

1. Developing and implementing fair and rewarding tenure tracks – organisational and professional aspects

Taru Siekkinen, Elias Pekkola, Maria Pietilä and Marjukka Mikkonen

INTRODUCTION

In the context of careers, the aspirations of organisations and individuals coexist. Careers are reciprocal in nature, that is, organisations provide certain career frameworks aligned with their objectives, and individuals contribute in accordance with their own motivations (Siekkinen et al., 2019; Van Maanen, 1977). This dynamic interplay is woven into the fabric of societal change, a crucial factor that shapes the landscape of careers. Van Maanen (1977, p. 8) emphasises the systemic approach where these aspects are strongly connected: ‘Seen in this way, the study of careers is the study of both individual and organisational change as well as of societal change.’

This systemic approach in the realm of academic careers can be described by the *exogenous* and *endogenous* drivers of change (changes in policies, structures and processes, and changes in academic work and the academic profession, respectively) (see Chapter 2). In addition, in academic careers, the psychological contract of academics places particular emphasis on a fair promotion system, the recognition of academics’ skills and talents and a substantial degree of freedom, surpassing even the importance of financial rewards. Research indicates that attracting academics involves not only addressing pecuniary concerns but also considering non-monetary issues, such as questions related to workload, flexibility and the degree of autonomy (Teixeira, 2022).

However, particularly in careers in academia, the reciprocity between the organisation and academic employees has become unbalanced (Siekkinen et al., 2017) due to the larger number of PhD holders compared with the number

of open positions at universities. This is affected by decreasing public funding and an increasing emphasis on efficiency in the context of corporate universities – also conceptualised as neoliberal (for example Bleiklie, 2018) and entrepreneurial universities (for example Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) – where the control of academic labour leads to its deprofessionalisation with decreasing autonomy and precarious working conditions (Jayasuriya et al., 2020).

Influenced by the current precarious working conditions for PhD holders (OECD, 2021; Aarnikoivu et al., 2019) and characterised by low salaries and increasing bureaucracy, universities may be losing their attractiveness as many motivated PhD graduates opt for alternative career paths (Kallio et al., 2024; Teixeira, 2022). In the competitive landscape of universities (Finkelstein & Li, 2022; Beerkens & van der Hoek, 2022), where the struggle for resources is pronounced, the most qualified staff become a key asset (Neave & van Vught, 1994). To enhance their attractiveness as employers for the most promising academics, European universities have in recent years aimed to develop more transparent and rewarding career paths (LERU, 2014).

In many countries, universities have introduced new tenure track career models that outline clear paths to full professorship. Tenure track recruitment is competitive, however, and the path to full professorship is open only to a small proportion of academics. It is important to critically evaluate the type of professors this system produces, as professors hold significant influence within universities and society, having a strong impact on the production of knowledge in their field. Meritocratic evaluation models have been implemented in university recruitment to support the transparency of processes and the equality of opportunities in academic careers, but there are many challenges that universities must acknowledge, particularly relating to diversity. Academia is changing in significant ways, and we have to study it to understand the changing nature of academic work and careers, including the issues of power dynamics, leadership roles, gender disparities and human resource practices (Sarrico et al., 2022).

In this chapter, we set the stage for the book and an analysis of the academic tenure tracks in Europe. First, we delve into the topics of the changing organisational environment of academic work and careers, the standardisation of academic work, tenure track systems as a case in point, performance evaluation of academic work and the diversity of the academic workforce. We then provide a dichotomous view of justifying and implementing academic tenure tracks and related aims. Last, we briefly introduce the structure of the book and the subsequent chapters.

Context: Organisational Changes of Universities Towards Efficiency and Performance Management

Over the last 20 years, universities in Europe have changed in many ways. Universities face societal expectations to be more efficient and impactful in their research and teaching activities (Bleiklie et al., 2017; Geschwind et al., 2020). In addition, global trends in public management, exemplified by neo-liberalism, New Public Management (NPM) and managerialism, have pushed universities to incorporate the characteristics of private sector organisations into their operational frameworks (Bleiklie, 2018; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Siekkinen et al., 2019). Managerialism assumes that most organisational problems can be solved through improved management (Deem & Brehony, 2005; Klikauer, 2015; Trow, 1994). It emphasises competition and the monitoring of efficiency, for example through performance evaluations and outcome measurements (Deem, 1998).

NPM was introduced in the United Kingdom in the 1980s as a response to demands for a cheaper and more efficient public sector (Evetts, 2009; Ferlie et al., 2008). According to Evetts (2009), NPM influences organisations in many ways: it increases the rational-legal forms of authority, standardises work processes and practices, makes authority and decision-making structures more hierarchical and intensifies performance appraisal and the accountability of professionals.

In response to managerialism and NPM, universities began to develop their human resource management (HRM). Central to HRM is the idea that performance can be improved by using specific quantifiable performance criteria and empowering managers to monitor and assess individuals against these criteria. In addition, in many national contexts, university management structures were centralised and the power of collegial bodies in universities was reduced, while the power of managers and other non-academic leaders was increased (Bleiklie et al., 2017; Deem, 1998; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Waring, 2017).

In response to the dynamic shifts in society, in many systems, universities have begun to evolve as organisations. Universities have adapted their organisational structures, transforming from loosely coupled communities of professionals into more 'real' or 'comprehensive' entities (Brunsson & Sahlin-Andersson, 2000; Seeber et al., 2015). Universities have also become increasingly hybrid organisations, influenced by the aforementioned changes. This means that they have incorporated numerous and sometimes conflicting practices, values and principles into their expanding activities, including those derived from the private sector that align with organisational goals (Pekkola et al., 2020).

Consequently, the current landscape of academic work and careers within the evolving context of universities is hybrid in nature, mixing entrepreneurial,

organisational and professional values. These values are also incorporated into the performance evaluations of academic work, career models and structures. They are also visible in the recruitment of academics, where diverse and sometimes contradictory goals and logics come into play, as recent studies on tenure track recruitment have shown (Pietilä & Pinheiro, 2021; Reymert, 2022; Siekkinen et al., 2019; Vellamo et al., 2022).

The evolving expectations regarding the accountability and relevance of academic work have also changed management and career practices at universities. Career assessment and progression are seen as important variables in universities' outreach to industry, business and society (Koryakina et al., 2015). From this perspective, the criteria used for assessment and reward structures play a crucial role in shaping academic work. Koryakina et al. (2015) state that the transformation of academic work requires a significant change in the way it is assessed and rewarded and in the way middle managers understand academic work and its outcomes (see also Pekkola et al., 2018).

Universities' Goals and Interests in a Competitive Environment

Despite national variations (see Chapter 2), universities' responses to global challenges have been rather similar (Finkelstein & Li, 2022). As the management of universities has changed, the management of human resources within universities has also changed, becoming more strategic (Pietilä, 2015; Siekkinen et al., 2016). Mainstream strategic HRM literature typically links organisations' human resource policies with their broader strategic objectives (for example Boxall & Purcell, 2008). When universities are perceived as rational organisational actors (Krücken & Meier, 2006), it can be assumed that they strategically use academic recruitment (and university career structures) as a means to achieve broader organisational goals. According to research conducted within the context of universities in Finland, universities have indeed used tenure track career recruitment to achieve goals related to internationalisation and research management. For example, tenure track systems have been used to implement organisational strategy by opening new positions in the areas that the universities considered strategically important (Pietilä, 2015, 2018).

From an organisational perspective, the tenure track as an internal career model poses several challenges. For example, it places new demands on universities, including the need to build support structures through additional training, funding (such as start-up grants) and mentoring for newly recruited assistant and associate professors. Furthermore, performance review systems need to address various issues, including determining the balance between standardisation and individualisation in expected academic performance.

Universities might want to explore the feasibility of acknowledging the diverse roles of academics. This could involve considering the introduction of tenure track positions that are research and teaching intensive and positions that are tailored for science-society interaction or business collaboration. Additionally, universities need to take a position on how to deal with possible career breaks, such as parental leave, in the evaluation of performance for recruitment and promotion decisions. The employment relationship in the tenure track system puts pressure on the university to be proactive and predictable in these considerations. When recruiting researchers from the international labour market, for example, job search assistance for partners and dual career services become important (Tzanakou, 2017).

The tenure track system necessitates certain performance levels and standards, not just from the researchers hired for the positions but also from university organisations (Pietilä, 2018). These include the formalisation of internal communication and procedures (see Maassen et al., 2017). Furthermore, the establishment of internal career paths is inevitably linked to traditional challenges in higher education governance. Universities have to make internal decisions regarding the degree of centralisation or decentralisation in decision-making processes related to recruitment and promotion (see Pietilä, 2015).

The Academic Profession in Tenure Track Systems

What are the implications of standardisation and control for academic freedom and diversity?

As academics have traditionally conducted their work within university settings (Musselin, 2013), it is important to examine how organisational frameworks and structures influence academic work and careers as well as the academic profession as a whole. The specificity of the academic profession is that academics traditionally have a high degree of autonomy over their work (Teichler, 2010). However, it is important to acknowledge that the academic profession is not a unified group. There exist numerous subgroups within the profession, each with varying levels of autonomy. These differences can be attributed to factors such as seniority, title and position, gender, and ethnicity. In addition, scientific outputs of academics are mostly reviewed by peers rather than employers; this strong disciplinary link with peers is unique compared with other professions (Musselin, 2013).

However, new HRM systems at universities have made managers more powerful in assessing and controlling academic work (Waring, 2017). Slaughter and Leslie's (1997) characterisation of academics as state-subsidised entrepreneurs in the context of the framework of academic capitalism in the US reflects the evolving nature of the academic profession (also Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Entrepreneurialism in this context is linked to the increasing responsibility

of academics to secure their own funding, deviating from the ideal notion of enjoying freedom akin to that of an entrepreneur. Building on the observation that universities have changed and developed as organisations, the position of academics has also changed in relation to their employers.

Drawing on the sociology of professions (for example Pekkola et al., 2018), Evetts' (2009, 2011) theorisation on the changed professionalism from *occupational* towards *organisational* influenced by NPM illustrates the current situation in the academic profession. As Evetts (2011) described, there are both changes and continuities in professionalism. Changes (related to organisational professionalism, influenced by NPM) include increasing organisational control and management, work standardisation and competition, audits and measurement and the introduction of targets and performance indicators. The continuities (related to occupational professionalism, which exemplifies the strong professional values and practices that resist the influence of NPM) include factors such as legitimacy from within the profession; discretion in handling complex cases, respect and trust; identity and work culture; and collegial relations.

As Siekkinen et al. (2019) have noted, however, drawing on Evetts (2011), 'changes' are not always regarded as 'good' and 'continuities' as 'bad'. Traditionally, the academic profession has been an elite group with limited diversity, where career progression has been strongly influenced by the individual's networks within the unit, a phenomenon known as inbreeding. While inbreeding is not entirely detrimental, as it can support organisational stability, it can impede organisational development (Horta & Yudkevich, 2015). European universities are promoting the development of more transparent recruitment systems with more secure career paths, which is a way to make university careers more modern and attractive (see LERU, 2014).

The principles of meritocratic recruitment are based on the assessment of candidates' verified performance. In an ideal meritocratic system, factors such as candidates' background (gender, age, socio-economic/ethnic background, sexual orientation and so on) would have no impact on the outcome (Castilla & Bernard, 2010) of, for example, recruitment processes. The recruitment decision would be based solely on a comparative assessment of the merits outlined in candidates' résumés and other documents. A standardised career model and performance assessment has the potential to establish a fairer meritocratic career system that acts as a counterweight to institutional politics and cliques.

There is also a risk, however, that a standardised career model fosters 'one size fits all' structures that fail to acknowledge the diversity of academic work and the diverse career paths of academics. Performance appraisals, for example, may emphasise outputs and activities that are easily quantifiable, potentially steering academic work in a uniform direction (Kallio et al., 2015; Siekkinen et al., 2019). Viewing academic work as a system also necessitates

the recognition of diverse institutions and disciplinary differences when evaluating academic outputs, prompting critical questions such as what types of scholarships are valued (Finkelstein & Li, 2022, p. 212). It has even been suggested that performance management is ill-suited for environments characterised by variability and complexity (Boxall & Macky, 2009; Waring, 2017).

Aimed at clarifying career structures and assessments at universities, standardisation may end up impeding diversity if universities fail to maintain a balance between different tasks and overemphasise narrowly defined, verifiable outcomes. In general, excessive competition hinders diversity because it forces individuals to concentrate too much on certain activities while neglecting others (Naidoo, 2016).

Tenure Track Models – Two Perspectives

Contrary to common assumptions, the tenure track model is not a uniform, standardised system. Rather, it has somewhat different applications even in the US, where the model originated (Chapter 13; Trower, 2002). The recent trend of developing tenure track models in Europe has further increased the number of different versions and applications. In continental countries, the introduction of tenure tracks has become a ‘fad’ linked to general changes in HRM, particularly strategic human resource planning at universities. In many national systems, it has been seen as a means to help institutions develop more dynamic human resource policies.

According to Pekkola et al. (2019), there are several reasons for establishing a tenure track model at a university. These include:

- Safeguarding academic freedom
- Increasing the efficiency and productivity of academic work
- Increasing the fairness, predictability and transparency of academic careers, recruitment and selections
- Increasing the attractiveness of having an academic career within the organisation
- Increasing the internationality of academic careers
- Profiling academic work as part of organisational profiling
- Setting new targets and quality standards for academic work
- Supporting professional development
- Decreasing the organisational risks of recruitment
- Reaching other policy goals, such as gender balance.

These overarching themes highlight a dichotomy in the evaluation of academic progress and career development within academia, delineated through two main approaches:

- Standardised career model – measurement of quantifiable scientific performance
- Tailored career model – assessment of novel excellence in academic work.

The first model aligns with the ‘new 1990s ethos’, which involves quantifying and measuring academic work in line with the NPM logic. This contrasts with the ‘old ethos’, which involved hardly any individual-level measurements. The second model can be considered a counterforce to the contemporary methods of measuring academic work and performance. It aims at recognising, at least to some extent, the ‘unknown’ elements of novelty and excellence in academic work (Bedford et al., 2023; Kallio et al., 2015).

Table 1.1 provides a non-normative, binary and simplified operationalisation of the objectives of tenure tracks within the context of two different ways of defining good evaluation. In addition, the table describes a heuristic way of thinking about the tenure track. It should be emphasised that, in practice, these aspects are not exclusive and often coexist. The following paragraphs elaborate on those aspects, aligning them with the previous discussion on academic work and careers.

The first approach, the ‘standardised career model’, focuses on quantitative assessment that should in an ideal case be free from contextual, political, and social influences. The second approach, the ‘tailored career model’, emphasises the significance of contextual specificity, striving to acknowledge excellence and novelty in research beyond mere numerical metrics.

The first objective of tenure tracks has been to safeguard academic freedom. This has particularly been the case in the US, where tenure track systems were first established (AAUP, 1940). The first career model endeavours to attain academic freedom by placing emphasis on neutral (or perceived as neutral) bibliometric performance measurements. Such an approach aims to mitigate the risk of schools, clubs and cliques favouring and promoting candidates based on subjective preferences. It can be argued, however, that the emphasis on quantitative indicators may restrict academic freedom and disciplinary discretion and that qualitative assessment would ensure the objective result of the assessment. This approach, often focused on ‘normal’ or ‘paradigmatic’ scholarship, can discourage academic novelty, methodological uniqueness and

Table 1.1 Binary heuristics of academic evaluation in tenure track careers

Aims of the tenure track system	Main means of measuring tenure track performance	
	Standardised career model – quantifiable scientific performance	Tailored career model – novel excellence in academic work
Safeguarding academic freedom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative measurement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative measurement
Increasing the efficiency and productivity of academic work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hierarchical assessment procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reciprocal process in setting performance targets
Increasing fairness, predictability and transparency in academic work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equal treatment Periodic standardised assessment Standardised managerial HRM practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equal treatment Individually tailored assessment Collegial and democratic decision making
Increasing the attractiveness of an academic career	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and rewarding career and assessment framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possibility for creative and unique career
Increasing the internationality of academic careers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unified career structures and services for all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting internationalisation by offering targeted services for international staff
Profiling academic work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting the standards for publications and publication forums, linking HRM to organisational strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting new initiatives Flexible and inclusive research profiles
Setting new targets and quality standards for academic work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation Reliance on bibliometrics and standardised assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellence initiatives Commitment to global initiatives and principles, such as the DORA Declaration (2013) and the CoARA Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment (2022)
Supporting professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring that performance measurement is internationally applicable, with well-defined criteria for career progression 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting individual and unique work tasks and careers

Aims of the tenure track system	Main means of measuring tenure track performance	
	Standardised career model – quantifiable scientific performance	Tailored career model – novel excellence in academic work
Decreasing the organisational risks of recruitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasising so called objective performance assessment (meritocracy) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combining quantitative and qualitative assessment
Equity on academic careers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on meritocratic ideals in assessment, positive discrimination with pre-set standards, training of managers and recruiters in diversity management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combining quantitative and qualitative assessment, emphasising different profiles in academic work, applying positive discrimination, training university staff on diversity

different types of academic output by prioritising standardised publication outlets and forums.

The second objective of tenure tracks is to enhance the efficiency and productivity of academic work. Typically, the introduction of periodic evaluations and well-defined goals is aimed at improving efficiency and productivity. In the first career model, performance appraisals follow highly standardised and hierarchical procedures, emphasising quantifiable outputs and employing standardised rewards. In the second career model, evaluations take a more flexible approach, involving communication about individual career goals with a holistic perspective on academic work.

The third objective of tenure tracks is to enhance the transparency, predictability and fairness of academic careers. In the first career model, this objective is pursued through a high degree of (pre-determined) standardisation in appraisals, formal management practices and transparent administrative processes. Conversely, in the second career model, predictability and fairness are sought by considering individual differences, tailoring personal development plans and performance targets and evaluating performance, while taking into account the individual's work situation, future vision and life circumstances.

The fourth objective of tenure tracks relates to increasing the attractiveness of an academic career. Attractiveness can be facilitated by having clear, transparent, standardised, predetermined and rewarding steps towards tenure. Alternatively, it can be facilitated by providing the opportunity to customise one's career path, putting an emphasis on possibilities to combine academic work and personal life.

The fifth objective of tenure tracks is to increase the internationality of academic work and the workforce. This can be expedited by providing unified

career structures and services for all. Alternatively, there may be an emphasis on fostering internationalisation by providing individualised services and packages for talented international people and their families.

The sixth objective of tenure tracks relates to profiling academic work. On one hand, this involves establishing standards for publications and preferred publication forums, tightly linking academic work with organisational strategies. On the other hand, it may entail avoiding preset standards and steering of research topics and instead supporting new initiatives and fostering flexible, inclusive research profiles.

The seventh objective of tenure tracks is to allow universities to reform their standards and procedures for evaluating academic work, along with their criteria for recruitment and selection. There are two possible approaches. Universities could assess publications based on the publication outlets, for example by following national or international journal rankings. Additionally, universities can adhere to the principles set in global declarations on responsible research assessment, such as the DORA Declaration, which emphasises the need to make assessments based on scientific content rather than publication metrics. Adhering to such principles is a step towards a more context-specific evaluation of academic merit. At the institutional level, tenure track systems may be linked to formal accreditation processes for academic programmes or to excellence initiatives with a thematic approach, emphasising the novelty of research.

The eighth objective of tenure tracks is to support staff development, which can be approached from two perspectives. On one hand, staff development can be linked to performance appraisal and support in securing funding, publishing in desired formats and meeting quantitative targets. On the other hand, the tenure track system can be linked to individual career planning. In this case, the university may provide opportunities to develop a career with a distinct profile by emphasising research, teaching or other activities.

As tenure track contracts typically include probationary period(s), they are often a way of reducing recruitment risk for universities at the cost of a secure career path for academics. The tenure track aims to provide a clear path to a permanent position, but also allows the employer to evaluate the candidate's performance and academic development. The tenure track can involve several options, ranging from the termination of a contract to a change of career path, away from the 'professorial' path to, for example, a more teaching-oriented path.

In terms of ensuring equity in academic careers, the tenure track may emphasise equity in meeting criteria (meritocracy with an emphasis on quantified outputs of academic work) and provide training for managers on diversity management; or, it may emphasise the combination of quantitative and qualitative dimensions of assessment to provide a more comprehensive picture, and

emphasise different profiles in academic work, as well as providing training to university staff on diversity issues. In each case, positive discrimination would be applied.

In this volume, our focus is on the implementation of tenure track models in Europe and how they shape the professoriate and the understanding of academic work and careers. We approach tenure track systems from individual, professional, managerial and organisational perspectives. We are also interested in the implications of introducing tenure track systems for academic work in general and for equality and diversity in the academic workforce.

Structure and Content of the Book

In the individual chapters of the book, the authors analyse the implications of establishing tenure tracks in relation to more ‘traditional careers’ and career structures in academia. In European countries, academic careers are outcomes of the historical development of respective higher education systems, administrative traditions and legal traditions of the civil service (Arnhold et al., 2022; Kivistö et al., 2019). We are interested in how the tenure track is developed in relation to these traditions and how its implementation impacts the management of academics and eventually the profiles, identities and demographics of the professoriate. As there are pushes towards both convergence and divergence (Capano & Jarvis, 2020), it is an empirical question how similar or different the tenure track career models and the performance criteria attached to them turn out to be in different higher education systems.

In the next chapter, Pekkola et al. provide an overview of the drivers changing the landscape of academic work and careers. In addition, they describe the interconnections between individual, organisational and national conceptions of academic careers.

The country-specific chapters describe the national tenure track schemes and their main characteristics. In addition, all the chapters pay additional attention to one specific aspect of tenure track. In the first country chapter (Chapter 3), on Austrian tenure tracks, Pausits and Geppert explore the changing academic profession and career trajectories by comparing the views of tenured and tenure track professors. They pay special attention to the connection between career structures and job satisfaction.

In Chapter 4 on Estonian tenure tracks, Kindsiko and Niinemets present an interesting European tenure track anomaly that is based on permanent positions. The Estonian tenure track challenges the basic premise of the tenure track system, typically characterised by probationary periods, emphasising the context-specific application of the tenure track vocabulary.

Chapter 5, about Finnish tenure tracks, by Siekkinen et al. explores the shift from the traditional, closed, vacancy-based recruitment system towards

a tenure-track-based system and the implications that change has had for the diversity of professors in the context of Finnish universities.

In Chapter 6, Musselin discusses the newly implemented possibility to open tenure track positions in France and the tensions it has created, highlighting the role of the tenure track as a national steering instrument that is at least partly contradictory to the support of universities' institutional autonomy.

In Chapter 7 on Germany, Schwabe et al. provide an interesting study of the traditional German academic career that has impacted many European systems and its relations to the new tenure track system.

In Chapter 8 on Italy, Anzivino and Vaira provide an analysis of the implications of the tenure track for the demographics and socio-economic positioning of academics. The chapter also provides another interesting anomaly: in Italy, unlike the conventional expectation, the tenure track does not automatically lead to full professorship. Based on the Italian and Estonian cases, it can be concluded that in Europe, the tenure track career path does not consistently include a probation period and may not necessarily lead to full professorship.

Chapter 9 on Ireland, by O'Connor and Drew, looks specifically at the gender dimension of the tenure track. The tenure track is described as a system between the Anglo-American and continental traditions. Together with Chapter 5 on Finland, this chapter contributes to a discussion of diversity within tenure tracks, particularly from the perspectives of gender and nationality.

The chapters on Norway (Chapter 10) by Korseberg and Hovdhaugen, Portugal (Chapter 11) by Carvalho et al. and Spain (Chapter 12) by Ortega-Colomer et al. highlight three additional aspects for the analysis of tenure tracks. These are the relations to academic disciplines, the implementation of tenure tracks in binary systems and the third, societal service mission of universities. In their chapter on Norway, Korseberg and Hovdhaugen discuss the disciplinary differences in tenure tracks and describe the mismatch in the needs of higher education institutions or academics and the current use of the tenure track system and its goals. The chapter on Portugal by Carvalho et al. describes the application of tenure in Portuguese legislation. It also explores the possible differences between tenured and non-tenured academics regarding their perceptions of professional and career conditions. In their chapter on Spanish tenure tracks, Ortega-Colomer et al. discuss the third mission of universities. In addition, the chapter provides a comparison of the tenure track system and the traditional south-European career model that is based on national accreditation of qualifications.

The third part of the book starts with reflections from Gary Rhoades, who examines the European country cases in comparison with the system in the US (Chapter 13). Rhoades also provides a historical account of the development of the study of academic careers. The book concludes with a chapter by Pekkola et al., in which the authors discuss the different dimensions of European tenure

tracks, exploring possibilities and challenges based on the insights from the country-specific cases. This chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the European tenure track models.

REFERENCES

- Aarnikoivu, M., Nokkala, T., Siekkinen, T., Kuoppala, K. & Pekkola, E. (2019). Working outside academia? Perceptions of early-career, fixed-term researchers of changing careers. *European Journal of Higher Education*, **9** (2), 172–89. doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2018.1548941.
- AAUP (1940). 1940 statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure. The American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges. aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure.
- Afonso, A. (2016). Varieties of academic labor markets in Europe. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, **49** (4), 816–21.
- Arnhold, N., Pekkola, E., Vitus, P. & Sursock A. (2022). Academic careers in Latvia: Reforms in a European context, in C.S. Sarrico, M.J. Rosa & T. Carvalho (eds), *Research Handbook on Academic Careers and Managing Academics*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 268–82.
- Bedford, D.S., Granlund, M. & Lukka, K. (2023). Safeguarding the unknown: Performance measurement, academic agency and the meaning of research quality in practice. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, **36** (9), 281–308.
- Beerkens, M. & van der Hoek, M. (2022). Academic leaders and leadership in the changing higher education landscape, in: C.S. Sarrico, M. Rosa and T. Carvalho (eds), *Research Handbook on Academic Careers and Managing Academics*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 121–36.
- Bleiklie, I. (2018). New public management or neoliberalism, higher education, in P. Teixeira & J.C. Shin (eds), *Encyclopedia of International Higher Education Systems and Institutions*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 1–6. doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9553-1_143-1.
- Bleiklie, I., Enders, J. & Lepori, B. (2017). Setting the stage – Theory and research questions, in I. Bleiklie, J. Enders & B. Lepori (eds), *Managing Universities: Policy and organisational change from a Western comparative perspective*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 3–30.
- Boxall, P. & Macky, K. (2009). Research and theory on high-performance work systems: Progressing the high-involvement stream. *Human Resource Management Journal*, **19** (1), 3–23. doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2008.00082.x.
- Boxall, P. & Purcell, J. (2008). *Strategy and Human Resource Management*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brunsson, N. & Sahlin-Andersson, K. (2000). Constructing organizations: The example of public sector reform. *Organization Studies*, **21** (4), 721–46.
- Capano, G. & Jarvis, D.S.L. (2020). *Convergence and Diversity in the Governance of Higher Education: Comparative Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 43–67.
- Castilla, E.J. & Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **55**, 543–76.

- Deem, R. (1998). 'New managerialism' and higher education: The management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, **8** (1), 47–70. doi: 10.1080/0962021980020014.
- Deem, R. & Brehony, K.J. (2005). Management as ideology: The case of 'new managerialism' in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, **31** (2), 217–35.
- Evetts, J. (2009). New professionalism and new public management: Changes, continuities and consequences. *Comparative Sociology*, **8**, 247–66.
- Evetts, J. (2011). A new professionalism? Challenges and opportunities. *Current Sociology*, **59** (4), 406–22.
- Ferlie, E., Musselin, C. & Andresani, G. (2008). The steering of higher education systems: A public management perspective. *Higher Education*, **56**, 325–48. doi: 10.1007/s10734-008-9125-5.
- Finkelstein, M. & Li, Q. (2022). Optimizing the productivity and performance of academic staff: Principles based on the US experience, in C.S. Sarrico, M.J. Rosa & T. Carvalho (eds), *Research Handbook on Academic Careers and Managing Academics*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 121–36.
- Geschwind, L., Kekäle, J., Pinheiro, R. & Sørensen, M.P. (2020). Responsible universities in context, in M.P. Sørensen, L. Geschwind, J. Kekäle & R. Pinheiro (eds), *The Responsible University: Exploring the Nordic context and beyond*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/22855/1/1007306.pdf.
- Goulden, M., Mason, M.A. & Frasch, K. (2011). Keeping women in the science pipeline. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, **638** (1), 141–62. doi.org/10.1177/0002716211416925.
- Horta, H. & Yudkevich, M. (2015). The role of academic inbreeding in developing higher education systems: Challenges and possible solutions. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **113**, Part B, 363–72. doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.06.039.
- Jackson J. & O'Callaghan, E. (2009). What do we know about glass ceiling effects? A taxonomy and critical review to inform higher education research. *Research in Higher Education*, **50** (5), 460–82. doi:10.1007/s11162-009-9128-9.
- Jayasuriya, K., McCarthy, G. & Song, X. (2020). The regulatory state and the labour process, in G. Capano and D.S.L. Jarvis (eds), *Convergence and Diversity in the Governance of Higher Education: Comparative Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 43–67.
- Kallio, K-M., Kallio, T.J., Tienari, J. & Hyvönen, T. (2015). Ethos at stake: Performance management and academic work in universities. *Human Relations*, **69** (3), 685–709. doi.org/10.1177/0018726715596802.
- Kallio, T., Siekkinen, T., Pekkola, E., Kivistö, J., Nokkala, T. & Kuoppakangas, P. (2024). Push and pull factors in leaving academia. *Tertiary Education and Management*, **30**, 65–80.
- Kivistö, J., Pekkola, E. & Pausits, A. (2019). Academic careers and promotions in Finland and Austria: System and institutional perspectives, in M. Mahat & J. Tatebe (eds), *Achieving Academic Promotion*. Leeds: Emerald, pp. 105–25.
- Klikauer, T. (2015). What is managerialism? *Critical Sociology*, **41** (7–8), 1103–19. doi:10.1177/0896920513501351.
- Koryakina, T., Sarrico, C.S. & Teixeira, P.N. (2015). Third mission activities: University managers' perceptions on existing barriers. *European Journal of Higher Education*, **5** (3), 316–30. doi: 10.1080/21568235.2015.1044544.

- Krücken, G. & Meier, U. (2006). Turning the university into an organizational actor, in G.S. Drori, J.W. Meyer & W. Hwang (eds), *Globalization and organization: World society and organizational change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 241–57.
- LERU (2014). *Tenure and tenure track at LERU universities: Models for attractive research careers in Europe*. League of European Research Universities. Advice paper no. 17. www.leru.org/files/Tenure-and-Tenure-Track-at-LERU-Universities-Full-paper.pdf.
- Lund, R. (2012). Publishing to become an ‘ideal academic’: An institutional ethnography and a feminist critique. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **28**, 218–28.
- Maassen, P., Gornitzka, A. & Fumasoli, T. (2017). University reform and institutional autonomy: A framework for analysing the living autonomy. *Higher Education Quarterly*, **71** (3), 239–50.
- Musselin, C. (2013). Redefinition of the relationships between the academics and their universities. *Higher Education*, **65**, pp. 25–37. doi: 10.1007/s10734-012-9579-3.
- Naidoo, R. (2016). The competition fetish in higher education: Varieties, animators and consequences. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, **37** (1), 1–10. doi: 10.1080/01425692.2015.1116209.
- Neave, G. & van Vught, F.A. (eds) (1994). *Government and Higher Education Relationships across Three Continents: The winds of change*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- OECD (2021). *Reducing the precarity of academic research careers*. OECD science, technology and industry. Policy papers. May, no. 113.
- Orupabo, J. & Mangset, M. (2022). Promoting diversity but striving for excellence: Opening the ‘black box’ of academic hiring. *Sociology*, **56** (2), 316–32. doi.org/10.1177/00380385211028064.
- Pekkola, E., Siekkinen, T., Kivistö, J. & Lyytinen, A. (2018). Management and academic profession: Comparing the Finnish professors with and without management positions. *Studies in Higher Education*, **43** (11), 1949–63, doi: 10.1080/03075079.2017.1294578.
- Pekkola, E., Siekkinen, T. & Kivistö, J. (2019). *Tenure track: Uramallin kuvaus, etenemisen kriteerit ja yliopistokohtaisia sovellutuksia*. Tampereen yliopisto. *Julkaisematon kriteerit ja yliopistokohtaisia sovellutuksia*. Tampereen yliopisto. *Julkaisematon kriteerit ja yliopistokohtaisia sovellutuksia*. University of Tampere. Unpublished report for the Finnish Union of University Professors.
- Pekkola, E., Siekkinen, T., Kujala, E.-N. & Kannianen, J.-P. (2020). *Professoreiden rekrytoinnit* [The recruitment of professors]. Final project report. University of Tampere.
- Pekkola, E., Siekkinen, T., Kujala, E. & Salmela, H. (2022). Managing seniority in academia, in C.S. Sarrico, M.J. Rosa & T. Carvalho (eds), *Research Handbook on Academic Careers and Managing Academics*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 375–89.
- Pietilä, M. (2015). Tenure track career system as a strategic instrument for academic leaders. *European Journal of Higher Education*, **5** (4), 371–87.
- Pietilä, M. (2018). *Making Finnish universities complete organisations: Aims and tensions in establishing tenure track and research profiles*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Helsinki.
- Pietilä, M. (2019). Incentivising academics: Experiences and expectations of the tenure track in Finland. *Studies in Higher Education*, **44** (6), 932–45.
- Pietilä, M. & Pinheiro, R. (2021). Reaching for different ends through tenure track–institutional logics in university career systems. *Higher Education*, **81**, 1197–1213.

- Pietilä, M., Drange, I., Silander, C. & Vabø, A. (2021). Gender and globalization of academic labor markets: Research and teaching staff at Nordic universities. *Social Inclusion*, **9** (3), 69–80.
- Reymert, I. (2022). Handling multiple institutional logics in professorial recruitment. *Higher Education Policy*. doi.org/10.1057/s41307-022-00294-w.
- Sarrico, C.S., Rosa, M.J. & Carvalho, T. (eds) (2022). *Research Handbook on Academic Careers and Managing Academics*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Seeber, M., Lepori, L., Montauti, M., Enders, J., de Boer, H. et al. (2015). European universities as complete organizations? Understanding identity, hierarchy and rationality in public organizations. *Public Management Review*, **17** (10), 1444–74.
- Siekkinen, T., Pekkola, E. & Kivistö, J. (2016) Recruitments in Finnish universities: Practicing strategic or pathetic HRM? *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, **2016** (2). doi: dx.doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v2.32316.
- Siekkinen, T., Kuoppala, K., Pekkola, E. & Välimaa, J. (2017). Reciprocal commitment in academic careers? Finnish implications and international trends. *European Journal of Higher Education*, **7** (2), 120–135. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2016.1248990.
- Siekkinen, T., Pekkola, E. & Carvalho, T. (2019). Change and continuity in the academic profession: Finnish universities as living labs. *Higher Education*, **79** (3): 533–51.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy. Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Teichler, U. (2010). The diversifying academic profession? *European Review*, **18** (1), 157–79. doi:10.1017/S1062798709990378.
- Teixeira, P.N. (2017). A bastion of elitism or an emerging knowledge proletariat? Some reflections about academic careers with an economic slant, in M. Machado-Taylor, V. Soares & U. Teichler (eds), *Challenges and Options: The academic profession in Europe*. Cham: Springer. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-45844-1_3.
- Teixeira, P. (2022) Academic labour markets in changing higher education systems: A political economy approach, in C.S. Sarrico, M.J. Rosa & T. Carvalho (eds), *Research Handbook on Academic Careers and Managing Academics*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 18–35.
- Trow, M. (1994). Managerialism and the academic profession: The case of England. *Higher Education Policy*, **7** (2).
- Trower, C.A. (2002). What is current policy?, in R.P. Chait (ed.), *The Questions of Tenure*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 32–68.
- Tzanakou, C. (2017). Dual career couples in academia, international mobility and dual career services in Europe. *European Educational Research Journal*, **16** (2–3), 298–312.
- Van Maanen, J. (1977). Introduction: The promise of career studies, in J. Van Maanen (ed.), *Organisational Careers: Some new perspectives*, London and New York: Wiley, pp. 1–12.
- Vellamo, T., Kosonen, J., Siekkinen, T. & Pekkola, E. (2022). Human potential undefined? Bureaucratic, professional, and organizational power in university recruitment, in E. Forsberg, L. Geschwind, S. Levander & W. Wermke (eds), *Peer Review in an Era of Evaluation: Understanding the practice of gatekeeping in academia*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Waring, M. (2017). Management and leadership in UK universities: Exploring the possibilities of change. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, **39** (5), 540–58, doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2017.1354754.
- Yadav, S. & Lenka, U. (2020) Workforce diversity: From a literature review to future research agenda. *Journal of Indian Business Research*, **12** (4), 57–603.