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Global Job Satisfaction and University Management in Hong Kong Higher Education

In the context of globalization and increasing domestic and international competition among higher education institutions, universities are under the pressure to reform in order to optimize management structure, enhance academic capacity and magnify overall performance and productivity. As actors central to the process of knowledge creation and dissemination, the professoriate remains the most determinant force shaping the quality and future direction of higher education (Enders 2006). Therefore, it is crucial to sustain a highly talented and deeply committed core of scholars by providing an atmosphere of free intellectual inquiry and the attractive material conditions (World Bank 2002).

I. The Significance of Job Satisfaction

Academics’ job satisfaction is one of the indicators that could help policy makers and university administrators understand the current situations of the professoriate. Job satisfaction of employees has long been one of the crucial topics in the research on organizational behavior and management (Spector, 1997; Cranny, Smith and Stone, 1992). Employees’ general attitudes toward their jobs are correlated with a variety of aspects of organizational management and the nature of the job. Conventional wisdom proposes that job satisfaction would affect employee’s performance and productivity (Spector, 1997; Katzell, Thompson and Guzzo, 1992). Those who are dissatisfied with their jobs would be more likely to be absent and quit, which increases to some extent labor costs, organizational volatility and inefficiency (Steers and Rhodes, 1978; Spector 1997).

Meanwhile, job satisfaction would help establish so-called organizational citizenship which means somehow a group identity associated with the organization and encourages some voluntary activities other than passively taking designated responsibility, such as, helping their co-workers and making suggestions to organization managers (Spector, 1997; Schnake, 1991; Organ and Konovsky 1989). In addition, job satisfaction is also correlated with some nonwork factors such as physical and emotional well-being of employees and, in a broader sense, their life satisfaction (Lee and Ashforth, 1993; Spector, 1997).

Up to date, there still lacks sufficient empirical evidence for some of these arguments. For instance, scholars still cannot agree with each other on how to explain the rather modest correlation between job satisfaction and individual performance, that is, whether there is a causal relationship between the two, and if there is, which causes which (Spector, 1997). But it is confirmed that job satisfaction does contributes in various degrees to organizational citizenship behavior, staff turnover and psychological conditions of employees (Spector, 1997; Schnake, 1991; Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Weitz, 1952; Lee and Ashforth, 1993; Lee, 1988).

1 We acknowledge the support from the General Research Fund of the Hong Kong Research Grants Council.
Hence, job satisfaction is a crucial factor in organizational governance and management. Its significance has been recognized in the field of higher education studies as well (Oshagbemi, 1997a, 1997b and 2003; Hagedorn, 1994). Among all the CAP countries/systems, Hong Kong has the highest proportion of academics who perceive a top-down management at their institutions\(^2\). In this paper, the impact of management style on job satisfaction of academics in Hong Kong higher education will be investigated. Some other crucial factors related to job satisfaction will be identified. Meanwhile, the implications of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of academic staff will be discussed.

Within a system bridging the East with the West, Asia with the rest of the world, Hong Kong is one of the places in Asia which have the highest density of top universities (Postiglione 2005 and 2009a). The local, regional, and global characteristics of the academic profession in Hong Kong, coupled with the compactness and interconnectedness of its government-supported system of universities, make Hong Kong a unique case in a comparative framework. In such a case, how do academic staff feel about their job in general not only indicates the level of attractiveness and organizational efficiency of the higher education institution in its current form, but also implies how much these professors would like to identify with it and contribute voluntarily to its future development and advancement.

In the following sections, the history and governance style of Hong Kong’s higher education system will be discussed. The comparative survey research which this analysis is based upon will then be briefly introduced.

II. The Development of Hong Kong’s Higher Education

*Brief History of Hong Kong’s Higher Education*

The higher education system in Hong Kong evolved in a British colony that later became transformed to a Special Administrative Region of China (Chan and Postiglione 1997, Chan and So 2002). The University of Hong Kong, established in 1911 with the goal of contributing to China’s modernization, had been standing alone for over 50 years until the reform of mass schooling led to the founding of the Chinese University of Hong Kong in 1963. Where in 1981, only two percent of the relevant age group (18-21 years old) occupied a university place, the colonial government increased the figure to eight percent by 1989 when a sudden emigration of talent necessitated a further expansion of the university system. By 1997, Hong Kong’s seven universities catered to about eighteen-percent enrolment, with another nine percent attending other postsecondary education. In 2000, government announced a sixty-percent enrolment target by 2010 for all forms of higher education.

New education reform agenda stipulated that in 2012, the length of secondary school will be reduced by one year, making the standard length of a university bachelor degree program increase from three to four years (Hong Kong Bureau of Education and

\(^2\) Three quarters (74\%) of the Hong Kong CAP respondents agreed that there was a top-down management at their institutions. The figure ranks first with the Australian figure.
Manpower: http://www.edb.gov.hk/FileManager/EN/Content_2174/consultation%20document291004.pdf). This change brings the length and structure of Hong Kong’s university system in line with its major trading partners, Mainland China and the United States.

Competition among institutions of higher education for the best students and most resources has intensified and new incentives have been introduced to enhance cross-institutional collaboration as a way of cutting costs and strengthening areas of teaching and research (Sutherland 2002). As the ideas of knowledge economy, financial retrenchment and massification come to dominate policy discourse, Hong Kong has to rethink its higher education strategy, including how it relates to academic staff. A 2004 Report by the University Grants Committee of Hong Kong entitled: To Make a Difference: To Move with the Times, stated:³

… it is also important to nurture a core of local faculty who give stability, local character, and cultural and intellectual rootedness to local universities, and engage themselves heavily with the local community. Their social and public role is vital to the development of a civil society and the quality of life (University Grants Committee 2004).

Governance Reforms in Higher Education

The reforms of governance in Hong Kong higher education have become guided by the global business values of efficiency, quality and accountability. There is an unmistakable stress on the role of education in the global competitiveness of Hong Kong. Economic rationalism has resulted in a distinct form of university managerialism in Hong Kong.

The University Grants Committee, an advisory body composed of academics and non-academic professions from Hong Kong and overseas, has come to play an increasingly proactive role in emphasizing those business-oriented values by facilitating implementation of a series of “quality assurance system” measures that link resource allocation directly to performance. The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), a funding methodology in which academic departments are evaluated and rated as cost centers, has also been influential. Research output has become the dominant factor in appointment, promotion, tenure, contract renewal and extension of service beyond retirement. Aside from the RAE, a teaching and learning quality process review (TLQPR) has been introduced, but not directly linked to the allocation of funds among the institutions. Rather, it has become a symbol for assuring teaching and learning quality.

Finally, a review process called Management Review (MR) has also been adopted which focuses on six aspects of school management as follow: whether an effective strategic

³ Nurturing a core of local academics who can offer intellectual rootedness to Hong Kong universities provides a strong rationale for concerning job satisfaction in the Hong Kong academic profession. But it is interesting to note that the government’s recommendation as such was not followed closely by the Hong Kong higher education institutions, specially amid their quest for world-class universities and an international outlook.
plan can be developed; whether resources are efficiently allocated; whether plans can be fully implemented; whether designated roles and responsibilities are completely fulfilled; whether services are well delivered; and whether the management information system is functioning.

Chan (2002) has referred to this as “a ‘value-for-money’ audit and a landmark for intervention into the governance of local universities in the quest for quality. Nevertheless, universities and individual faculty members in Hong Kong retain a great deal of autonomy from government and have been known to resist the proposals by the Minister of Education to steer the system, consolidate institutions, and influence academic discourse about reform agenda.

Universities had been relatively insulated from the ethos of Hong Kong business practice until the expansion of 1989. As more funds were invested in the largely public system of higher education and the unit cost per student reached new heights, there was a new focus on attaining quality, efficiency and financial accountability. Since the Asian Financial Crisis (1997-2005), universities have become more active in fundraising through donations and more interested in a market-driven approach to research and instructional services.

This has resulted in a large scale of performance-oriented management practices and therefore brought unwelcome pressure on academic life. Yet, it occurs alongside of notable improvements in facilities and other types of assistance for academic activities, particularly, a sustained support for academic freedom (Postiglione and Wang, 2009b). Under such circumstances, to what extent academics like their jobs is a significant issue for the sake of organizational efficiency and competitive capacity of each university and the whole higher education system.

III. The Second Changing Academic Profession (CAP) Study

The second CAP survey was carried out in nineteen countries/systems over 2007-08. The common aim was to complete an “effective” sample of 800 academic staff in degree-granting institutions. Taking into account the design effect and possibly low expected response rate of non-face-to-face survey, country sample frames typically targeted from 2000 to 4000 faculty members. Some countries used mail surveys and others electronic. The CAP data allow for multi-level (cross-national and within country) comparisons of numerous factual and perceived features of the academic profession in 2007 (circa 400 variables).

*The Hong Kong CAP Study*

The Hong Kong CAP data were collected through questionnaires consisting of fifty-three questions in six sections developed by the international CAP team and modified by the Hong Kong CAP team in accordance with specific characteristics of the Hong Kong higher education system. The survey work was contracted to the Social Sciences Research Centre (SSRC) of the University of Hong Kong. A pilot study was conducted in May 2007 on the basis of which selected questions were modified before the main survey
was conducted in June across eleven institutions of higher education. Preceding the
survey, an article appeared in the Hong Kong press that outlined the significance of this
research and noted the importance of academic staff to participate. Each institution had a
senior academic who acted as the CAP affiliate and in certain cases reminded academic
staff to complete their survey questionnaire.

Hong Kong academics were sent a survey package comprised of a cover letter with a two
page explanation of the CAP project, the survey questionnaire and a stamped envelope
addressed to the Social Science Research Centre (SSRC) for returning the survey. The
survey packages were distributed in bulk to each department of each institution, and
academic staff received the survey via their office in-trays. A reminder card was sent
after a ten-day period, followed a second reminder. Reminder e-mails were also sent by
the institutional affiliates.

During June to August 2007, respondents returned their completed surveys to SSRC. A
total of over 811 questionnaires were sent back via the post, institutional affiliates, and
the project assistant. SSRC handled data input and cleaning. A data set and codebook
were delivered to the Hong Kong CAP team in January 2008.4

The Representativeness of Hong Kong Sample

When compared with the official profile of academic staff reported by the University
Grants Committee (UGC), the Hong Kong CAP sample survey captured a relatively less
bottom heavy structure in terms of academic ranks. The 2006/07 official population
figures report that nearly three quarters (74 percent) of Hong Kong academics were of
ranks equivalent or below assistant professorship, including teaching fellows, teaching
assistants, instructors, etc..5 However, as figure 1 indicates, the 2007 CAP sample has a
slightly larger representation of senior academics, with more than half (51.7 percent)
being associate professors or professors (as compared with the actual population
distribution of 25.7 percent). This is because teaching fellows/instructors are more likely
employed on a part-time or temporary basis and their profiles are not posted or updated in
the institutions’ public directories, which is not the case for most senior academic staff.
Regarding gender distribution, the CAP data reflect exactly the population, consisting of
around one-third female and two-thirds male.

---

4 The response rate in the Hong Kong 2007 CAP study is 12.9%.
5 The population data are calculated by merging official data on the population academics in the eight
public-funded universities in Hong Kong (statistics reported by the University Grants Committee at
http://www.ugc.edu.hk/eng/ugc/index.htm) and estimated data on those in the three additional institutions
which are also included in the sample.
IV. Global Job Satisfaction in Hong Kong’s Higher Education System

There are two ways to approach the issue of job satisfaction. One approach is correlational or facet approach, which measures one’s attitudes toward and perceptions of each of a list of important aspects regarding a particular job and assumes global job satisfaction reflects a net effect of these attitudes (Spector, 1997). A long list of influential factors that evidently contribute to job satisfaction has been identified in the previous literature. The most popularly used facet framework, among others, is the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall and Hulin, 1969 and 1985). They emphasize five specific aspects of a job: the nature of the work (for instance, satisfying or routine), the pay (adequate or inadequate), the opportunity for promotion (fairly distributed or not), supervision (encouraging or discouraging), and coworkers (intelligent and responsible or not). The other is causal. Instead of calculating employees’ attitudes toward each aspect of their jobs, scholars in this group regard these factors as conditions and even causes for global job satisfaction.

In this paper, we will focus particularly on global job satisfaction of academics in Hong Kong higher education and attempt to find out which factors have an impact on the general attitude of the faculty toward their jobs. In a degree, the nature of their work is held constant, consisting of teaching, research, service and administrative work; these academics may however vary in the amount of time spent on different components. This factor will be incorporated into our analysis. Some evidence shows that comparatively speaking academics in Hong Kong as a whole tend to have a relatively high payment and social status, and hence feel satisfied with their jobs (Boyer et. al. 1994). But there is a rather huge difference across academic ranks. Getting promoted may be hard in the Hong Kong higher education system, but as long as the criteria are clearly laid out, professors,

---

6 There are multiple ways to lay out and measure the facets of job satisfactions. Widely recognized studies include the Job Satisfaction Survey, the Job Descriptive Index, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Job Diagnostic Survey, the Job in General Scale, and Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Subscale (Spector, 1997).
senior and junior, might probably believe that promotion procedures are quite fair and satisfying.

Additionally, if one has a strong (material and thereof psychological) attachment to the institution where he is working, he may be more likely to favor his job. At the same time, organizational structure which encourages faculty participation and respects staff’s academic freedom vis-à-vis administrative hierarchy may also attract academics and boost their global job satisfaction.

In order to explain different levels of overall job satisfaction across individuals, we concentrate in this research on the main correlates to global job satisfaction in two categories. The first category characterizes individual characteristics of respondents, namely, demographic characters, material benefits and social status associated with the job, attachment to one’s institution, and proportion of nonteaching and nonresearch work; the second category features their perceptions of institutional structure, especially from the perspectives of faculty participation, academic freedom and the pattern of managerialism.

**Measurement of Global Job Satisfaction**

In the CAP study, a global measure of job satisfaction was managed in one question: “how would you rate your overall satisfaction with your current work?” The answers were rescaled so that 1 represents “very low” satisfaction level and 5 “very high” level. Figure 2 compares the composition of subjects who fall in different response categories in Hong Kong with that in the rest cases of the international sample. It seems that on average academics of Hong Kong mirror exactly those in the rest cases in this sample and majority academic staff in the world is overall satisfied with their current jobs as of 2007. Around one tenth of the respondents who answer the question are somewhat dissatisfied in general with their jobs both in Hong Kong and the rest of the cross-national sample. One quarter of them stay neutral with this question. A little bit less than half of them choose satisfaction level “4”. About fifteen of them are very much satisfied with their jobs.

---

7 The comparison is between the average situation of Hong Kong and that of all the rest cases as one group. A Pearson Chi-square test does not appear significant statistically. Nevertheless, it does not mean that individual countries in the sample do not vary. As a matter of fact, a Pearson Chi-square test considering survey design effect at the country level shows that the variance of the global job satisfaction across countries is statistically significant. As this article focuses on Hong Kong, the result of this test is omitted.
Correlates and Their Measures\textsuperscript{8}

Under the circumstances of university management reform, understanding which factors are closely related to people’s attitudes towards their jobs might provide policy-makers and administrators with some hints for potential structural and procedural enhancement in governance and thereafter improve organizational efficiency and management in higher education.

We argue in this paper that it is not only the material benefits associated with the job that influences the level of satisfaction, but the corresponding social advantages also impact one’s evaluation of his job. As in higher education, job pay and social status/resources are highly associated with the rank of an academic staff member, we use academic rank as a proxy for material and social benefits brought about by the job.

---Proxy for Material and Social Benefits of the Job: Academic Rank

Academic Rank in the case of Hong Kong is a strong indicator of material treatment for academic jobs. Full professors normally earn more than associate professors, and much more than junior ones. In the meantime, fringe benefits increases with pay. In addition, senior staff members are advantaged in terms of social networking and status. According to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, people have not only fundamental and physiological needs, but they also have some uppermost level needs of self-actualization and self-esteem. In this sense, global job satisfaction would attribute to some nonmaterial aspects, such as whether the staff member gains respect and recognition by doing this job. No doubt professors are likely to gain more respect and have a higher level of self-esteem than new recruits. The longer one stays in the academia, the more opportunities he gains to socialize with people with a similar background, the more social capital (academic capital) he accumulates, which may also affect his evaluation of the job.

\textsuperscript{8} Basic summaries and correlations of explanatory variables are reported in Appendix A and B.
In the Hong Kong 2007 sample, we have 167 respondents at the rank of full professorship, recoded as “4”, 238 at the associate professorship, recoded as “3”, 310 at the junior assistant professorship, recode as “2”, 78 teaching instructors/assistants, rescaled as “1”, and 18 with other irregular and temporary titles, recoded as “0”.

--Individual Attachment to the Institution

If the institution is perceived as more important, subjectively or objectively, will one be more likely to feel satisfied with the job? The CAP study in 2007 captures both subjective and objective measure of this issue. As the objective measure is factual and therefore tends to be less volatile than the subjective one, it will be utilized here. The measure is indicated by the question “in the current academic year, what percentage of the funding for your research came from your own institution? The answers of Hong Kong respondents range between 0 and 100 percent. The above argument is also made in the context of Hong Kong academia that research is highly favored. Almost half (49%) of the Hong Kong CAP respondents indicated that their interests lay on both teaching and research but leaning toward research, and 12% had their interests primarily on research. Hence institutional support for research funding may lead to a satisfying academic life.

By the same token, an environment that academics can focus more their time on research and teaching can as well conducive to satisfying faculty members.

--Time Devoted into Non-Performance-Relevant Work

Promotion opportunity is distributed according to quantified performance in research and teaching in Hong Kong higher education, it is generally speaking fair and just. But academic work comprises not only teaching and research, but also service and administrative work. Spending more time on the latter means less time left devoted into the former, which may probably affect one’s promotion probability and therefore job satisfaction. Hence, we hypothesize that the more time spent on service and administration, the less likely one is overall satisfied with his job. In the later regression analysis, the percentage of total work hours in one typical week spent on activities other than teaching and research is utilized to indicate the extent to which non-performance-relevant work takes up one’s time. The range of this index spreads between 0 and 100 percent. 9

--Gender 10

9 The question asked in the CAP research is: how many hours do you spend in a typical week on each of the following activities when classes are in session and not, respectively, teaching, research, service, administration and other academic activities? In this case, the measure incorporated in the regression model is calculated by 1 subtracted by the percentage of work hours spent on teaching and research. If the respondent fills out the blanks in both situations that classes are in session and not, the percentages are averaged out; if the respondent only fills out the blank in one situation, that answer will be taken as the final value of this observation.

10 Age is also in some studies a factor related with job satisfaction. Studies propose cohort effect on job satisfaction (Wright and Hamilton, 1978). But in this research, age is highly correlated with academic rank.
There is no agreement in the literature on the relationship between gender and job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). It seems interesting that several studies do not find any significant difference in job satisfaction between men and women even there is a gender division in terms of types of jobs and a gender inequity in material benefits (Spector, 1997). The factor of gender is captured in the study. As mentioned earlier, the Hong Kong sample mirrors the gender division of the academic population, that is, one third female and two thirds male.

--Organizational Features: Academics’ Policy-Making Power, Management Style, Administrative Support for Academic Freedom, and Performance-Oriented

In addition to individual level factors, organizational structure and management style may also determine to some extent the level of global job satisfaction of employees. Those institutional features favored by academics in general may help satisfying them; whereas those disliked by them may dampen down their positive attitudes. In the case of Hong Kong higher education, four crucial measures are focused on in this study. Faculty members, individually or as a whole, have some policy-making power. Granting them some policy power and encouraging them to participate in decision-making may assist them to develop a sense of “citizenship”. As a matter of fact, even though institutionally, they may enjoy the same level of policy power, they perceive it differently. What matters to their attitudes is their perceptions. Will those who believe that they have more policy-making power have a higher level of global satisfaction with their jobs than those who only perceive a lower level?

In the CAP study, respondents are asked to indicate the primary influential player in each of a list of policy issue areas, namely, selecting key administrators, choosing new faculty, making faculty promotion and tenure decision, determining budget priorities, determining the overall teaching load of faculty, setting admission standards for undergraduate students, approving new academic programs, evaluating teaching, setting internal research priorities, evaluating research, and establishing international linkages. The potential primary influential actors include government or external stakeholders, institutional managers, university senate, academic unit managers, faculty committees/boards, individual academic staff, and students. A faculty policy-making power index is calculated by the total number of policy issue areas where faculty, collectively (boards/committees) or individually, has the primary impact, ranging from 0 to 11.

Academics are one of the most liberal social groups. Hence, they would value largely academic freedom and disagree with top-down style of management in an extreme form. Institutional support for academic freedom and liberal style of management would be the key organizational characteristics satisfying these professors. Respondents in the CAP

In the case of Hong Kong, a simple Pearson’s correlation between age and academic rank is 0.45. Cohort effect, such as the level of skill and generational difference, can be normally covered by academic rank in the field of higher education. As age is not a particular variable of interest, it is omitted in the following analyses in order to avoid the problem of multicollinearity.
survey are asked whether they agree with the statements describing the situations “the administration supports academic freedom” and “at my institution, there is a top-down management” with “1” coded as “strongly disagree” and “5” “strongly agree”.\footnote{For last three organizational variables, top-down management style, administrative support for academic freedom and performance-orientation, there are lots of missingnesses. In order to avoid losing valuable information by listwise deletion of the whole observations, the cells with missingness values are imputed by their means in later regression analyses.}

Also, higher education institutions with a strong performance orientation are usually endowed with practices of performance-based work contract renewal, promotion and resources allocation. Academics are well-informed of rules of the assessment and rewarding mechanisms. Perceptions of academics about the strong performance orientation of their institutions therefore contribute a factor to their job satisfaction.

In the following section, a regression is run on the level of global job satisfaction. As the dependent variable (job satisfaction) is coded in a likert scale, an ordered probit model is utilized.

\textbf{V. Ordered Probit Analysis and Results}

As the dependent variable is an ordinal measure, an ordered probit analysis (a type of maximum likelihood estimation), weighted by gender and academic rank, is conducted to detect the correlations between job satisfaction and the other variables described above. The regression results are reported in the following table.
Overall in terms of statistical significance, organizational design and structure do appear to affect global job satisfaction of its employees, compared to individual-level factors. First, our data do not suggest a strong relationship between gender and satisfaction. Gender does not affect one’s level of satisfaction with their current work, holding other factors constant; statistical analysis does not provide strong evidence that a male faculty member is statistically more (or less) satisfied with his current work than a female member. Secondly, it seems that academic rank is not significantly correlated with one’s job satisfaction.
satisfaction, holding other factors constant. Hence statistically speaking, a professor is not necessarily more satisfied with his/her work than a junior faculty member.

Thirdly, individual level financial attachment to the institution does not statistically affect job satisfaction. The one whose research funding all comes from the institution in which he is working is not more likely to get satisfied with his job than the one who gets nothing from her institution. Fourthly, it seems that academics are not quite concerned with the time they spend on service and administration. Maybe a strong sense of “civic” duty overcomes the negative attitude toward service and administrative work.

The table shows that individual level factors are not as significant as organization level ones in determining who is satisfied with his job and who is not. The institution’s structural features and policy practice are more crucial on one’s global satisfaction. All the four indicators are strongly associated with the dependent variable except faculty policy power. Faculty cares more about individual freedom and procedural justice than actual participation in decision-making. Perceived faculty influence on one’s institution’s decision making process does not show any statistical significant impact on global job satisfaction, all else being equal.

Faculty values academic freedom. If one perceives that the administration supports academic freedom and does not witness a strong top-down management practice in her institution, one would be more satisfied with her job than otherwise, holding others constant. A clear performance orientation of one’s institution also helps explain her positive evaluation of and attitude toward her job.

VI. Conclusion and Implications

In sum, the analyses show that institutional settings and policies have a great impact of global job satisfaction, especially that the administration’s support for academic freedom has the strongest effect. It is noteworthy that Hong Kong academics value their academic freedom being protected by their institution but not their personal influence maximized in the institutional decision-making. This phenomenon suggests a new understanding about academic freedom in a world freest economy like Hong Kong (for example “2009 Index of Economic Freedom” http://www.heritage.org/index/). Academics in Hong Kong favor an environment free from top-down interventions which they can achieve performance in compliance with their institution’s strong performance orientation. The freedom to perform, rather than material/social benefits and organizational decision-making power, can mostly satisfy Hong Kong academics. To sustain the attractiveness of the Hong Kong academic profession locally and globally, the administration of the Hong Kong universities should continue their efforts in safeguarding academic freedom and maintaining the liberal, dynamic and competitive environment where academics can excel and achieve performance. Engaging in ‘academic liberalism’ is still the management challenge Hong Kong universities need to take.
Appendix A

Variables Obs Mean Std. Dev. Min Max
job satisfaction 800 3.65 0.94 1 5
gender 797 0.67 0.47 0 1
research funding 811 37.28 41.28 0 100
% of time in academic rank 811 2.56 0.99 0 4
faculty policy making 811 2.38 2.51 0 11
top-down management 811 4.06 0.94 1 5
performance orientation 811 3.75 0.97 1 5
academic freedom 811 3.49 1.02 1 5

Appendix B

Correlations of Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>academic rank</th>
<th>faculty policy making</th>
<th>top-down management</th>
<th>performance orientation</th>
<th>academic freedom</th>
<th>research funding</th>
<th>% of time in service/adm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic rank</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty policy making</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top-down management</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic freedom</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research funding</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of time in service/adm.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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