—like the remorseless politeness of the British traffic police when they are confronted with something they do not like. Kim survived; indeed she fought back. She won her independence. Her viva was a polished performance—after some of the tutorials it was probably a bit of a relief and a bit of relaxation. But that was a while ago and that was the beginnings of making a young scholar.

Now the thesis is objectivated. It stands alone as text. It can be criticised. It will be. Her work is in the public arena. Let us hope she is not too distracted by criticisms of it and let us hope she does not spend a great deal of her professional career defending her doctoral thesis. Some academics do—and I am not thinking of Durkheim. There are other things to do, and other things to move on towards and already Kim is thinking of new topics and of some changes in her approach to this one.

In this work as it stands, she has made a good initial case for the historical and sociological contextualisation of analyses of professions. She has raised some interesting questions about the role of colonial states in the construction of professions. She has raised some good questions about the narrow line between the public interest and the need for some parts of the work of the academic profession to be left to academics. Clearly some of these themes come out of colonial oppression—the Japanese occupation of Korea was not kindly and the British occupation of Malaya while sometimes kindly was culturally overconfident and corrosive. The recovery from those colonialisms and the construction of the academic professions in those countries is a fascinating story that Kim tells well. The story is a dramatic one and sometimes, for example, in the search by Koreans for ways to claim their own educated identity, a moving one.

But for me it is the contrast—between Kim's story of tragedies and the contemporary academic profession in England—which captures my imagi-

nation. Certainly there are a lot of historical and comparative tragedies—the figures of Socrates or Heidegger. There are the Generals or Colonels in Argentina or Brazil or Greece and the universities. There are the university exiles and those who ‘disappeared’ or had their careers destroyed in times of McCarthyism, or fascism in Asia or Europe, or in the former USSR and Central and Eastern Europe. These are the high dramas of academic life and its relation to the state. The tragedies—the destruction of the mandarins—are there for us to explore and explain.

But what I would like to see now is more studies of banalities and the academic profession. What are the mechanisms of state surveillance of universities in ‘democratic societies’? How corrosive is ‘management’ to and within university academic culture? What is the relationship between entrepreneurial or theoretical creativity and the bureaucratisation of teaching—where aims and objectives and expected learning outcomes have to be stated for each lecture-seminar? Does it make a difference if Paulo Freire or a visitor with a bit of paper and a check-list of behavioural expectations assesses your teaching?

The contemporary answer in many countries is, ‘yes, it—management, measuring, public transparency—does make a difference’. Careful measurement of performance in universities is important because this sooner rather than later leads to improvements in the quality of university research and teaching and care for students and productive links with society and efficiency and effectiveness in the use of scarce resources, including public money and the ability of countries to compete in an international and globalised knowledge economy; and so on and so on. The ideology, in some countries, is fully developed. In what ways are this ideology and these banalities of surveillance leading to the destruction of the scholarships of teaching, of integration, of the application of knowledge, and of discovery about which Ernest Boyer writes so well? In what ways are the ideology and the surveillance leading to improvements in the power, elegance and impact of those scholarships?

I suggest we do not know. I suggest that much of the time we are asking the wrong questions—questions about trends and convergences—and collecting the wrong descriptions—descriptions of training systems or processes for the improvement of the academic profession, for possible transfer to other countries.

And indeed there is the core of the matter. Imagine Kim’s comparative account of the social construction of the academic profession in parts of Asia—and the human tragedies and cultural discontinuities involved in that story—allied with the borrowing from, say, England of concepts and practices for the quality control of the university and the academic profession. Imagine the historical tragedies combined with the contemporary banalities. The imagining must be urgent: there is strong interest in policy circles in Japan, for example, in improvements in quality control of the universi-



ties. Senior Taiwanese visitors wish to discuss the same themes. In South Korea there is a powerful interest in the 'internationalisation' of universities—which on closer inspection seems to be quality control by other means.

Tacitus once wrote that the Romans in Britain made a desert (*solitudinem*) and called it peace. One contemporary version of that theme would be: how much banality can university systems stand? Kim's writing—on colonialism and the academic profession and on the contemporary controls on the university by the state in some countries—is a fine entry point for thinking about both propositions. The answers she gives in this work are disturbing. Were she now to extend her work to contemporary fashions in the international transfer of quality control practices in universities she might generate answers that were frightening.

# Preface

The first version of this book was written as my doctoral thesis at the Institute of Education, University of London in 1998. The book traces the changing shape of the academic profession in (South) Korea and Malaya, Malaysia and Singapore, since colonial times.

This work tries to explain the different formations of the academic profession in modern East Asian university systems, with the argument that the colonial origins of the university systems have affected the postcolonial conditions of State-University relations in these East Asian countries; and the work aims at a comparative understanding of the shape, and the shaping, of the academic profession in the historical context of the different cultural and knowledge traditions of East Asia under international influences. In Korea, the formation of the modern academic profession was heavily influenced by Japan and the U.S.A.; in Malaysia and Singapore, by Britain. My comparative research interest in 'the academic profession' came also from a personal desire to understand something of the history of my family within the academic profession in Korea. Since the turn of the 20th century, Korea has undergone constant political upheavals and rapid social transitions in the process of colonisation and modernisation. My grandparents and many of my family members in the academic profession had studied in foreign universities—e.g. in Japan, U.S.A., China, Canada, and Germany—during and after the Japanese colonial period.

Currently my parents are university academics. Exceptionally, however, my parents deliberately chose not to study abroad and completed their higher degrees in Korea. My father was awarded the first 'Korean' Ph.D. in Education at Yonsei University in Seoul, Korea. He then pioneered the new academic "decolonisation" movement in Korea in the 1970s and 80s. Unlike my parents, I chose to study abroad. I went to England to study comparative higher education for both M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. In fact, I am the only person in my family who was awarded an "English" Ph.D.—

the first such Ph.D. in Comparative Education in Korea.

Thus, given my family's history and my own experience of the English university, my comparative inquiry began in both professional and personal curiosity about the social contexts, the political power, and the economic forces which have shaped the academic profession. To me, the academic profession in Korea seemed very different from the academic professions in countries with British colonial legacies, let alone in countries that have very European ideas about what a university academic is. I felt that the academic profession in Korea should be understood both comparatively and in a particular East Asian context.

In the existing literature, however, comparative studies of the academic profession often tend to stress comparison out of context and a convergence hypothesis. In this book, I wanted to explain a particular shape of the academic profession, as an historical object of transformation in the social dynamics of political and economic conditions in East Asia and international relations of the region.

The initial argument of my research was that the shape of the academic profession which has emerged by the contemporary period is a reflection of both the inherited models of higher education and their redefinition after the colonial period. The specific argument of this book is that the shaping of the academic profession in Korea, Malaysia and Singapore can be understood because of this colonial genesis and because the State formations of the colonial and postcolonial periods permitted only restricted social space for the university and academic autonomy.

Many debts had been incurred in composing this work. In particular, I should like to thank the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP), for having been honoured with an Overseas Research Scholarship at the Institute of Education for three years, from 1995.

I was extremely fortunate as a doctoral student to have two supervisors. They enabled me to understand the importance of a strong academic culture, of being at a major international academic centre to learn both comparative higher education and intercultural studies.

The intellectual and pedagogic charisma of Professor Robert Cowen, my supervisor, illuminated what the English model of liberal knowledge and cultivation can mean—when coupled with demands for precision of thought and excellence in writing. I also remain amazed by the quality of teaching in his fortnightly doctoral seminars. My special thanks are expressed to Professor Jagdish Gundara, my other supervisor, for his genuine personal concern for my progress and especially his invitation to think divergently and broadly about the themes in my thesis.

The excellent supervision and the very English apprenticeship I received from my supervisors were vital in forming my self-identity as an academic. Two years after my Ph.D., my comparative concerns for, and interest in, the university and the academic profession have become more realistic with

some hands-on experience of teaching at universities in Korea.

Finally, I dedicate this book to my parents and grandparents on both sides, who were pioneers in the formation of the Korean academic profession. Without my parents' academic inspiration, loving encouragement and support during the entire period of my Ph.D., I would not have begun, nor been able to complete, this comparative research on the academic profession.



# Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# List of Tables

## **In Chapter Three**

Table 1: Higher Education Enrollment in Korea by Nationality in 1925

Table 2: Number of Students at Kyung Sung Imperial University (1924-1943)

Table 3: Types and Number of Schools and Student Enrollment

Table 4: Private Missionary Institutions of Higher Education in Korea in the Colonial Period

## **In Chapter Four**

Table 5: The Number of University Students and Academic Staff (in South Korea)

Table 6: Higher Educational Institutions, 1992 (in South Korea)

Table 7: Number of Students of College and Universities by Course in 1997 (in South Korea)

Table 8: Annual Rate of Increase in Enrollment, 1960-1985 (in Malaysia)

Table 9: Enrollment Rate by Race in Malaysian Universities in 1980

Table 10: Ethnic Composition of Students in Each Faculty of the University of Malaya

Table 11: Enrollment and Output for First Degree Courses from Local Public Educational Institutions, 1990-2000

Table 12: Percentage Changes in Student Enrollment by Faculty University of Singapore, Sessions 1969/1970 to 1973/1974

Table 13: Post-colonial Career Routes of Kyung Sung Imperial University Graduates

Table 14: Korean Academics Studying Overseas by Country in 1986

Table 15: Foreign Professors in Korea in 1986

Table 16: Number of Expatriates vs. Locals in the Academic Profession in Malaysia

Table 17: University of Malaya: Rate of Recruitment of Staff

Table 18: Academic Staffing at the University of Malaya 1962 - 1977

Table 19: Teaching Staff by Academic Rank University of Malaya

Table 20: Scholarships and Bursaries by Country of Study, 1985-1991 (in Singapore)

### In Endnotes

Table A: Education Enrollment in Korea by Nationality in 1925

Table B: Development of Junior Colleges (1910-1945)

Table C: Annual Growth Rates in Real GNP in South Korea (1965-1994)

Table D: Percentage of Students in the Public Sector in South Korea

Table E: Changes in Enrollment Rates in Higher Educational Institution by Year in South

Korea

Table F: Expansion of Higher Education in South Korea, 1945-1997

Table G: Students per Teacher in Higher Educational Institutions (in South Korea)

Table H: Revenues of Higher Education Institutions (1985) (in South Korea)

Table I: Membership of Registered Professions by Ethnic Group in 1990 (in Malaysia)

Table J: Faculties and Schools at the University of Singapore

Table K: Official Qualification Requirements for Faculty Members in Year (in South

Korea)

Table L: Qualification Requirements for Academic Staff in Year (in South Korea)

Table M: Employment by Occupation and Ethnic Group 1990 (in Malaysia)

Table N: Postcolonial Career Development Trends of Kyung Sung University Graduates

after Independence

# Introduction

The purpose of this book is to examine comparatively the formation of the academic profession in Korea and Malaya (and later South Korea, Malaysia and Singapore) from colonial times. The main argument is that the academic professions in these places have been affected by their colonial genesis and by the particular State formations in the three East Asian countries. The comparative analysis of this book thus takes account of the connections and disconnections between the colonial and postcolonial periods in the shaping of the academic profession.

The initial proposition of the book is that the Western notions of the 'idea' of the university, of the State and of the academic profession are not always appropriate ways in which to approach East Asia.<sup>1</sup> Part of the work of the book is to show why this is so, starting with the colonial period in Korea and Malaya. However, this book is not in itself an historical narrative.

This book is a comparative inquiry into the relations of the State and the university which define some of the dynamics of the social construction of the academic profession in the three countries. By investigating the different formations of the State and relations of the State and the University at different times, the book attempts to locate comparatively the forces shaping the academic profession in these countries.

To create its analytic frame—the theme of 'the shaping' of the academic profession—the book critically assesses the concept of the academic profession as this is treated in the existing literature, establishes ideal typical models of the university (through the writings of Newman and Jaspers and Confucius), looks at conventional views of the East Asian State, and by the end of Chapter Two sets out a way to think about the shape of the academic profession, without imposing on the analysis some of the assumptions made in the classic and recent literature on professions.

Chapter Three analyses the emergent academic profession in Korea and



Malaya, in the context of Japanese and British colonial policies. The colonial political, economic and cultural milieux in Korea and Malaya define variations in, and close some of the options for, the formation and the subsequent shape of those two academic professions.

Chapter Four looks at the academic profession in the postcolonial period, within the processes of decolonisation and 'indigenisation'. (Indigenisation is here taken to mean the political processes by which each State redefined the national culture against colonial legacies in a postcolonial context.) Subsequently, all of these three East Asian States have recently taken up the theme of 'internationalisation' of higher education and this theme is also incorporated in the analysis.

Thus the themes that run through the book are: (i) the continuing cultural legacy of the pre-colonial and the colonial origins of what became the academic profession in the post-colonial period; (ii) the role of the East Asian States as actors in defining, legitimating, and implementing the political, economic and cultural contexts within which the academic profession was shaped in the postcolonial indigenisation process; and (iii) the challenges of internationalisation and globalisation as contemporary influences on the academic profession.

The book, in its closing argument, will analyse the overlap and contradiction of the various State projects in the colonial and postcolonial shaping of the academic profession, including the redefinition of imported models of the university, and the consequent 'peculiar' shape(s) of the academic profession in these East Asian countries.

The next chapter will begin the task of sorting out ways to think about the social construction of the academic profession in the countries selected for analysis. However, before that effort at rethinking begins, it is important to explain why existing approaches in the literature are not, simply and directly, incorporated into the book.

There is a considerable literature on the academic profession in general, but the book begins in disappointment with this literature, notably with the Carnegie Commission Report and subsequent analyses of the Korean academic profession. Perhaps, as in most books, there is also a personal element. My own family for several generations has included academics. Currently, both my parents are academics. The conventional literature on the academic profession seems to me to capture little of the anxieties, tensions and social struggles within which the academic profession in South Korea, at least, has been formed.

So the book begins in both professional and personal curiosity about the social contexts, the political power, and the economic forces which have shaped the academic profession in different places. Is it really the case that the academic profession is everywhere becoming the same ('converging')? Is it really the case that university academics everywhere are working within the same 'idea of the university', although this is now under pressure

from 'the market'? Is it really the case that these East Asian governments, as in North Western Europe (with some exceptions) or North America, have respected academic autonomy and freedom? And even if the academic profession is under pressure to be 'relevant and useful', why is this so and what does 'relevant and useful' mean in particular times and places?

Thus, the first issue in the book—reviewed in the remainder of this chapter—is what theoretical purchase does the existing comparative literature offer to clarify such puzzles about the academic profession? How useful and relevant in theoretical terms is the existing literature for examining the academic profession in the context of East Asia, especially during the times when the academic professions were in process of formation?

It will be suggested that some of the best existing analyses of the academic profession in the literature are not directly useful for this book.

The existing literature has examined the academic profession within the general concept of profession as this has been constructed in Western sociology. In the existing sociological literature on 'professions', 'a profession' is often specified through criteria such as cognitive base, institutionalised training, licensing, work autonomy, collegial control over entry and exit, and codes of ethics.<sup>2</sup> For example, according to Myron Lieberman, a profession "performs a unique and essential social service; is founded upon intellectual techniques; has a long period of specialised training; offers a high degree of autonomy both to the individual practitioner and to the occupational group as a whole; accepts responsibility for judgements made and acts performed within the scope of professional autonomy; puts emphasis upon the service it performs rather than the economic rewards that the practitioner gets; is a self-governing organisation of practitioners, and finally operates on the basis of a code of ethics."<sup>3</sup>

However, it is important to be clear, immediately, that this book is not asking and answering the question of whether "academics" constitute 'a profession' in such a traditional sociological sense.<sup>4</sup> In other words, this book does not set out to utilise as a *tertium comparationis* such a standard concept of profession. Such models are normally static and distract attention from the question of the dynamics of the construction of professions. Even where there has been some effort to tackle the issue of power, and to locate the State and its role in the construction of the professions, the work has remained at a high level of abstraction and does not close down the issue comparatively and descriptively.<sup>5</sup>

The existing literature on the academic profession itself falls into two groups. One group uses an explicit comparative approach.<sup>6</sup> The other group offers case studies e.g. of America or of Britain, with implicit implications for comparison.

Most comparative analyses of the professions in the existing literature focus on Anglo-American and European examples and Anglo-American issues. These local issues have been extended to the international level to

conduct "comparisons"; for example, by academics in books, and by major agencies such as the Carnegie Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).<sup>7</sup> Among the analyses by academics<sup>8</sup>, P. G. Altbach wrote on the academic profession as early as the 1970s, in his *Comparative Perspectives on the Academic Profession*.

The book deals with eight cases: Britain, Italy, Japan, Australia, Canada, Latin America, India and North America.<sup>10</sup> The rationale for selecting these countries is not explained. There is no common conceptual framing for the analysis of the national academic professions. Nor is there any suggestion of the need to conceptualise the academic profession differently in Asia, Europe, Latin America and North America.<sup>11</sup>

The main analytic theme of the volume is the Anglo-American concern with "academic drift" in the 1960s and 1970s, a period marked by rapid expansion of higher education in many countries.<sup>12</sup> The main issues identified in the book are that "...general economic problems have caused governments to cut back on funding for universities. Demographic and economic factors have caused a downturn in enrollment in the industrialised nations".<sup>13</sup> The issues regarded as central in this book thus stem primarily from Anglo-American contexts and concerns.

The book makes no effort to synthesise the issues discussed in each chapter in a comparative conclusion, a point which Altbach, as Editor, notes in his Introduction:

Comparative analysis of higher education in general and of the academic profession in particular is rare, and difficult to undertake because of the many national differences involved and the expense of such research (see Altbach, 1977). The chapters in this volume are case studies of specific countries, and it is left to the reader to discern relevant comparison [sic].<sup>14</sup>

Thus, the book offers little, conceptually and descriptively, for the comparative analysis of the formation of the academic profession in other social contexts and other times.

Similarly, Burton Clark's comparative discussion in *The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings*<sup>15</sup> is limited to northwestern Europe and the United States. The countries in this volume are the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and the United States. The rationale is that they are considered "the major international centres of learning". Although Burton Clark indicates that this book is an international comparison to explore the variety and uniformity of the academic profession, the main emphasis in the text is on the enormous variety in "American higher education".<sup>16</sup> The conceptual apparatus used for the comparative analysis of the academic profession in this book is based on three categories: nation, discipline and institution.<sup>17</sup> However, they are used only to analyse the structural foundations of the Western aca-

demic profession in the 1980s.<sup>18</sup> The book does not cover a wide range of time and space—and does not consider East Asia.

Among the work by the agencies, a wide-ranging comparison of the academic profession was made by the Carnegie Foundation in 1994 in its Report, *The Academic Profession: an International Perspective*. The fourteen countries included in the survey were Australia, Brazil, Chile, Germany, Hong Kong, Israel, Japan, (South) Korea, Mexico, the Netherlands, Russia [sic], Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.<sup>19</sup> The point of the comparison:

... was to learn more about the condition of the professoriate from a larger perspective and, in the process, define priorities that could strengthen the academy worldwide....The result is, we believe, the most comprehensive view of the professoriate available today [1994].<sup>20</sup>

The Carnegie Foundation Report offers contemporary portraits of the academic profession in these fourteen countries through seven major themes: (i) the individual national contexts of the institutional framing of the professoriate; (ii) access to higher education; (iii) professional activities; (iv) working conditions of faculty; (v) governing the academy; (vi) higher education and society; and (vii) the international dimensions of academic life. Within these seven themes, the information provided in this report is analysed in two categories: (i) variations (e.g. on student access, teaching and research, and support for academic freedom) (ii) similarities among faculty (e.g. the need for better methods of evaluating teaching, a commitment to service to help solve societal problems, as well as concern over the governance of higher education).<sup>21</sup> The Carnegie Foundation survey offers, in these categories, substantial *descriptions* of the academic profession in the fourteen countries.

However, the weakness of the Report is its lack of theoretical foundation. The Report discusses differences and similarities among the participating countries on issues such as salary, job satisfaction, means of governance and evaluation. The Carnegie Foundation Report is concerned with the socio-psychological aspects of academic life, on the assumption that there are common characteristics of the academic profession across different cultures.<sup>22</sup>

This is empirical research—a survey—without an account of why the seven themes were selected. The Carnegie Foundation research does not provide a new typology of the academic professions in different countries and different time periods, nor does it provide a theoretical analysis of the “changing shape” of the academic profession in the respective countries. For the purposes of this book, the comparative usefulness of the Carnegie Foundation Report is mainly in its statistical information about the academic profession in 1994 in South Korea and in other participating countries.<sup>23</sup>

The Carnegie Report was however influential. It affected the work of

Sungho Lee<sup>24</sup>, U. Teichler and F. Van Vught<sup>25</sup>; and the recent work of Anthony Welch, on the academic profession.<sup>26</sup> The work of Van Vught and Teichler concentrates primarily on Europe.<sup>27</sup> The work of Welch, however, is more interesting as he raises fresh concerns, although the work by no means solves the problem of how to look at the academic profession in East Asia.<sup>28</sup>

In the Special Issue of *Higher Education: the International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning* which he edited, Welch stresses in his editorial introduction the changing pedagogical traditions in the contemporary university.<sup>29</sup> He points out new relationships between teacher and learner, following the massive growth of higher education and the introduction of new technology in higher education.<sup>30</sup> Welch also edited another Special Issue on the academic profession (*Comparative Education Review* Vol. 42, No. 1, February 1998).<sup>31</sup> In the first article, 'The End of Certainty? The Academic Profession and the Challenge of Change', Welch reflects on the cases of the fourteen countries surveyed in the Carnegie Foundation Research. The article relies on data from the Carnegie Foundation Report, but Welch attempts to conceptualise the shifting culture of higher education in the context of globalisation.

He argues that the culture of the academic profession is shifting dramatically, with closer ties between the 'performativity' of higher education and national economic growth. Consequently, there is a widening breach between the professoriate and university administrators, with signs of a growing managerialism within universities, in which a technocratic logic of efficiency and economy prevails and collegiality succumbs increasingly to more hierarchical modes of decision making.<sup>32</sup> Welch also points out that the cult of efficiency in universities has been accompanied by increasing financial pressures.<sup>33</sup> As Welch notes, "In the name of accountability, academics have become subject to measurement by performance indicators. In the name of quality, academics' time is increasingly governed by the technology of total quality management (TQM) in which style can overwhelm substance".<sup>34</sup>

Overall, then, on Welch's argument, the academic profession is assailed by a managerial hierarchy, by a business ideology in universities, by economic conceptions of education held by governments and profit-oriented industries related to higher education. The result is loss of tenure, loss of status in a context of cost-effectiveness and the prevailing notion of a "do more with less" culture.<sup>35</sup> Welch's analysis then is critical and thoughtful and takes up—nor least on the basis of information provided by the Carnegie Report—themes of the evaluative State and the entrepreneurial university and the shift in definitions of "quality" already opened up by scholars such as Berdahl, Clark, Cowen, Lewis, Neave, and Watson.<sup>36</sup>

However, there are three central difficulties with the categories of analysis used by the Carnegie Commission and by Welch.

First, the analyses of the Carnegie Commission and Welch tend to impose Anglo-American concerns as topics of relevance for comparative work. Second, their analyses use convergence assumptions, i.e. there is a world-wide convergence of the patterns of higher education. Thirdly as higher education systems are becoming the same, by extension the academic profession, and its concerns, are assumed to be becoming the same everywhere. However, this 'convergence' hypothesis—while it has some obvious contemporary evidence in its favour—makes it difficult to remain alert to the particular shapes of the academic profession in particular countries. Studies of the academic profession are being culturally decontextualised—paradoxically in the name of comparative education.<sup>17</sup> Contemporary studies of the academic profession are in danger of being ethnocentric—placing Anglo-American experience at the centre of the conceptual apparatus for thinking about the academic profession everywhere. Furthermore, if it is 'well known' via the empirical work of the Carnegie Commission survey that academics everywhere share the same concerns, or if it is 'well known' through the work of Welch that convergence around the themes of efficiency is occurring, then any other differences between academic professions are trivial. An imposition of Anglo-American interpretations of the 'significant issues' for the academic profession will have occurred, within an insistent contemporary comparative analysis. Such insistent contemporary analyses are ahistorical, and take a very short time perspective to 'understand' why things are as they are. The studies offer little comparative account of the social dynamics of how things *became* as they are. In contrast, in this book, it is argued that it is important to identify the historical context of specific political and economic conditions in particular countries which, even if in the end they produce some symptoms of 'convergence', can permit an *explanation* of apparent convergence.

It is the argument of this book that the *longue duree* of the struggles between the State and the university in these East Asian countries is a complex story of the social construction of different academic professions. Further, it is argued that to tell this tale with delicacy it is necessary to clarify conceptions of the State, the university and the social role of the 'man of knowledge', which are tightly related to particular histories of colonial and post-colonial State projects.

Thus, the central thrust of this book is to demonstrate that the academic profession is not the same everywhere and to illustrate comparatively why this is so. To begin this task a considerable excursion into concepts of the State and the university and the social role of the man of knowledge is necessary. The academic profession is formed at the intersection of the social struggles over these concepts and their institutionalisation. The book begins with the suggestion that concepts of the State, the university and the social role of the 'man of knowledge' are not the same everywhere—and that defining the shaping and the shape of the academic profession requires

comparative attention to such major concepts and their changing institutionalisation, over time.

This then is the methodological perspective of this book. The emphasis on the comparative conceptualisation of the academic professions, and their location within their particular histories in time and space, leads to the avoidance of the classical methodologies of the comparative education of the 1960s and 1970s, which tended (with the rejection of Hans) to be ahistorical. Similarly the book has made the methodological choice to reject the normal models of 'a profession'. As argued, these models also tend to be ahistorical, and to disguise the struggles over power which occur in the creation of professions. The methodological perspective of the book begins in the outline of different conceptual apparatus, concentrating on university and state relations.

The next chapter will review classic 'ideas of a university' in Europe by Newman and Jaspers and in East Asia by Confucius to establish ideal typical models of the University in the English, German and Confucian traditions. This will—later—permit the highlighting of an 'East Asian' configuration of the university, and the East Asian academic professions.

## NOTES

1. The concept of East Asia in this book is based on the geographic definition used in the existing literature. (For reference, see Berger, Peter L., and Hsin-Huang Michael Hsiao (eds). *In search of an East Asian Development Model*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Transaction Publishers, 1988; Berger, M. T. and D. A. Borer (eds). *The Rise of East Asia: Critical Visions of the Pacific Century*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997; Brook, Timothy, and Hy V. Luong (eds). *Culture and Economy: The Shaping of Capitalism in Eastern Asia*. Michigan, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997; Murphey, Rhoads. *East Asia: A New History*. New York: Longman Inc., 1996.)

The geographic location of Korea; South Korea is conventionally defined as Northeast Asia and that of Malaya; Malaysia and Singapore as Southeast Asia. However, the concept of "East Asia" is currently used to denote the so-called NICs (Newly Industrialising countries) in both Northeast and Southeast Asian countries. For example, Berger and Borer noted "the rapid economic growth of East Asia (particularly Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore) was already setting the region apart from the rest of the world by the 1970s. By the 1980s, the trend was seen to have spread southward to Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia". (M. T. Berger and D. A. Borer (eds)., op. cit., p. 1) In their book "East Asia" was conceptualised as the Asia-Pacific region in the context of the political economic transition from the Cold War to the post-Cold War era. Timothy Brook and Hy V. Luong also used the concept of "East Asia" as a single unit that includes South Korea, Malaysia and Singapore, referring to the "remarkable expansion of capitalism in Eastern Asia". (T. Brook and Hy V. Luong (eds)., op. cit., p. 1)

2. Lieberman, M., *Education as a Profession*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956; Dingwall, R. and P. Lewis (eds). *Sociology of the Profession*, London: Macmillan, 1983; Bledstein, Burton J. *The Culture of Professionalism*, New York: Norton, 1976; Macdonald, K. M., *The Sociology of the Professions*, London: Sage Publications, 1995; Middlehurst, R. 'Professionals, Professionalism and Higher Education For Tomorrow's World' in F. Coffield (ed). *Higher Education in a Learning Society* Durham: School of Education, University of Durham on behalf of DfEE, ESRC and HEFCE, 1995, pp. 34-44.

3. Lieberman, M., op. cit., p. 18.

4. Freidson, E. *Professionalism reborn: theory, prophecy & policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994; Siegrist, H. The Professions, State and Government in Theory and History, in *Government and Professional Education*, edited by T. Becher. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University, 1994, pp. 3-22; Torstendahl, R., M. Burrage (eds). *The Formation of Professions: Knowledge, State and Strategy*. London: Sage Publications, 1990.

5. By the extension of this general sociological definition of the professions, the historical formation of professions in relation to the State was examined notably by Magali Sarfatti Larson's *The Rise of Professionalism: a Sociological Analysis* and Terry Johnson's 'Expertise and the State' in *Foucault's New Domains* (edited by Mike Gane and Terry Johnson, London & New York: Routledge, 1993, pp. 139-152).

Larson, in *The Rise of Professionalism: a Sociological Analysis*, considers the professional phenomenon from a double perspective: first, "as structural elements of the general form of the professional project, and second, as specific resource elements whose variable import is defined by different historical matrices". (Larson, M. op. cit., 1977, p. 212) As structural elements, these characteristics appear in various combinations in all the modern professions. As resources, however, they are qualitatively different in different historical contexts and therefore they vary in import or "useableness". In tracing the historical formation of the professions, Larson considers the cases of Britain and the United States in the 19th century, in a Marxian perspective.

In the capitalist social formations of these Anglo-Saxon societies, Larson provides an account of the emerging significance of professional training and the need for public recognition of tested competence so as to objectify professional privilege and the market value of professional service. According to Larson, the creation of professional commodities, and their unified definition ultimately necessitated the State's monopolistic appropriation and organisation of a social system of education and credentialing. Larson notes that the relation of market value and specific professional services appears to be ideological, as "it functions more as an implicit justification for the prices of the professional commodity and for the privileges associated with professional work, than as the actual quantitative translation of "aver-



age socially necessary labour time" into market value." (ibid.)

On the other hand, Johnson analyses the profession by incorporating Foucault's concept of 'governmentality'. He suggests that the State forms, in the context of the exercise of power, systems of technique and instrumentality of governance. The power relations in governance are not a relationship of domination, but the probability that the normalised subject will habitually obey, through which the legitimacy of power in the modern state can be regenerated. Consequently, the rise of the modern professions is construed in terms of the process of the reproduction of the self-regulating subject to form the tacit agreement of government apparatus as defined earlier. The emergent cognitive and normative patterns of political authority have not only generated the popular legitimation underpinning the government apparatus, but also induced what Stanley Cohen has called a profound shift in the 'master patterns of social control'. (Cohen, S. *Visions of Social Control*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1985; Johnson, T. 'Expertise and the State', op. cit., 1993.)

More recently, S. Slaughter and L. Leslie' *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University* used professionalisation theory (developed from Larson, M. S. *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977) and resource dependence theory (developed from Pfeffer, Jeffrey, & Gerald R. Salancik, *External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*, New York: Harper and Row, 1978; Brint, S. G. *In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994). For details, see Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. L., *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*, Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

6. For example, Harold J. Perkin, *Key Profession: the History of the Association of University Teachers*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969; A. H. Halsey, *Decline of Donnish Dominion: the British Academic Professions in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992; H. R. Bowen & J. H. Schuster, *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Harold J. Perkin's *Key Profession: the History of the Association of University Teachers* is a historical investigation of the rise of the English university teacher to the key role in the reproduction of society and its mastery of the physical and social environment from about 1920 until 1969. However, it is argued that behind Perkin's term, key profession there is a standard set by the ideal-type of the profession forged in the Anglo-Saxon context.

A. H. Halsey's *Decline of Donnish Dominion: the British Academic Professions in the Twentieth Century* investigates the academic profession in Britain from the mid-1960s until the early 1990s. That is to say, the book covers the history of British higher education from the beginning of the period of expansion associated with the Robbins Report until the period of the Thatcher government, during which education was put at the top of the British political agenda. Halsey's examination relies

on his own surveys of the behaviour and opinion of the academic staff conducted in each decade during the time period. The surveys offer a systematic account of the changing disciplinary composition, material conditions, status, attitudes, orientations, and morale of the academic staff in British higher education. In short, the core of his research interest in the academic profession is sociological account of changes in the structure and functions of the academic profession since the Robbins Report.

H. R. Bowen & J. H. Schuster, *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled* describes the conditions and major concerns of the 1980s related to the American academic profession. It provides a explicit taxonomy of the academic profession in America. In the introduction and the conclusion, the purpose of the book is indicated as offering policy advice to officials in the universities and the state governments. The book intends to warn against the future deterioration of quality of those in the academic profession, through the idea that the academic profession is likely to become less and less attractive for highly able young people, over the next twenty five years or so, from 1985 to 2010.

7. For example, see Clark, B. (ed). *The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and International Settings*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987, which was initially sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation; Boyer, E.L., Altbach, P.G., Whitelaw, M.J. (eds). *The Academic Profession: an International Perspective*, Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1994; Kogan, M. Moses, I. & El-Khawas, E., *Staffing Higher Education: Meeting New Challenges*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, OECD, 1994; Blumenthal, P. et. al., *Academic Mobility in a Changing World: Regional and Global Trends*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 1996.

The book of M. Kogan, I. Moses, and E. El-Khawas, *Staffing Higher Education: Meeting New Challenges*, was published as the final report of a funded research project by the OECD in 1994, and offers another frame of reference for the Western academic profession in the contemporary period. The purpose of this book was to provide practical guidance for policy makers in higher education at both the system and the institutional levels in the OECD member countries. Unlike the other comparative books being reviewed, this book is not structured by national settings, but by common issues in the OECD member countries.

Themes used in this book are: (i) staffing, (ii) changing frameworks for the academic profession such as expansion, changes in funding, governance and management and evaluation of higher education, (iii) changes in the nature and forms of task required of academic staff (e.g. teaching, scholarship, research, consultancy, community service and administration), (iv) changes in staffing structures in response to new demands (e.g. increasing part-time appointments), (v) policies and practices: qualifications and staff development, implications of graduate education for academic staffing policies, conditions of service including tenure and length of appointment and salaries and other rewards. Thus, the book extends some academic issues raised in a limited number of OECD countries to the level of general

key points related to “all OECD countries”. (Among the OECD member countries, the book especially focuses on the cases of the U.K., the U.S.A., Canada, Australia and Northwest European countries such as the Netherlands and Germany. The Japanese case is not dealt with in a separate chapter, but is sporadically mentioned for comparison. The cases of Central and Eastern European countries are not separately dealt with either, even though differences with the Western European countries are strong in a region where the institutions of higher education were still run by a centralised bureaucracy.) However, this conceptual frame for the analyses of OECD member countries follows the major issues in Anglo-American contexts. The full conclusion of the book is:

University decisions on academic staffing have been broadly affected by changes in the external environment over the last few decades. As already discussed at length, these changes have included a tightening financial climate and the pressures of accommodating larger students numbers and participation rates. Another environmental change that has affected staffing decisions is a general move, in all OECD countries, towards a social policy of encouraging greater participation of women and ethnic minorities in all arenas of life. (*ibid.*, p. 111)

8. Altbach, P.G. (ed). *Comparative Perspectives on the Academic Profession*, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977; Clark, B. R. (ed). *op. cit.*; Kogan, M., Moses, I. and El-Khawas, E., *op. cit.*; Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., and Whitelaw, M. J., *op. cit.*.

9. Altbach, P.G. (ed), *op. cit.*

10. There are a total of ten chapters in the volume and six chapters are allocated to the Anglo-Saxon professoriate: two chapters for the Canadian case, two chapters for the American case, one chapter for Australia, and one chapter for Britain. The book also includes separate chapters on Japan, Latin America, and India.

11. The terminology in this book is loose—with an emphasis on the concept of staff—“professor”, “teacher”, “lecturer”, “academic staff”, and “faculty”. All these terms were used to describe the academic profession.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-7.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

15. Clark, B. R. (ed), *op. cit.*

16. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-10.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 371-398.

18. Burton Clark suggests that disciplinary and institutional settings are essential categories to understand the academic profession in context to grasp the comparative significance of differences between stereotype and reality:

Large areas of similarity may still exist, but they ought to be found, not assumed. They ought to be induced from empirical observation, not deduced from traditional images and statements of personal preference. (ibid., p. 3)

For example, in Chapter Five, Guy Neave and Gary Rhoades offer a broad juxtaposition of the Anglo-American academic “profession” and the Western European academics as an “estate” to analyse the academic profession in the organisational and disciplinary settings. In Chapter Six, Tony Becher deals with the disciplinary context. He investigates the academic profession in the perspectives of (Western) sociology of knowledge, social studies of science, and the study of higher education. (Neave, G. & Rhoades, G., ‘The Academic Estate in Western Europe’ in B. R. Clark (ed.), op. cit., pp. 211-270.) The chapter deals with the core issues of Tony Becher’s major book, *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*, which was published in 1989. He shows the ways in which disciplines contribute to the shaping of the academic profession: (i) different forms of knowledge characterised as hard-pure, soft-pure, hard-applied, and soft-applied; (ii) how recruits are attracted and initiated, i.e. academic routes; (iii) the nature of social interaction within a field—so-called cosmopolitans and the locals in Gouldner’s terms (For details, see Gouldner, Alvin W. “Locals and Cosmopolitans.” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (1957): 281-306; 444-480; (iv) the type and degree of specialisation within it; and (v) the modes of change in international structures and external boundaries of fields and in the career lines of those in the academic profession. For details, see Becher, T., ‘The Disciplinary Shaping of the Profession’ in B. R., Clark (ed.), op. cit., p. 7 and pp. 271-303; Becher, T., *Academic Tribes and Territories: intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*, Bristol: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, 1989.

19. Boyer, E., P. G. Altbach and M. J. Whitelaw (eds), op. cit.

20. Ibid., pp. 1-2.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.

23. First, according to the Carnegie Foundation Research, the Korean academic profession is staffed mainly by males. The Korean case shows the second highest proportion of male faculty; of the surveyed academics only 13 % in Korea and 8 % in Japan were female.

Second, according to the Carnegie Survey, Korean academics along with Japanese