ATTITUDES ABOUT WORK PRACTICES, TIME ALLOCATION, AND PUBLICATION OUTPUT: PROFILES OF AUSTRALASIAN MARKETING ACADEMICS

Biljana Juric, University of Auckland, New Zealand
Michael Jay Polonsky, Victoria University, Australia
Gary Mankelow, University of Newcastle, Australia

ABSTRACT

The Australasian tertiary education sector has undergone significant organizational and cultural changes, which have increased pressures on academics to undertake a range of additional activities while at the same time improving research performance. These pressures impact on individuals in different ways, although there may be some groups or clusters of individuals within institutions with common characteristics. Managers may need to develop different sets of management strategies and policies to assist each group of academics to deal better with these pressures and improve their individual performance. The paper examines Australasian marketing academics' perceptions of their work environments and whether these perceptions result in differing clusters of individuals who might also vary based on their research performance, time allocated to different academic roles, and their professional and demographic characteristics. Sixty-eight members of the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Marketing responded to a survey using a modified version of an instrument developed by Diamantopoulos et al. (1992). K-means clustering procedure identified four groups of academics – "Traditional Academics," "Satisfied Professors," "Newer Academics," and "Satisfied Researchers." While only a few significant differences among clusters were identified in relation to time allocated to academic activities and research performance, it appears that clusters differ on several professional and demographic characteristics.

INTRODUCTION

During the last decade the Australian and New Zealand (Australasian) tertiary education sectors have undergone significant changes. A transformation in methods of tertiary delivery and governance including adoption of traditional management models has intensified pressures on academics. In addition to improving teaching quality and service levels (e.g., Danieli and Thomas 1998; Pearce and Bonnor 2000) there are expectations that academics increase publication volume and/or produce higher quality research, i.e., suitable for publication in "top" marketing journals. Australasian universities are only now beginning to consider the impacts of such changes on academics and realize that they need to understand how academics view their work environment, how they use their time and how these relate to research productivity.

Perceptions by marketing academics towards their workplace have recently attracted researchers' attention (e.g., Baker and Erdogan 2000; Hertzel 2000; Polonsky and Mankelow 2000; Sinkovics and Schlegelmilch 2000). The relationships of academics' perceptions of their work environment, and other factors such as demographic characteristics or research output, have rarely been examined (Diamantopoulos 1996; Polonsky et al. 2003). Additionally, there have been few attempts to empirically profile (i.e., cluster) marketing academics based either on their attitudes to the profession or their individual characteristics; Polonsky et al. (2003) is a United States-based exception. Gaining an understanding of how marketing academics perceive their work environment may assist administrators in creating strategies for managing and supporting academic staff with development programs (Polonsky et al. 2003). Identifying clusters of academics that share similar views may assist school and departmental administrators in implementing staff development strategies to respond to the needs of particular groups of academics, such as flexible work practices and mentoring programs.

The primary objective of this paper is to develop profiles of Australasian marketing academics based on their perceptions towards teaching, research, administration, and promotion. We then investigate whether and how these clusters differ regarding demographic and

academic characteristics, time spent on work-related activities and an individual's research performance. The paper is structured as follows: background – changing academic environment and impact on academics; methodology; results and discussion; followed by conclusions and implications.

THE CHANGING ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT

There is evidence (Baker and Erdogan 2000; Hetzel 2000; Polonsky and Mankelow 2000; Sinkovics and Schlegelmich 2000) that globally marketing academics are working significantly longer than 40 hours weekly to accomplish all the activities associated with their jobs. Averages such as 46 hours per week spent on work-related activities by marketing academics in the United Kingdom (Baker and Erdogan 2000) and France (Hetzel 2000) or 52 hours in the United States of America (Polonsky and Mankelow 2000) are commonly reported. The authors are unaware of extant government documents or other academics' studies reporting the number of hours or other workload indicators of either Australian or New Zealand marketing academics prior to this study.

Change within the tertiary educational systems of these two countries seems to have become the norm. Since the early 1990s Australian and New Zealand tertiary institutions have placed greater emphasis on research performance with, for example, the introduction of governmental quality assurance and research-based funding mechanisms such as the Australian Committee for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and New Zealand Tertiary Education Commission. Prior to the 1990s both the Australian and New Zealand Governments sought to provide equity of access to higher education, although this was accompanied by decreased levels of public funds for tertiary education and thus may have signaled the beginning of increased academic workloads (e.g., Taylor et al. 1998). A reduction in public funding is especially important given that all but two Australasian universities are public institutions and thus rely mainly on governmental funding, although they do get limited funding from the fees of overseas and domestic students.

The 1990s and 2000s saw an increase in student numbers and additional international and offshore programs, coinciding with decreasing staff/student ratios. At the same time new, apparently more efficient but usually more time-intensive, modes of delivery and pedagogic approaches were promoted by administrators and accepted by marketing academics. The changing conditions in tertiary institutions adopted in the 1990s and 2000s also involved more managerial/entrepreneurial models of operation, with less participation in institutional management by academics (Winter et al. 2000).

Academics are not only expected to undertake teaching, research, and administrative activities more often, but are also being asked to undertake a range of non-core activities ranging from providing pastoral care to participating in student recruitment (Kogan et al. 1994; Polonsky et al. 1999a). Considering the high number of hours academics already work, institutional requirements forcing them to undertake additional activities might result in dissatisfaction. For example, individuals with outstanding research records are frequently asked to undertake more administration (Rotfeld 2000), which directly reduces their ability to produce research (Polonsky and Mankelow 2000) and possibly decreases their satisfaction with academia. These challenges are not unique to Australasian academics. Nixon (1996) notes that U.S. academic staff experience a sense of insecurity and identity crises as they are buffeted by changes from both increased demands and competition for resources to meet those demands.

IMPACT ON ACADEMICS

Globally, changes in overall institutional focus and workloads increase individuals' levels of stress (e.g., Layzell 1996; Landsbergis and Vivona-Vaughan 1995; Reger et al. 1994). While part of this increased stress might relate to shifting organizational priorities of academic institutions, for example moving from teaching focused to a more balanced teaching/research approach, it also requires that the institutions facilitate staff development to deal with such changes. Individuals who have difficulty adapting would, of course, experience higher levels of stress from these changes, as would those who try and take on these extra roles without cutting back other activities. The importance of organizational changes cannot be understated, as there is evidence that stress due to excessive workloads (real or perceived) has been one of the most pressing issues in regards to the quality of academic life in Australian and New Zealand universities (e.g., Wolverton et al. 1999; Currie 1996). Winter et al. (2000), for instance, in their study identified excessive time pressures and unrealistic performance expectations as major issues for academics across all levels at an Australian university. The most frequent comment respondents used to describe their work environment were related to "dramatically increasing workloads" and "not having enough time to do the required tasks/activities to a desired quality."

It has been argued that increased workloads of Australian academics (Soliman and Soliman 1997) and elsewhere (Diamantopoulos 1996) are not well supported by resources or institutional rewards. This view is complemented by Winter et al. (2000), who suggest that the consequences of increased academic pressures are that some academics feel demoralized and disconnected from their institutions, even though they are staying intrinsically motivated and committed to their work and profession. And while in some places academics can opt out of some activities, or decline to participate or shift their focus (say

from teaching to research), in some cases this is not an option.

Others have suggested that stress resulting from an increasing workload and/or an inability to cope with changes is not necessarily evenly distributed across academics. Individuals at lower academic levels (Ward and Sloane 2000) and non-tenured staff (Polonsky and Mankelow 2000) are often more susceptible to these pressures. However, the impact of stress on differing groups of academics is not necessarily identified consistently across studies. For example, while some studies (e.g., Romanin and Over 1993; Polonsky and Mankelow 2000) found that workload stress affects female academics to a greater degree than males, Lease's (1999) study did not show a gender differential on the perceptions of work related stress.

If individuals with certain characteristics have difficulty coping with increased work-related pressures (Landsbergis and Vivona-Vaughan 1995), this would have a negative impact, not only on how they perceive and relate to their work environment, but also on their performance. The supposition that stress and dissatisfaction negatively impact on employees' quality of work has long been supported in the management and human resource literature (e.g., London and Oldham 1976). Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) specifically proposed that an individual's psychological response to work influences work behavior. Studies (e.g., Somers 2001) that have tested this hypothesis have generally confirmed that unfavorable work attitudes reduce individuals' performances. In particular, it has been found that stress reduces the overall quality of academic performance (Winter et al. 2000; Soliman and Soliman 1997) and, specifically, in some cases has been found to reduce academics' publishing output and/or teaching effectiveness (Blackburn and Bentley 1993). As such it is important that we reach a better understanding of the relationships between academics' attitudes towards work, "overwhelming workloads," and their performance.

Piercy (1999) observed colleagues' activities and attitudes towards work-related activities and defined four groups of Business School Professors. He described how business professors perform, how this performance impacted on other academics within their business school and, based on these observations, suggested that some professors believed they were part-time academics and full-time consultants who under-performed in the areas of teaching, supervision, service, and research. Polonsky et al. (2003), using a similar research design to that presented in this study, identified differing segments of U.S. academics. Interestingly, Polonsky et al. (2003) found that those focused on teaching appear to be more "satisfied" with their employment conditions than many research-focused academics. As such individual academics may be making lifestyle decisions based on their perceptions of the pressures and rewards of adopting various types of behaviors. Thus, it is possible some of the stress they experience is self-imposed from attempting to accommodate too many activities.

Conceptually, employees, i.e., academics, do not have isolated perceptions about diverse issues related to their work environments, but rather complex combinations of perceptions and/or attitudes that may interact. As such this research focuses on two issues: (i) are there clusters of academics that exist based on their attitudes towards the work environment; and (ii) are there any differences in the time spent on different activities, research performance and/or their demographic and professional characteristics, across any clusters identified.
The identification of groups of academics with similar favorable and/or unfavorable views about work issues may be of great help to the academic managers or administrators who have the responsibility for developing and maintaining mentoring schemes, monitoring research and teaching performance goals, minimizing levels of staff turnover, recruiting, as well as other staff development activities. It might be suggested that clustering academics using workplace attitudes would be similar to segmenting a market based on psychographics or motivational characteristics rather than simple demographics. Thus, examining the composition of these groups may identify a way that academic managers might be able to categorize those whom they are responsible for managing.

METHODOLOGY

Primary Collection of Data

Respondents were drawn from participants at the 1997 Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference (ANZMAC). There is not a comprehensive listing of Australasian marketing academics, a problem with researching the profession in most countries. However, Danaher and Starr (1998) identified 269 marketing academics from a sample of 24 Australian and 11 New Zealand tertiary institutions (NZ institutions included four polytechnics). Thus, based on Danaher and Starr's figures, the sample of 221 respondents would most likely represent a substantial proportion of Australasian marketing academics. Two hundred and twenty-one questionnaires distributed at the ANZMAC conference and a follow-up reminder letter were sent to all participants. In total, 68 surveys were returned, with three unusable questionnaires, providing a response rate of 31 percent. Using attendees at one academic conference may bias the sample, as those who have no interest in research may be under-represented, although this type of approach has been used in other studies evaluating academics (Polonsky and Mankelow 2000).

Survey Instrument

Based on past studies (e.g., Baker and Erdogan 2000; Hertzel 2000; Polonsky and Mankelow 2000; Sinkovics and Schlegelmilch 2000), academics' attitudes towards their work environment was measured using a modified version of the Diamantopoulos et al. (1992) instrument. This scale was deemed to be most appropriate as it was targeted towards academics. Respondents were asked to indicate how strongly they agreed with 14 items related to their attitudes towards teaching, research, administration and promotion (Table 4 lists the items). All items were measured on a five-point Likert scale with anchors from 1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree.

Meyer (1998) proposed that "workload … captures how [academics] time is spent, while productivity is a measure of what is produced with that time." Workload analysis in this study is based on the weekly number of reported work hours. A simple count of respondents' publications across eight categories such as books, book chapters, refereed, and non-refereed journals was used as an indicator of research performance. To allow for an aggregation of publication output, individuals' average output per year in academia was divided by the overall average output within their academic level (i.e., a Professor's average output per year was adjusted based on the overall average output per year of all Professors). Thus numbers greater (less) than 1 indicate that a respondent produces more (less) research output than other similar individuals, on average. These relative publication scores across respondents can then be aggregated. Data on individual characteristics, namely gender, age, marital status, qualification, position, type of appointment, and years spent in academia were also collected.

Data Analysis

The primary focus of the study is to examine profiles of academics clustered on their attitudes towards work environments. However, the aggregate data is first briefly examined to provide a foundation for cluster comparisons. The first aggregate analysis focuses on basic descriptive results of the overall demographic characteristics, as well as how many hours were allocated to teaching, research, and administration. The relationships between workplace activities and research outputs are then examined using Pearson correlations. Finally, the general attitudes of the sample towards specific work environment issues are examined.

Respondents were clustered using a K-means non-hierarchical clustering approach to identify whether there were "groupings" of academics based on the attitudinal variables towards the work environment. The cluster solution was established based on the interpretability of cluster profiles and the average within-cluster difference criterion (Hair et al. 1998). ANOVAs and Tukey tests were used to investigate cluster differences related to the clustering characteristics – respondents' attitudes towards academia – as well as allocation of time, publication outputs, years spent in academia and age. Aggregated books (books written and edited), refereed (book chapters, journal articles, and conference papers) and non-refereed publications (book chapters, journal articles, and presentations) were also examined across clusters. Chi square tests were used to evaluate how clusters differ regarding their professorial levels, PhD degree, tenured position, gender, marital status, and nationality. Due to the small sample and cell sizes these results should be interpreted with caution.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Before describing each of the clusters' characteristics a description of the sample and the results for the total sample will be presented. This section overviews how marketing academics allocate time to different activities, whether there is a relationship between the time allocated on different activities, and to what extent this can help explain faculty research productivity. The extent to which respondents' views are favorable or unfavorable will also provide additional understanding of the sample and cluster characteristics.

Sample

Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the sample. The sample is male dominated (74%), with mean age of 43.8 years and a majority (83%) married at the time of the survey. Approximately half have PhDs (53%). The Australian and New Zealand education systems have traditionally followed the British model of postgraduate education, where PhD students do not take subjects (Alpert and Kamins 2003), but rather work on a focused thesis. Many marketing academics complete their PhDs part-time over 6–8 years while working as full-time academics.

In terms of academic level, 28 percent of the respondents are full and associate professors ("Professors"), 29 percent are senior lecturers ("Senior Lecturers") and 43 percent are lecturers, associate lecturers and others ("Others"). The majority of respondents are tenured or eligible for tenure (60%) and a relatively large proportion (30%) of respondents are on contracts.

Overview of Aggregate Findings

An overwhelming majority of respondents (82%) worked more than 40 hours a week and the mean number of hours respondents worked was 48.3. Table 2 shows that almost half of an individual's time (on average 20.55 hours) was taken up with teaching-related activities, i.e., teaching and preparation. However, 22 percent of respon-

TABLE 1
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Gender (n = 66)	Male	74%
	Female	26%
Age (n = 65)	Less than 29	9%
Mean 43.8	30–39	22%
	40–49	38%
	50–59	31%
	60+	0%
Qualification	Doctorate	53%
(n = 66)	Masters	33%
	Other	14%
Type of Appointment	Full-Time & Tenured/able	60%
(n = 66)	Full-Time Contract	30%
	Part-Time Contract	3%
	Adjunct	0%
	Sessional	5%
	Other	2%
Level of Position	Professor/Chair	19%
(n = 65)	Associate Professor	9%
	Senior Lecturer	29%
	Lecturer	29%
	Associate	12%
	Other	2%
Hours Worked in	Less than 40 hours	17%
Week (n = 63)	40–50 Hours	49%
	51–60 Hours	23%
Mean 48.3 hours	61 Hours +	11%

dents were involved in teaching related activities for more than 30 hours weekly. On average, respondents spent 11.5 hours on research activities and 13.2 percent of respondents allocated more than 21 hours a week to research. Academics were engaged in administrative duties for an average of 8.4 hours. While the majority (69.1%) spent less than 10 percent of their time on administration, 7.5 percent allocated more than 21 hours to administration-related activities. The final activity examined was consulting, which had a mean number of hours of 2.8, with 39.7 percent of the respondents not undertaking any consulting activities. These results might be considered low, given that the union awards governing universities in New Zealand and Australia explicitly allow individuals to spend from 10 to 20 percent of their work time on consulting.

The relationships between time respondents spent on different activities have been explored by calculating Pearson correlations (see Table 3). Time spent on research and aggregated teaching activities were statistically significant and positively related ($r = .377$ $p < .002$). This is counter intuitive and is also contrary to Hattie and Marsh 1996, who found that there was a negative relationship between these two activities. The Australian and New Zealand results might reflect increasing expectations on respondents to teach and research, and/or of those who have high teaching loads and work extra hours to keep up with the research requirements. It is interesting that the relationship between time spent on administration and consulting was also statistically significant and positively related ($r = .250$, $p < .039$). Requirements on senior staff to develop relationships with external partners might be

TABLE 2
HOW WE SPEND OUR TIME

Teaching and Preparation	Nil	7.4%
(20.55 mean hours)	1–10 hours	11.7%
	11–20 hours	29.4%
	21–30 hours	29.4%
	31+ hours	22.1%
Research Activities	Nil	8.8%
(11.5 mean hours)	1–10 hours	39.7%
	11–20 hours	38.3%
	21–30 hours	11.7%
	31+ hours	1.5%
Administration	Nil	16.2%
(8.4 mean hours)	1–10 hours	52.9%
	11–20 hours	23.5%
	21–30 hours	3.0%
	31+ hours	4.5%
Consulting	Nil	39.7%
(2.8 mean hours)	1–10 hours	58.8%
	11–20 hours	1.5%
	21–30 hours	0%
	31+ hours	0%

TABLE 3
PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF PROPORTION OF TIME SPEND ON ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES

Time Spent on Activity %	Teaching	Administration	Research	Consulting
Teaching	1			
Administration	-.070 (.570)	1		
Research	.377** (.002)	.192 (.117)	1	
Consulting	.179 (.145)	.250* (.039)	.045 (.716)	1

** Significant at the >.05 level
* Significant at the >.10 level

an explanation for this relationship, or perhaps there is a more "applied" focus by Australian and New Zealand academics. Pearson correlations also identified that the amount of time spent on some activities is significantly positively correlated to some research outputs. For example, teaching is positively correlated to the number of edited books ($r = 254$, $p < .042$), consulting is positively correlated to written book chapters ($r = 359$,$p < .003$) and

time spent on research to presentations ($r = 248$, $p < .011$). Overall, academics' working time was associated with the number of book chapters published ($r = 286$ $p < .02$).

The mean scores of the 14-attitudinal items indicated relatively unfavorable attitudes among the respondents towards a number of issues. In particular, the results (see Table 4) suggest respondents felt strongly that they were spending too much time on administration (mean 2.18) and not enough time on research (mean 2.32). Interestingly, Pearson correlations indicated that time spent on these two activities was *not* significantly correlated.

On average (3.15), and their views were neutral about availability of appropriate research funding (mean 2.91). The sample agreed that there is too little emphasis placed on teaching (2.85), and that students' quality is decreasing (2.87). Both of these issues may imply a concern for the quality of teaching output. They disagreed that there is too much focus given to theory and not enough to practice (3.36). This view may reflect a focus on business relevance in teaching approaches of Australasian academia. Respondents were negative about the length of time required for promotion (2.62), but were neutral about fairness of promotion procedure (2.92).

The issue on which the majority of respondents agreed and expressed strongly negative attitudes was the excess of bureaucracy and politics in the institutions where they work (mean 2.14). While academics on average disagreed that they had little input into the running of their department (mean score 3.35), they agreed they had little say in the running of the university (2.74). They also generally believed their universities were resistant to change (mean score 2.72). Respondents were most satisfied with the availability of equipment at Australian and New Zealand universities (3.91).

Clusters Description

The interpretability of clusters indicated by the K-means show that the four-cluster solution is the most appropriate (Hair et al. 1998). The average within-cluster difference criterion (Hair et al. 1998) also identified that a four-factor solution was superior.

The four groups varied in size from seven to 30 individuals. The ANOVAs revealed that there were statistical differences ($p < 0.05$) for 12 of the 14 items across clusters. Table 4 provides the mean values for items across the groups. Tukey tests were run to identify how these attitudinal items differ between clusters. The results show that Cluster 2 had the most favorable views about their work environment, followed by Clusters 4, 1, and 3.

Demographic characteristics also varied across clusters (see Table 5). Cross-tabulation and Chi square tests indicated significant differences in the composition of academic levels (Chi square = 14.369. Sig. = .024) and gender (Chi square = 8.668. Sig. = 0.034). For instance, while almost half of the respondents in Cluster 2 are full professors, Cluster 3 has 73 percent of the junior academics (i.e., "others"). Cluster 3 also has a significantly higher proportion (53%) of female staff than other clusters (see Table 5). While on first examination it appears that indicators of time allocation (Table 6) and research output (Table 7) differ across the clusters, ANOVAs indicates the only statistically significant differences exist for the time respondents spend on consulting (see Table 6) and refereed journal publications (see Table 7). Comparisons of the responses to the attitudinal questions (see Table 4), demographic and professional characteristics (see Table 5), time allocation (see Table 6) and research output (see Table 7) of respondents in each cluster provide the context for a discussion of each of the four clusters.

Cluster 1 – Traditional Academics

This is the smallest cluster with seven members (11%). It is worth noting that this cluster may be underrepresented due to the sampling procedure used in the study, i.e., given they undertake less research they may be less likely to be members of a research-focused academic organization. In terms of demographic factors these individuals have been in academia for an average of 11 years, are relatively older, there is a low proportion of females, and 50 percent are at the Senior Lecturer level. There is also a relatively lower level of tenured individuals, although 50 percent have a PhD. It should be noted that this group would have been traditional within the Australian and New Zealand context in the 1980s and early 1990s and they entered academia after business careers and were hired primarily to teach rather than research.

The academics that belong to this cluster felt there should be more emphasis on teaching, and especially on practice in relation to theory. They also spent relatively more time per week on teaching related activities (26 hours) and relatively less time involved in research and administration (see Table 6). The time this cluster and Cluster 2 – Satisfied Professors – spent on consulting is significantly higher than that of the other two clusters.

The cluster members strongly believe there is too much pressure to publish and insufficient time for research, which might explain why their time allocation to this activity was the lowest across clusters. However, the results in Table 7 suggest that these individuals are not the least active producers across all research output categories. They excel (i.e., a mean of greater than 1) in the production of books (authored or edited), but are relatively lower performers (i.e., a mean of less than 1) in the other six categories.

They believed that too much time is spent on administration. However, they also feel that they have some input into the running of their department. They perceive the university environment as less bureaucratic and political when compared to other groups. They also generally felt it took too long to get promoted within their institution

TABLE 4
ANOVA STATISTICS, CLUSTER MEANS, AND TUKEY TEST RESULTS

	Sample	Traditional Academics (11%)	Satisfied Professors (46%)	Newer Academics (23%)	Satisfied Researchers (20%)	F (sig) Tukey Test*
Too little emphasis is placed on teaching	2.85	1.71	3.00	2.53	3.54	4.08 (0.1) 2,4>1,3
Too much time is spent on administration	2.18	2.14	2.43	1.4	2.46	3.27 (0.3) 2,4>3
There is not enough time to do research	2.32	1.86	2.2	1.73	3.62	7.76 (.01) 4>1,2,3
There is a lack of funding to do research	2.91	3.28	3.00	2.13	3.38	3.43 (.02) 1,2,3>3
Equipment is limited	3.91	4.29	4.07	3.40	4.00	2.28 (.80) –
It takes too long to get promoted	2.62	2.14	3.30	1.93	2.00	8.22 (.01) *2>1,3,4*
There is too much bureaucracy and internal politics	2.14	4.29	2.43	1.13	1.54	16.41 (.01) *1>2,3,4* *2>3*
We have little say in the running of the department	3.35	3.57	4.10	2.53	2.54	9.16 (.01) *2>3,4*
We focus too much on theory and notenough on practice	3.36	2.57	3.73	2.53	3.92	7.99 (.01) *2,4>1,3*
The university is resistant to change	2.73	2.71	3.03	2.67	2.15	1.58 (.20) –
Student quality is deceasing	2.88	2.71	3.37	2.60	2.08	4.03 (.01) 2>4
Too much pressure to produceresearch output	3.15	1.43	3.57	2.47	3.85	11.99 (.01) *2,4>1,3*
Little say in running of the university	2.74	2.43	3.67	1.93	1.69	23.28 (.01) 2>1,3,4
Promotion procedures unfair	2.93	2.00	3.73	2.33	2.31	10.7 (.01) 2>1,3,4

* Cluster differences significant at $p < .05$ 1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree.

TABLE 5
DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS BY CLUSTER, PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST, AND ANOVA STATISTICS

	Traditional Academics	Satisfied Professors	Newer Academics	Satisfied Researchers	Pearson (sig)	ANOVA F (sig)
Professors	**17%**	**47%**	**0%**	**23%**	**14.369 (.024)**	**–**
Senior Lecturers	**50%**	**23%**	**27%**	**39%**		
Others	**33%**	**30%**	**73%**	**38%**		
PhDs	**50%**	**70%**	**33%**	**46%**	**38.886 (.893)**	**–**
Tenured	**43%**	**67%**	**40%**	**84%**	**10.201 (.116)**	**–**
Female	**14%**	**17%**	**53%**	**15%**	**8.668 (.034)**	**–**
Married	**86%**	**83%**	**80%**	**92%**	**5.663 (.773)**	**–**
Non-Australian/NZ	**14%**	**23%**	**13%**	**23%**	**2.945 (.816)**	**–**
Age	**45**	**45**	**42**	**43**	**–**	**.619 (.606)**
Years in Academia	**11**	**12**	**8**	**12**	**–**	**.671 (.110)**
Total Publications Per Year	**1.88**	**4.3**	**2.49**	**2.51**	**–**	**2.317 (.067)**
Refereed Publications Per Year	**0.75**	**2.21**	**1.51**	**1.54**	**–**	**.483 (.898)**

TABLE 6
TIME ALLOCATED TO ACTIVITIES PER CLUSTER

	Traditional Academics	Satisfied Professors	Newer Academics	Satisfied Researchers	F (sig) Tukey Test
Research (hrs)	10.16	12.41	11.14	14.15	0.577 (.632) ns
Teaching (hrs)	26.02	22.76	20.89	20.46	0.469 (.705) ns
Administration (hrs)	5.98	11.8	6.77	6.42	2.149 (.103) ns
Consulting (hrs)	4.05	4.39	1.9	1.78	3.280 (.027) 1,2>3,4
Total	52.67	51.53	41.33	46.67	1.721 (.172) ns

and that the promotion procedures were unfair. Given the composition of their time allocated to various activities, they seem to feel that non-research activities are not appropriately rewarded.

This cluster was only positive about four issues. It perceived that there is a sufficiency of equipment and research funding; interestingly, respondents strongly disagreed that there is too much bureaucracy and internal

politics (mean = 4.29); and that they have little say in running the department (mean = 3.57). Overall, the mean scores and Tukey tests suggest that this cluster is not overly satisfied with its work environment.

Cluster 2 – Satisfied Professors

This is the largest cluster with 30 respondents (46%) and, as its name suggests, contains the largest proportion of associate and full professors (47%). This cluster has the largest proportion of respondents with PhDs (70%) and more than half are tenured (67%). There is a relatively low proportion of females (17%) in this cluster; it is also relatively older with an average age of 45 years (tied with Cluster 1). Individuals in Cluster 2 feel that there is not too much emphasis on theory in relation to practice in teaching. They believe that there is too much time associated with administration and too much bureaucratic process and internal politics, although they do feel they have considerable input into the running of their departments and the university. This group has the highest number of hours allocated to administration (11.8), although as we mentioned previously, time spent on administration was not statistically different across clusters. They have the highest number of hours allocated to consulting per week (4.39) and a relatively high number of teaching-related hours per week (22.76). However, this could result from an involvement with postgraduate programs and supervision rather than teaching undergraduate courses.

They feel that there should be more time available for research, but do not feel the pressure to publish. They also believe that research is funded at appropriate levels. This is important given that, on average, this group was *relatively* more productive than its peers, i.e., a mean greater than 1, for three of the eight outputs, as well as for aggregated refereed and aggregated non-refereed publications (see Table 7). Its individuals produced *relatively* more refereed book chapters, non-refereed journal articles and conference presentations.

Respondents in this group were alone in that, on average, they did not object to the length and fairness of the promotion procedure. Interestingly, this group also comprises a high proportion of individuals from other countries: 23 percent (tied with Cluster 4). Values of mean scores above 3 for 11 out of 14 items, and Tukey tests (see Table 4) indicate that this cluster is the most content with their workplace environment. Satisfied Professors differed the most when compared to the other clusters on how they view their work surroundings (views significantly different on 22 out of 39 comparisons with the other groups). It appears that their views differed the most from those of Cluster 3 – Newer Academics – described in the next section.

Cluster 3 – Newer Academics

These 15 individuals represent 23 percent of the sample. There are no professors in this category and this cluster has the largest proportion of associate lecturers and lecturers (Others), i.e., junior staff, as well as having a relatively low proportion of tenured staff (40%). In addition, over 50 percent of individuals are female. They are also relatively younger (42 years), contain relatively fewer PhD recipients (33%) and have a relatively small number of overseas-born respondents (13%). Another distinctive characteristic of this group is length of time spent in academia (eight years on average) compared with those in other clusters. This group may in fact be underrepresented within this study (and possibly at academic conferences), as individuals at these levels (i.e., junior faculty members) probably represent the largest proportion of marketing academics in Australia and New Zealand.

This cluster believed that more emphasis should be given to teaching, and especially to practice in relation to theory, although its individuals do not have the highest number of teaching hours. This is the group most concerned with time spent on administration, for while they spend relatively little time on this activity (6.77 hours) this may be a disproportionately high figure given their junior status. Cluster 3 members feel they have little input into the running of their department and the university. In addition, they believe that there is too much bureaucracy and politics.

They feel strongly that there is insufficient time for research and that funding for research is lacking. They also spend relatively less time undertaking research (11.14 hours). Interestingly, their research output is *relatively* the highest for several categories, including refereed journal articles, books edited, non-refereed book chapters, and conference papers. In terms of aggregate outputs, this group has a *relatively* higher than average number of books and refereed publications (both have means greater than 1). Thus, while these individuals are "newer" academics, they appear to be developing their research profile rapidly. This might partly explain why they feel that it takes too long to get promoted and that the promotion procedures are unfair. That is, promotion procedures may not be designed to support individuals trying to fast-track their career. Values of mean scores, reported in Table 4, for 12 out of 14 items were less than 3. The Tukey results also confirm that Cluster 3 was usually less satisfied than the other clusters. This is rather indicative of the negative attitudes within this cluster regarding many aspects of the work environment.

Cluster 4 – Satisfied Researchers

This group contained 13 respondents or 20 percent of the sample and comprises all academic levels. They have

TABLE 7
RELATIVE OUTPUT PER CLUSTER (INDIVIDUAL ITEMS AND GROUPED), ANOVA AND TUKEY TEST RESULTS

	Traditional Academics	Satisfied Professors	Newer Academics	Satisfied Researchers	F (sig) Tukey Test
Books	2.37	0.70	1.20	0.72	9.130 (.440) ns
Books Edited	1.48	0.59	1.87	0.79	1.138 (.341) ns
Refereed Book Chapters	0.28	1.35	1.06	0.53	0.455 (.715) ns
Non-Refereed Book Chapters	0.92	0.70	1.42	1.29	1.030 (.386) ns
Refereed Journal Articles	0.31	0.74	2.40	0.37	3.932 (.013) 3>1,4
Non-Refereed Journal Articles	0.89	1.48	0.84	0.21	0.978 (.409) ns
Conference Papers	0.44	1.07	1.24	0.89	0.333 (.802) ns
Presentations	0.84	1.38	0.70	0.63	2.140 (.105)
Aggregate Books Written and Edited	1.30	0.68	1.43	1.06	0.725 (.541) ns
Aggregate Refereed Publications	0.29	1.29	1.20	0.50	0.528 (.665) ns
Aggregate Non-Refereed Publications	0.66	1.03	0.94	0.77	0.508 (.678) ns

a relatively higher proportion of tenured members (84%), a small proportion of females (15%), they have been in academia for 12 years on average, and are on average 43 years old.

This cluster seems to believe that there is too much emphasis on teaching, and that teaching should focus more on theory rather than on practice. These respondents have a relatively low number of teaching related hours (i.e., 20.56). They do not believe that teaching and administration cuts into their research time, which is relatively higher than other clusters (14.15 hours a week). They also think that research is reasonably funded. Their research output is, however, not relatively higher than their peers, with only one category – non-refereed book chapters – having a mean greater than 1 (i.e., higher than average). This might suggest that this group is focusing on specific types of journals, which have more rigorous requirements.

Satisfied Researchers felt strongly that they have little influence in the running of their department and the university, and that extensive politics or bureaucracy does exist. As mentioned earlier this group contains a relatively higher number of overseas and tenured academics. While these individuals were more satisfied with the conditions for research than many of their colleagues (see mean scores and Tukey results in Table 4) they still believed that it took too long to get promoted and promotional procedures were unfair. This may suggest that they did not

believe that their efforts were being appropriately rewarded despite their research contributions.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study four clusters of Australian and New Zealand academics were identified using cluster analysis, based on individuals' attitudes towards work environment issues. The analysis indicated substantial differences among academics in regard to their perceptions and satisfaction with the academic environment. The results also showed that these attitudes are associated, in varying degrees of strength, with the respondents' position level, type of appointment, gender and nationality, and with some indicators of time allocation (i.e., consulting) and research output (i.e., refereed journal articles).

It is interesting that there were two groups (Satisfied Professors and Satisfied Researchers) that seemed to have more favorable perceptions of academia and are more satisfied with their working environments. There are relatively larger proportions of tenured staff and overseas-trained individuals in these groups. This may suggest that job security has a positive impact on how individuals perceive the environment, which is consistent with the literature on academic satisfaction (e.g., Ward and Sloane 2000; Warne and Lundy 1988). The fact that these two groups have higher levels of overseas respondents might suggest that these individuals perceive that the grass is indeed greener on the other side (Schlegelmilch 2000) at least when the other side is the Australian and New Zealand academic environment.

The Traditional Academics (Cluster 1) seem to be focused on teaching and production of books (authored and edited), rather than journal and conference publications. This might, of course, be a reflection of their individual orientation or the orientation of their institutions, i.e., universities or departments where teaching is emphasized. It seems that these academics might feel pressured to shift their emphasis from teaching to research, as there is more pressure on all institutions and academics to "produce" research outputs. However, this might be difficult for some academics, especially for those who have explicitly pursued a teaching orientation.

It appears that clusters have different publication strategies, which might also reflect type of publications different universities value or valued in the past, those academics take into account for promotion purposes. For example, newer academics (Cluster 3) appear to direct their effort to the refereed journal articles and, as we mentioned previously, Traditional Academics to publishing and editing books. The fact that quality of publication outputs is not measured is a limitation of the research output measure and may need to be further developed in future research.

The most concerning result is that there appear to be a number of younger and/or female academics who consistently have unfavorable perceptions of academia and also appear to be less satisfied with it (Cluster 3). One explanation might be that they feel they are performing (their research output would generally suggest that this is the case), but not being adequately rewarded. These individuals may decide to leave the system, or focus on their own priorities and negatively impact on the overall academic environment. Alternatively, they may challenge the status quo by progressing up the academic ladder more quickly and/or motivating others to improve their performance. This positive outcome would only be possible in flexible and dynamic environments which, according to most respondents, does not appear to be the case in academia.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that traditionally there have been limited academic development programs in place within universities that would facilitate individual improvements and progression in an academic career (Smith and Ferris 1990). This, however, does appear to be changing with many universities developing formal and informal mentoring and other programs. Hopefully, this will translate to improving opportunities for staff within a workplace, demonstrating a greater dynamism and an appropriate reward structure.

Academic managers may face challenges in developing strategies to deal with all types of academics, should they exist in one department or school. For example, introducing incentives for more productive researchers (for example, increased travel money, reduced teaching hours, and the like) might result in further alienating some clusters of academics (such as Traditional Academics). It may, however, also be possible to have a range of staff development programs targeting different clusters. For example, in addition to "rewarding" those who are more productive there could also be specialized funding for emerging researchers independent of age or tenure of staff, but focused on their track records. In addition, there needs to be a holistic staff development solution that considers where staff are in their career and the pace of their development. In this way reward structures would not only benefit productive researchers but highly regarded and productive teachers and administrators as well.

The staff development issues may be easier to manage when hiring new staff, that is, explicitly defining the expectations with regard to multi-dimensional performance criteria, research, teaching, and administration. As is suggested in the traditional marketing literature developing appropriate expectations is one method of managing "satisfaction."

There are a number of avenues for future research. Repeating the survey will uncover if perceptions of the academic environment, total time and time allocation to activities, and publication outputs and strategies, have changed over time. This is especially important considering the changes that the tertiary environment is experiencing and increasing demand on academics. There is a need

to extend types of performance being measured. For example, the measurement of research quality and teaching performance would also need to be included, as would administrative performance. Measuring and/or quantifying these issues would in itself pose interesting research challenges. Another interesting opportunity to undertake a longitudinal study would be to follow individuals throughout their career. This type of examination could also encompass different countries and academic systems to identify if these profiles are specific for Australasian academia. Finally, there is an opportunity to undertake a complex modeling approach, which could explore the relationships between workload, satisfaction and performance, as well as incorporate other demographic and institutional variables that might influence performance.

REFERENCES

Alpert, F. and M. Kamins (2003), "The Problematic Nature of the Lack of Doctoral Coursework in Australasia," *ANZMAC, 2003 Conference Proceedings*, 1–3 (December), 1368–73.

Baker, M.J. and B.Z. Erdogan (2000), "Who We Are and What We Do-2000," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 16 (7), 679–98.

Bellas, M.L. and R.K. Toutkoushian (1999), "Faculty Time Allocations and Research Productivity: Gender, Race, and Family Effects," *Review of Higher Education*, 22 (4), 367–90.

Blackburn, R. and R. Bentley (1993), "Faculty Research Productivity: Some Moderators of Associated Stressors," *Research in Higher Education*, 34 (6), 725–45.

Boyde, S. and C. Wylie (1994), *Workload and Stress in New Zealand Universities.* Association of University Staff of New Zealand – New Zealand Council for Educational Research: Wellington, NZ.

Chapman, L. and D. Taylor (1993), "Marketing Academics in Australia: A Profile Analysis," *Australia New Zealand Academy of Management*, (Unpublished Paper) Auckland.

Currie, J. (1996), "The Effects of Globalization on 1990s Academics in Greedy Institutions: Overworked, Stressed Out, Marinalized, and Demoralized," paper presented at the 9th World Congress of Comparative Education, University of Sydney.

Danaher, P. and R. Starr (1998), "A Study of Marketing Departments in Australasian Universities," *European Journal of Marketing*, 32 (9/10), 771–84.

Danieli, A. and A. Thomas (1988), "Occupational Identity and Organizational Change Among University Management Teachers," paper presented at the conference *Higher Education Close Up*, University of Central Lancashire and retrieved from [www.leads.ac.uk/educol] on 9th of Mat 2001, 1–16.

Diamantopoulos, A., B. Schlegelmilch and S. Neate-Stidson (1992). "Who We Are and What We Do: A Profile of Marketing Academics in U.K. Universities," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 8 (1), 5–20.

_____ (1996), "A Model of Publication Performance of Marketing Academics," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13 (2), 163–80.

Fairweather, J.S. (1993), "Faculty Rewards Reconsidered: The Nature of Tradeoffs," *Change*, 25, 44–47.

Garza, H. (1993), "Second-Class Academics: Chicano/Latino Faculty in U.S. Universities," in *Building a Diverse Faculty. New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, J. Gainen and R. Boice, eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, (53), 33–41.

Gottlieb, E.F and R. Yakir (1995), "Perceptions of the Research-Teaching Nexus and Job Satisfaction: An Analysis from the Carnegie International Survey of the Academic Profession," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 27 pages.

Grasha, A.F. (1994), "A Matter of Style: The Teacher as Expert, Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delegator," *College Teaching*, 42 (4), 142–49.

Hetzel, P. (2000), "Where are we Going? Perceptions of French Marketing Academics," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 16 (7), 717–44.

Hult, G. and J. Hasselback (1998), "A Report of Gender and Professional Age of the Marketing Professoriate," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 20 (1), 35–40.

Kogan, M., I Moses, and E. El-Khawas (1994), *Staffing Higher Education.* London: Kingsley.

Landsbergis, P.A and E. Vivona-Vaughan (1995), "Evaluation of An Occupational Stress Intervention in A Public Agency," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16 (1), 29–48.

Layzell, D.T. (1996), "Faculty Workload and Productivity: Recurrent Issues with New Imperatives," *Review of Higher Education*, 19 (3), 267–81.

London, M. and G.R. Oldham (1976), "Effects of Varying Goal Types and Incentive Systems on Performance and Satisfaction," *Academy of Management Journal*, 19 (4), 537–46.

Lease, S.H. (1999), "Occupational Role Stressors, Coping, Support, and Hardiness, as Predictors of Strain in Academic Faculty: An Emphasis on New and Female Faculty," *Research in Higher Education*, 40 (3),

285–307.

Long, J. (1990), "The Origins of Sex Differences in Science," *Social Forces,* 68 (4), 1297–1315.

_____ and M. Fox (1995), "Scientific Careers: Universalism and Particularism," *Annual Review of Sociology,* 21, 45–71.

Mankelow, G. and M.J. Polonsky (1998), "The Future of Marketing Theory, Practice, and Academia – Views of U.S. and Australian/New Zealand Academics," *AMS Quarterly,* 2 (4), 1,5.

Meyer, K.A. (1998), "Faculty Workload Studies: Perspectives, Needs, and Future Directions," *Higher Educational Report No.1,* Washington, DC: George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Development.

Nixon, J. (1996), "Professional Identity and the Restructuring of Higher Education," *Studies in Higher Education,* 21, 5–16.

Rabinowitz, S. and D. Hall (1977), "Organizational Research on Job Involvement," *Psychological Bulletin,* 84, 265–88.

Pearce, J.A., II and P.G. Bonnor (2000), "The Views of Marketing Faculty on the Major Controversies in Collegiate Business Education," *Journal of Marketing Management,* 16 (7), 779–92.

Piercy, N.F. (1999), "A Polemic in Search of Excellence Among Business School Professors: Cowboys, Chameleons, Question-Marks, and Quislings," *European Journal of Marketing,* 33 (7/8), 698–706.

Polonsky, M.J., M.L. Fry, G. Mankelow, P. Morgan, R. Rugumbana (1999a), "A Structural Overview of Undergraduate Marketing Education in Australia: Implications for Defining Core Competencies," *Marketing Education Review,* 9 (2), 33–42.

_____, G. Jones and M. Kearsley (1999b), "Accessibility, An Alternative Method of Ranking Marketing Journals?" *Journal of Marketing Education,* 21 (4), 181–93.

_____ and G. Mankelow (2000), "Where Are We Going? Perceptions of U.S. Marketing Academics," *Journal of Marketing Management,* 16 (7), 717–44.

_____, B. Juric, and G. Mankelow (2003), "Attitudes About Work Practices, Time Allocation and Publication Output: Profiles of U.S. Marketing Academics," *Journal of Marketing Education,* 25 (4), Forthcoming.

Reger, R.K., L.T. Gustafson, S.M. Demarie, and J.V. Mullane (1994), "Reframing the Organization: Why Implementing Total Quality is Easier Said Than Done," *The Academy of Management Review,* 19 (3), 565–84.

Romanin, S. and R. Over (1993), "Australian Academics: Career Patterns, Work Roles, and Family Life-Cycle Commitments of Men and Women," *Higher Education,* 26 (4), 11–29.

Rotfeld, H.J. (2000), "It Gets in the Way," *AMS Quarterly,* 4, 7.

Schlegelmilch, B.B. (2000), "Editorial: Is the Grass Really Greener on the Other Side?" *Journal of Marketing Management,* 16 (7), 675–78.

Sinkovics, R.R and B.B. Schlegelmilch (2000), "Marketing Academics in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland: Hulbolt's Ideas Give Way to Performance Pressure," *Journal of Marketing Management,* 16 (7), 745–60.

Smith, C.S. and G.R. Ferris (1990), "Human Resources Strategy and Planning in Higher Education," *Human Resources Planning,* 13 (1), 13–25.

Soliman, I. and H. Soliman (1997), "Academic Workload and Quality," *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 22 (2),135–57.

Taylor, T., J. Gough, V. Bundrock, and R. Winter (1998), "A Bleak Outlook: Academic Staff Perceptions of Changes in Core Activities in Australian Higher Education, 1991–1996," *Studies in Higher Education,* 23 (3), 255-68.

Thompson, T.C. (1997), "Learning Styles and Teaching Styles: Who Should Adapt to Whom?" *Business Communication Quarterly,* 60 (2), 125–27.

Ward, M.E. and P.J. Sloane (2000), "Non-Pecuniary Advantages versus Pecuniary Disadvantages: Job Satisfaction Among Male and Female Academics in Scottish Universities," *Scottish Journal of Political Economy,* 47 (3),273–303.

Warne, B.D. and K.L.P. Lundy (1988), "Career Patterns and Role Performance of Part-Time Academics: The Impact of Sex and Setting," *1988 Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education,* (November), St. Louis, MO.

Winter R., T. Taylor, and J. Sarros (2000), "Trouble at Mill: Quality of Academic Work-Life Issues Within a Comprehensive Australian University," *Studies in Higher Education,* 25 (3), 279–94.

Wolverton, M., W.H. Gmelch, M.L. Wolverton, and J. Sarros (1999), "Stress in Academic Leadership: U.S. and Australian Department Chairs/Heads," *Review of Higher Education,* 22, 165–85.