

Differences in perception about the competent leadership by the academic profession: Based on the analysis of Findings of the APIKS Surveys in 2017

Akira Arimoto (Research Institute for Higher Education Hiroshima University), Tsukasa Daizen (Research Institute for Higher Education Hiroshima University)

Enhancing academic leadership in higher education institutions has become one of the most important challenges in government reform agenda in Japan (Chuoh Kyouiku Shingikai 2014). The interest on academic leadership is not limited to Japan, since there have been rising interests in academic leadership elsewhere in the world.

In the United States, management, governance and leadership have always been one of the major topics in the literature of higher education studies (Gerber 2014; Ginsberg 2011; Mortimer and Sathre 2007; Tierney ed. 2004; Trachtenberg et al 2013). In the European countries, governance has been one of the most discussed topics in the field of higher education (De Boer and File, 2009; Huisman 2009; Paradeise et al eds. 2009; Shattock 2014,).

According to the academic profession questionnaire survey that carried out from 1992 to 2017 in Japan, the level of the Japanese academic profession replying agree to "At your institution, there is a competent leadership" dramatically decrease.

As a result of analyzing why the level of academic professions who reply agree to "there is a competent leadership in my institution" decrease from 1992 to 2017, it became clear that the collegial decision-making processes lead to a competent leadership and the top-down management style impede a competent leadership (Arimoto & Daizen, 2020).

In the above analysis, we did not examine the difference in perception of the competent leadership depending on the university sector (national university and private university) and the university level (research university and non-research university). The purpose of this study is to analyze and discuss the differences in perception of the competent leadership depending on the university sector and university level.

The analytical hypotheses are as follows.

Hypothesis 1: The academic profession at research universities perceive collegial decision-making as the competent leadership more than the academic profession at non-research universities.

Hypothesis 2: The academic profession at national universities perceive collegial decision-making as the competent leadership more than the academic profession at private universities.

References

Arimoto, A. (2018). "Declining Academic Autonomy under Neoliberal Reforms: Lessons from Japanese Higher Education after Incorporation." In: J.C. Shin, S. J. Lee and Y.K. [Eds.] Higher Education Governance in East Asia: Transformations under Neoliberal Reforms. Springer.

Arimoto, A. & Daizen, T. (2020), Why does the Japanese academic profession recognize that there is a competent leadership in my institution?, APIKS conference in Vilnius.

Birnbaum, Robert. 1992. How Academic Leadership works; Understanding Success and Failure in the College Presidency. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Bowen, William G. and Tobin, Eugene. 2015. Locus of Authority. Ithaca:Princeton University Press.

Chuoh Kyouiku Shingikai (Central Education Council) 2014. Daigaku Gabanansu Kaikaku no Suishin ni Tuite (On Further Reforms in University Governance). Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture.

https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo4/houkoku/1344348.htm

Cummings, W. (2013). "Faculty Perceptions of the Efficacy of Higher Educational Governance and Management." In: Teichler, U., Arimoto, A., and Cummings, W.K.[Eds.] The Changing Academic Profession: Major Findings of a Comparative Survey. Dordrecht: Springer, Chapter 6, pp.165-211.

De Boer, Harry and File, Jon, 2009. 'Higher Education Governance Reforms Across Europe'. European Center for Strategic Management for Universities.

Gerber, Larry G. 2014. The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ginsberg, Benjamin. 2011. The Fall of the Faculty. Oxford University Press.

Huisman, Jeroen ed. 2009. International Perspectives on the Governance of Higher Education. New York: Routledge.

Iijima, S. (1979). "President Type and Lecter Type" (In Japanese). In Amano, I. [Ed.] University Reform on the Stating Point. (in Japanese). Tokyo: Simultaneous Publishing Co. pp. 175-181.

MEXT (2015). Revised School Education Law (in Japanese).

McNay, I. (1995). "From the Collegial Academy to Corporate Enterprise: The Changing Cultures of Universities." Schuller, T. (Ed.). The Changing University? Buckingham: SRHE, pp. 105-115.

Mortimer, Kenneth P., and Sathre, Colleen O'Brien. 2007. The Art and Politics of Academic Governance. Academic Council on Education.

Paradeise, Catherine et al. eds. 2009. University Governance: Western European Comparative Perspectives. Springer.

Shattock, Michael. Ed. 2014. International Trends in University Governance. Routledge.

Tierney, William G. ed. 2004. Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance. Baltimore: Johns

Trachtenberg, Stephen Joel; Kauvar, Gerald B.; and Bogue, E. Grady. 2013. Presidencies Derailed: Why University Leaders Fail and How to Prevent It. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.