

Shaping the ‘new’ Academic Profession Tensions and Contradiction in the Professionalisation of Academics.

**Teresa Carvalho,
CIPES and University of Aveiro.**

Introduction

Over the past thirty five years deep changes have occurred in Portuguese higher education. The Democratic Revolution of 1974 opened the way for both institutions and students to increase. The path to mass higher education beckoned. At the same time, other challenges emerged. System diversification, in institutional types and variety, actors and even in curricular assumptions – had now to respond to societal and market expectations. Changes in system steering brought major revision to the traditional role of the State, moving it from a Weberian remit of direct control towards a ‘panopticon’ function of remote steering. An alternative account used slightly different terms, moving from rational planning and state control to a model of state supervision (Neave and van Vught, 1994; van Vught, 1997).

These changes are not unique to Portugal. They are visible in many Western countries. For Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley (2009) they amounted to an ‘academic revolution’, the impact of which ranged from the policy level down to the institutional level and on into the everyday lives of higher education institutions, administrators, academics and students.

Many different perspectives have been brought to bear in exploring these major developments. In Portugal, analysis tends to concentrate on the system level with particular weight on governance, governing and management as key points of inquiry. (Magalhães, 2004; Amaral and Magalhães, 2007; Amaral, Magalhães and Santiago, 2003; Magalhães and Amaral, 2007; Santiago, Magalhães and Carvalho, 2005; Santiago and Carvalho, 2004; Santiago, Carvalho, Amaral and Meek, 2006) Less attention has been devoted to internal dynamics and actors. And very little indeed to academics.

Whilst this lacuna has been addressed recently, (Carvalho and Santiago, 2010; Carvalho and Santiago, 2008; Santiago and Carvalho, 2008) tracing the development of the academic profession over the years since the Democratic Revolution of 1974 is a road still largely un-trodden.

This Chapter sets out to rectify the apparent oversight. It begins by reviewing the concept of “a profession”. It asks whether use of this term is appropriate for academia. Second, it examines the literature of the sociology of professions as a possible framework to interpret the changes, historical and sociological, that affected teachers in Portuguese higher education over the past few years. Three major processes of change are identified: segmentation, feminisation and commodification. The

prospects this group of academic actors now face, are scrutinized as are the potential consequences for the standing of this particular group inside academia and in society.

Academics as a Professional Group

Any inquiry into the “academic profession” must begin by reflecting on the general concept of what it is to be a “profession”. This conundrum has occupied sociologists for a long time. The first answers to this question emerged during the first half of the twentieth century and rested on frameworks that derived from functionalist and interactionist theory. The functionalist perspective (Parsons, 1958, 1972) sought to identify and classify the attributes of an ideal type of profession by isolating professions from other occupational groupings. Symbolic interactionism (Hughes, 1958, 1963) focused on how professions constructed their status and privileges through day-to-day negotiation.

During the Seventies, at a time of economic crisis, further critical perspectives developed. Amongst the then contemporary literature, Johnson (1972), Larson (1977) and Freidson (1977, 1978) introduced the dimension of power into the analysis. Johnson (1972) concentrated on power relations between professionals and clients. Differences between the two parties, he argued, are legitimated by the specialized knowledge professionals possess. Larson (1977) interpreted professions as relying on historical processes. Larson proposed that professionals obtain a legal monopoly over certain activities by constructing specific professional markets. To these markets state protection is added through legal recognition of the professional group, a step that allows it to gain material and symbolic privileges. The monopoly a profession exercised over the market was consolidated by its monopoly over knowledge and over professional qualifications obtained through higher education. Professional monopoly over a specific market and its cultural closure gave rise to ‘social closure’. This latter notion, taken up by Parkin (1979) and Murphy (1988), interpreted professionalization as a closure strategy based on credentialism. To Freidson (1978, 1986) a profession was associated with the organization of the labour market. Professionals legitimated their power through three different elements: technical autonomy, based on control over the way work is done (the professional as expert), monopoly over a specialized and institutionalized area of knowledge and, finally, credentialism which represented a form of gate-keeping. By contrast to Johnson and Larson, Freidson defined the notion of professionals and professionalism positively. In a recent study, Freidson (2001) represented professionalism as a third form of logic in society over against the market or the bureaucracy. Professionalism’s positive consequences for society derived from its counter-balancing both administrative and bureaucratic power. The professional, based on specialized knowledge, was thus the only protection possible for the organization of work and to protect the particular interests of clients. (Evetts, 2003).

At that time, debate over the importance of professionals and of professions in society unfolded along two different lines. Some analysts of post-industrialism argued that the ability professions marshalled would increase their social and political power. (Bell, 1976) The contending thesis was that of proletarianisation (Oppenheimer, 1973; Derber, 1983) and de-professionalisation. (Hall, 1975) in short, the shrinking importance of professionals, their power, status and autonomy in society.

These analyses of professions as privileged groups with ethical values and norms, ideologies and formal knowledge supporting their control over the organization of their work - and professionalism, which is a specific system of values and norms - were conducted at a time when capitalism developed under strong economic and financial constraints.

During the Eighties, Abbott (1988) introduced a more systemic and complex perspective. Relying on the concept of a '*system* of professions', he argued that different professions contended for a specific jurisdictional field. In this struggle, knowledge was the first and most important resource which professions used against each other. However, Abbott (1988) also pointed out that professions were not homogeneous. Internally, they split into distinct groups, each with different working situations. Changes to which professions are prone were created by both external and internal forces. Such forces dissolved the profession's hold over the jurisdictional field it previously controlled.

These studies, however, were set in Anglo-Saxon practice. Important differences exist between the concept of a "profession" in USA and United Kingdom and in other states. In Continental Europe, the term profession is applied broadly, though hiding many meanings. Taking the French case as illustration, Dubar and Tripier (1998) identified four dimensions behind the concept: profession as a statement (professional identity), profession as a '*métier*' (vocational specialisation), profession as employment (professional classification), and profession as a role (professional position inside the institution). More recently, Dubar proposed replacing the term "profession" by "professional group", and defined it as:

"(...) a fluid set, segmented, in a permanent evolution, reassembling people who share one activity with the same name with social visibility and enough political legitimacy during a significant time period". (2003: 51)

Against this backdrop, the Academic Profession is a most interesting group to examine. Rapid reflection on the "academic profession" in Portugal reveals that it never faced the need to contend with other professional groups in the same jurisdictional space. Since its origins with the medieval schoolmen, the "academic profession" always enjoyed a privileged status in the 'system of professions'. (Abbott, 1988). More than with other professional groups, power relations with the State seem to be the main pillar, upholding its material and symbolic power in society. Thus, the relationship between the academic "professional group" and the State is specific and unique. Under different political regimes and forms of States, academics - at least in the Western countries - have always benefited from strong state protection. This protection applied not only vis à vis the market and religious power but even applied to political, economic and bureaucratic interference. (Bourdieu, 1996). It is the specificity of this relationship that had Neave and Rhoades (1987) argue that:

“In mainland Western Europe, academia is not a profession. It is an estate, whose power, privileges, and conditions of employment are protected by constitutional and administrative law¹”. (p. 213).

State protection is particularly relevant under the welfare state, especially in view of the alliance professionalism forged with state bureaucracy. (Larson, 1977; Freidson, 2001). Yet, academics exercise monopoly not only over their own knowledge but also over the production and dissemination of other groups’ professional knowledge. They exert an important role through the so-called monopoly over credentialism. (Slaughter and Lesley, 1997; Perkin, 1987, 1990).

Whilst recognizing these specificities, it is appropriate to bring in other, more contemporary, theoretical developments from Europe. (Evetts, 2002, 2003; Wrede, 2008; Kuhlman, 2006). Recent studies on professionalism have returned to the ideas of the Italian political theorist, Antoni Gramsci (2000) and those of the French social philosopher, Michel Foucault. (1991a; 1991b; 2006; 2004). Gramsci’s theory argued that the struggle different groups engage in society does not involve economic distribution but, rather, a quest for “consent” or “cultural hegemony”. Hegemony entails acquiring more influence, leadership and consent than domination. It relates to how a given social group, by negotiation and compromise, influences other groups with the view of obtaining consent to its leadership in society. (Gramsci, 2000). Of these groups, the most effective is the one best able to spread its ideas among others, even if the latter do not share its economic interests. For Gramsci, civil society was the terrain where groups both build up, but also contest, those hegemonic, normative identities that subordinate them. (Gramsci, 2000). Hegemony was based not on mechanical so much as on organic, relationships. Individuals form part of social organisms, from the more simple to the more complex. Hence, their interactions are always organic. (Gramsci, 2000; Jones, 2006). Each social group can create, inside itself, in an organic way, one or more intellectual *strata* - organic intellectuals - who ensure homogeneity and an awareness of their own function both in the economic, but also in the political, field. (Gramsci, 2000; Jones, 2006).

The links Gramsci (2000) established between ‘organic intellectuals’ and the transmutation of technical/‘specialised’ knowledge into political knowledge (Jones, 2006) opens the possibility of combining Gramscian concepts with Foucault’s theories. (Foucault, 1991; 2006; 2004). For Foucault, expertise had a crucial role in providing solutions to social problems, that is to say, control of the social order and morality. (Foucault, 1991a; 1991b; 2006; 2004). Academics are part of this “cohort of experts”. They are also key actors, providing other professional groups with knowledge and techniques, and thus the opportunity to build up skills and capacities to apply scientific and technical knowledge in the control and regulation of social life.

These conceptual approaches open important and additional perspectives for analyzing systematically the overall *problématique* in the process of the

¹ Even if we agree with this definition, in this chapter we abide by the notion of profession. It seems to us that “profession” is a more dynamic concept. It is more accommodating to the different steps and different strategies an occupational group takes to define or sustain its position in the professional field.

professionalisation of academics. Furthermore, account has also to be taken of Abbott's (1988) concept of the internal diversity within professional groups.

The academic profession in Portugal has always enjoyed strong support from the State and has been able up to now to cast themselves as 'organic intellectuals'. It is our view, however, that the ability to remain so is related, in the main, to the internal dynamics endemic to this professional group. The academic profession consists of many different groups (Becker and Trowler, 2001). Each entertains distinct ideas about academia, the State and Society, and are thus engaged in constructing different normative and professional identities.

In this Chapter, Gramsci's concepts serve not only to explore the struggle between different professional groups but, primarily, to analyze how struggles and contradictions developed inside a particular group, as well as how a hegemonic normative and professional identity was institutionalized which in turn upheld its status as "organic intellectuals". Likewise, Foucault's insights may be used to show how dominant ideas are transformed into day-to-day practice.

We start from the notion that an historical and sociological interpretation of the academic profession in Portugal can be developed by the way different groups inside it elaborate and impose their interpretative scheme and normative identity. Later, the Chapter will examine how this long-term process of internal segmentation unfolded within Portugal's academic profession.

The Long-term Process of Segmentation.

The Pre-Democratic Era.

As a professional group, academia has never been homogeneous. However, since the Revolution of 1974, a clear tendency developed to increase segmentation and internal diversification.

Under the Dictatorship, academia could be classified as an elite profession. Three main characteristics bear this descriptor out:

- i) *social prestige* - In a study of the Portuguese industrial elite dating from the Sixties, Makler (1968) concluded that academic professionals were amongst the most prestigious in the country²;
- ii) *small numbers* - selection for academic positions was so rigorous that only a small minority, shaped into a privileged elite, was permitted to acquire to this status.
- iii) *government involvement* - In his study of political elites during the 'Estado Novo' period, António Costa Pinto (2000) concluded that from 1933 to 1944, a considerable number of ministers - some 40% - had previously served as university professors. The place university professors in Ministerial appointments is one of Portugal's outstanding features when set against other

² With more standing than those exercising top management responsibilities in private firms.

dictatorships during this period, a situation which Gallagher (1981) qualified as '*catedratocracia*' - an autocracy of full professors.

During the Estado Novo, Academics formed a 'profession of the elite', wielding great influence over national policy. Such elitism, to a large degree, derived from an intellectual hegemony born out of a balance between power exerted by the coercive State and the consent of a large fraction of academics (Gramsci, 2000). It was directly linked to the expert knowledge academics possessed which allowed the state to exercise control over civil society and to make it operational (Foucault, 2004; 2006, 1991a; 1991b). Cultural hegemony, however, was not merely the consequence of coercive state power. It was also the outcome of authority conceded by the State to 'autonomous' professionals, through degree-granting and bureaucratization. Such authority was granted by the State, confident that expert academic knowledge could, in a Foucaultian perspective (Foucault, 2004; 2006), exercise a major role in social and ideological control.

However, within this privileged elite, a distinction should be drawn between what Gramsci (2000) termed "the consenting" and the "non consenting". The 'consenting elite', had the opportunity to support a specific normative identity for academics, together with the cultural hegemony of the 'Estado-Novo'. The 'non-consenting elite', by contrast, rested on a minority of academics who sought to hold out against this hegemony. Furthermore, the presence of a chair holder system marked out a primary fault line between junior and senior staff, which broadly marked the frontier between the 'consenting' and 'non-consenting'. In fact, junior staff were highly dependent on their senior colleagues.

Highly dependent on the good graces of full professors as they were, young academics could count on gaining a measure of academic or teaching autonomy only after their doctorate degree. This demanded several years for only at that point could young academics aspire to the mantle of academic or pedagogical autonomy to the extent it was available at that epoch. (Tavares, 1999).

In effect, institutions enjoyed autonomy only insofar as it was defined according to the tenets of 'corporatist logic' which had the rector as a government appointee and deemed to be the 'representative of the Ministry of Public Instruction in the university'. (*Estatuto da Instrução Universitária*, 2 of August of 1930, art. 8º). If the truth were out, even full professors possessed little autonomy. They were obliged to develop teaching and research within the ideological framework the Dictatorship set. Some scholarly fields were virtually inexistent - the social sciences, for instance. (Pinto, 2004) Academic work was subject to strict and direct control. A large number of academics were dismissed on suspicion of working against state ideology.³ Others were exiled or were forced to return to private life to survive. (Marques, 1981). Portugal's colonial wars also contributed to "academic flight" with substantial numbers of academics leaving for other countries, mainly to the United States but also to Europe. They came to play an important role in developing academic communities within the Portuguese Diaspora and were instrumental in fostering resistance abroad to the political regime at home.

³ Some of them were effectively engaged in political activities against the regime.

From a broad perspective, the Portuguese higher education system at that time was not greatly dissimilar to the profile Clark (1983) assigned to Italian higher education. University governance was grounded on a high degree of hierarchical and central control, both ideological and bureaucratic, a species of hybrid combining features of a pre-Weberian mandate with elements of the Weberian structure. The former involved Rectors and other major administrative actors being incorporated with their ‘consent’ into the ideological thralls of the ‘Estado Novo’. That latter took form around rationalising organisation, structures and processes of decision-making.

The Ministry of Public Instruction exercised a close and unremitting control over university life from the status of teaching staff, over salaries, curricula, courses, budgets and on to the validation of academic degrees, titles and qualifications. Such control was grounded in an oligarchy of full professors, arrayed around a ‘chair-holder’ system. Here, it is important to note that Antonio Salazar - then Portugal’s dictator – was himself an academic and as such well able defend both dictatorship and academic oligarchy. As Moscati (2002) pointed out for Italy, so for Portugal:

“(the system) operated according to the principles of a centralised administrative system (the French model) with academic power channelled through chair holders (the German model) in the pursuit of the traditional task of the reproduction of elites” (p.4).

Segmentation under a Democratic Regime

The Democratic Revolution of 1974 ushered in profound change to the architecture of academic power inside the university. The specific conditions of the state’s structure drove in favour of a particular form of academic professionalism. Thus, the way stood open for those groups, previously excluded from an academic career – junior staff without power and academics in exile – to present an agenda that was both counter-hegemonic and professional. The elite of the “non consenting”, acting as a counter-hegemonic group, saw the opportunity to back and to develop new normative identities. The shift in the nexus of power inside academia was all the more marked because an important number of academics had been purged from public universities thereby paying the price of their previous and close ties with the Ancien Régime. (Amaral and Teixeira, 2000).

The Democratic Revolution laid down a new basis for the State, rooted in the ideals of the Welfare State, a fundamental re-definition to the role of the state and to state professionalism. Education, and Higher Education most certainly, were held to form one of the fundamental pillars of democracy and to be essential to social equity.

In these circumstances, the professional group of academics was able to retain its status as ‘organic intellectuals’. This it could do by dint of changing its dominant normative identity, by presenting itself as the guarantor of democracy. As Kuhlmann (2006) noted, though in a very different setting, academics appeared to incorporate the image of the professional as a blueprint for the ‘ideal citizen’. Two developments were fundamental for consolidating the ‘new’ hegemonic process of the academic profession:

the internal organization of universities and polytechnics and the legal framework defining the profession.

The new organizational principles for higher education institutions introduced the freedoms to teach and to learn. Under the new Constitution of 1976, the law upheld the principles of university autonomy, though these became effective only in 1988. (Amaral and Carvalho, 2003). Earlier patterns of organization and their structures, grounded in a non-democratic model, made up of elements drawing upon collegiality/hierarchy/corporatism, (Lima, 2002) were hotly contested by academics, by teachers associations and by students unions. All pressed for democracy representative and participative at the level of both central administration and in the basic units. Universities and polytechnics adjusted internal governance around the principles of collegiality and democracy, with full participation of academics, students and non-academic staff. Election became the main legitimation for power. (Amaral, 2003). Thus, two features were set into Portuguese higher education - 'bottom-up' decision-making (Clark, 1983) or what others have described as the model of organized anarchy (Cohen, March and Olsen, 1972).

The democratization of higher education's governance structure stood as the simultaneous outcome of the radical overhaul of political and social outer frameworks together with an internal re-definition of power. One-time members of junior staff and exiled academics imposed their own counter-hegemonic professional agenda. They injected new cultural symbols, beliefs and values, which concentrated around the ideas of democracy, autonomy and merit. In short, academics saw their level of professionalism rise through increased control they wielded over the organisation of work and over their own careers. (Larson, 1977)

Thus, the bureaucratic/collegial/political model of governance largely upheld the new occupational ideology of the academic body and was perceived politically as an important technology of governmentality (Foucault, 1991a,b) in 'normalizing' higher education and Portuguese society.

In reality, the collegial mode of governing granted the academic profession a degree of autonomy virtually without parallel, when compared with other professions in the public sectors. As in many other systems in Western Europe, collegial decision-making as it developed in the newly democratic higher education institutions, rests upon a highly hierarchical professional structure that largely preserved the earlier characteristics of chair-holder supremacy. (Neave and Rhoades, 1987).

At the end of the Seventies, the legal outline for university careers was promulgated (Decree Law 448/79) and, at the start of the Eighties, its polytechnic counterpart. (Decree Law 185/81). Laying down the legal framework for careers in both sectors may be seen in terms of a "strategy of closure". (Larson, 1977; Parkin, 1979; Murphy, 1988). Save for a few minor changes, these enactments remained in place for almost three decades, which seemed to endow them with a *quasi-constitutional* status.

Defining the university career drew on Humboldtian values with academics assuming three forms of responsibility: teaching, research and services to society. The University career covered 5 ranks and four academic degrees: full professor –

agregação; associate professor - agregação; auxiliary professor – doctor; assistant – master; assistant trainee – bachelor. Entry was strictly regulated by government to avoid irregularities in recruitment. Selection required the setting up of an internal commission, comprising at least three senior academics, to evaluate the *Curriculum Vitae* of applicants and to select the best on the grounds of merit. (Meira-Soares, 2001; Santiago and Carvalho, 2008). The principles defining merit upheld equality in access whilst maintaining the control of professionals over entry to the profession. The importance of limiting the selection of new members to professionals is acknowledged in the literature as a key element in the profession’s exercising control over itself. (Larson, 1977; Parkin, 1979; Murphy, 1988).

Promotion was automatic, except to senior posts (full and associate professor) which were filled as a vacancy occurred. The tenure position could be granted five years after obtaining the PhD – in effect, five years at the level of auxiliary professor - based solely on merit. A selection committee of senior level academic staff decide whether the applicant’s record of achievement entitles him to a tenured position. (Santiago and Carvalho, 2008; Meira-Soares, 2001).

By dint of this legal framework, the academic profession in Portuguese universities was, as Clark noted of Italy, “an arm of the state bureaucracy (...), wholly supported by the government and protected (...) by a well-understood Humboldtian tradition” (Clark, 1987, 44).

The structure of careers in polytechnics though also hierarchical, enshrined different principles, stemming from its vocational nature. It too covered five different levels: coordinating professor with the *agregação*; Coordinating professor; Adjunct professor; Assistant (second three year period) and Assistant (first three year period). Additional qualifications did not ensure automatic advancement to a higher rank, however. Academic staff at all levels have to wait for a vacancy to occur. (Santiago and Carvalho, 2008). Moreover, the Phd did not play so crucial a role in career progress. Academic staff in polytechnics could apply for tenure three years after their appointment as adjunct professor, which demanded only a master’s degree.

Linkage and cross-flow between the two careers was absent. The possibility existed to invite individuals whose main commitments lay outside academia. They formed part of ‘specially contracted personnel’, non-academics whose curriculum upheld their expertise in a specific domain. With similar working conditions, this category of personnel were not eligible for tenure track appointments. Traditionally, this category was only used in exceptional situations to invite people with ‘special skills’ to develop teaching. (Santiago and Carvalho, 2008).

Traditionally, both careers paths were considered very secure and strongly embedded in the idea of full-time permanent academic status. Turning down a tenured post was virtually unknown. Between 1988 to 1997 only 4 cases in polytechnics and 14 in universities took this decision, though between 1997 to 2004 refusals increased to 16 in polytechnics and 45 bold spirits in universities. (GPEAR, 2004).

Even these academics were covered by the legal framework of careers, which underwrote employment in public sector higher education even for the non tenured – a

clearer illustration of academia's unique and privileged status that substantiates both Neave and Rhoades' (1987) portrayal of academics as an estate as it does Altbach's argument that academics have always been a highly esteemed professional group, "somehow standing apart from society, with special privileges and responsibilities" (Altbach, 2000, p. 12).

Interestingly, the academic profession in Portugal secured the best working conditions for itself and at a time when some European countries, the British not least, embarked on managerialism, thereby threatening the main principles of the welfare state, a situation, generated inter alia, by the world recession that followed the oil crisis of the Seventies and extended by the emergence of neoliberal ideology and market assumptions (Perkin, 1987; Deem, 1998; Reed, 2002).

Even if the granting of special privileges could not be gainsaid, the launching of a binary system was an important development. Two distinct career modes were established, marking a further step in professional segmentation. As with other European countries (Perkin, 1987) universities command a higher social status than polytechnics. (Perkin, 1987; Taylor, Ferreira, Machado and Santiago, 2008) with direct consequences for the working conditions of academics.

If academics may no longer be seen as an elite, they remained nevertheless a key profession. With the advent of a polytechnic subsystem, new training courses emerged as did different occupational groups striving to derive legitimation from scientific knowledge and credentialism: (Larson, 1977) in short, to become a profession in their turn. As the English social historian, Harold Perkin pointed out;

"(...) university teaching was the key profession because academics had become the educators and selectors of the other professions." (Perkin, 1987, 13).

To sum up: the Democratic Revolution saw a new professionalism emerge within the professional academic group, a professionalism born up by democratic principles, which gave further weight to its position as 'organic intellectuals'. Yet, with a binary system, the academic profession faced rising internal segmentation and stratification. To those devoted to research and training in fields linked to the legitimacy and credentialism of 'traditional' professions, a new constellation of 'knowledge experts' had surfaced, devoted mainly to training for new occupations. Despite the well-documented phenomena of 'academic drift' and 'professional drift' in as forms of common identity, different types of higher education establishments, with very different social status meant different sources of legitimacy, terms of employment and social standing.

The application of democratic and egalitarian principles to higher education had other consequences, not least opening up participation to women, a development that increased both diversification and segmentation inside the academic profession. What the implications may be, will be dealt with later.

The Emergence of a Private Sub-System

In the course of the Eighties, the consensus that focused on implementing the welfare state began to unravel. According to the sociologist, Boaventura Sousa Santos (1993) the 1989 constitutional revision eliminated the last vestiges of the socialist program proclaimed by the Democratic Revolution of 1974. This 'turn' in the Eighties was especially visible in the health sector. (Simões and Lourenço, 1999; Carvalho, 2009) Nor was higher education spared.

Certain minority groups, deprived of power and influence by the Democratic Revolution, saw an opportunity to regain both by pressing for a private sector of higher education in Portugal. Once more, a counter-hegemonic group inside academia set out to impose an alternative normative identity. Expanding private higher education rallied political support. Urged on by the former Minister of Education, Roberto Carneiro, private higher education experienced 'explosive' growth. (Amaral and Teixeira, 2000). (Cross Reference Teixeira Chapter) However, it lacked resources, and especially well-qualified academic staff. The government, bent on expanding market forces in higher education, therefore decided:

“(...) to ease the restrictions to teachers accumulating teaching activities in both public and private institutions in order to allow for the fast development of the latter” (Amaral and Teixeira, 2000: 252).

Responding to such encouragement, many academic staff in public HEIs began working with private establishments. The number of hours these stalwarts claimed to spend teaching in both public and private institutions was so spectacular that the media dubbed them '*turbo-professors*'. In reality, some did not teach at all, but rather allowed their names to go forward as part of private universities' marketing strategy of drawing in more students. As Meira Soares noted:“(...) private institutions went their way, often illegally using professors of the public sector with the complacency of the state authorities.” (Meira-Soares, 2001: 234). Thus, higher education's teaching body, with state support, played an important role in undermining the very social prestige that profession once possessed.

Though little is known about academic staff in Portugal's private sector higher education, an impression, widely shared, exists that by far the larger part are neither permanent nor well-qualified. Other differences are to be seen in the status of academia in the two sectors. Whilst public sector teaching staff have civil servant status, their fellows in private HEIs are contract personnel and their contracts are governed by national labour legislation as it applies to the private sector. The private sector is devoid of career regulations.

The absence of a clearly defined career structure left the way open for private higher education institutions to “(...) use the general law according to their interests” (Meira-Soares, 2001: 245). It also provides another example of segmentation in academic careers.

Across the Nineties, the academic profession in Portugal faced a high degree of segmentation in the shape of increasing numbers of professionals in the private sub-

system whose working conditions were more akin to those of service workers. Added to this, the profession itself saw its profile change with the rise in the number of women.

A Profession Feminized? The Broad Perspective on Structure and Gender.

Hegemonic concepts of professionalism were equated at first with the notion of “hegemonic masculinity”. (Davies, 1996). Welfare professionalism’ had a crucial place in the advent of egalitarian policies. As it had in other sectors, the legitimating discourses of the state shifted. A new discourse arose which emphasized the “sameness” of interests between workers, women and men. No longer were women cast as ‘citizen-mothers’ (Wrede, 2008).

The ideology of egalitarianism (Henrikson et al, 2006) went hand in glove with the rise in the numbers of women employed in the Portuguese system of higher education. Since the foundation of the Portuguese Republic in 1910, women had been authorized to profess in university.⁴ Still, the university profession’s elitism, combined with the Dictatorship’s deeply traditional stance on gender, did not admit women to a visible role in academia. Only in the aftermath of the Democratic Revolution were the same rights granted to women as they were to men, set into the Constitution.

Massification drew an increasing number of women into higher education, first as students but also as teaching staff. Indeed, to a great degree massification was a function of the rise in the number of women students. (Amâncio and Ávila, 1995). This trend, well-documented in other countries, gave institutional expression to the notion of a ‘feminised future’ (Leathwood and Read, 2009)

This is a construct especially relevant in Portugal where female participation in HE is amongst the highest in Europe (EC, 2009; OCDE, 2006; Rees, 2001). By 2007, women formed the majority of students in HE and 41.3% of its teaching body. However this trend is understandable only against the specific backdrop of gender relations in Portugal. Traditionally, female participation in the labour market was high: In 2006, for example, it topped 62% - well above the average of 57,3% for Europe of the Twenty Five. Male participation rates stood at 73,9%. (MTSS, 2009)

Such a situation reflected a long-term presence of women in the formal economy; primarily, as wage earners in agriculture and in subsistence farming and later, under the impetus of political, economic and social change, increasingly in the service sector. The cultural and economic values the Dictatorship upheld played an important part in bringing women onto the labour market. At the very moment when most developed countries saw the rise of movements for women’s rights, Portugal was waging a colonial war in Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique. War, cultural stagnation and economic underdevelopment gave rise to both flight from the countryside and from Portugal itself towards other European countries. The shortage of men thus made women the main source of labour in the economy. (Nogueira, Constâncio and Amâncio, 1995). Here was a condition compounded by political initiatives intended to uphold traditional gender roles which, paradoxically, increased feminisation of certain professions in the service sector, amongst which nurses in the

⁴ In 1911 for the first time, a woman – Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcelos – was authorized to teach an academic subject at professorial level. (*cátedra universitária*).

health sector (Carvalho, 2009; Escobar, 2004) and teachers in education (Araújo, 1990; 1991). In the latter instance, by 1993 the number of women teachers placed Portugal as the lead country with the highest percentage of women in the teaching body in the whole of Europe. (Nogueira, Constâncio and Amâncio, 1995).

This trend has continued, though with certain disparities across different levels of the education system. According to the World Economic Forum's report, *Global Gender Gap Report* (2009) the percentage of women in primary education was 82%; in secondary schools, 69% and in tertiary education, 43%. Whilst women's participation in academia has most assuredly advanced in the course of the past three decades, it is not possible - yet - to speak of a feminised profession. True, the formal barriers against women entering academia have given way. But other obstacles to equality of participation at different levels of academic ranking and access to senior posts have yet to be resolved. (Salaria and Agans, 2006)

Women in Portuguese Academia.

In 2005, academics in public higher education in Portugal numbered 24,280. Of these, 14,063 (58%) were men and 10,217 (42%) women. Compared to other European countries, it shows a higher participation of women in higher education (European Commission, 2006). Nevertheless the high proportion hides a certain variability. While men formed the majority of academic staff in both sub-systems, the participation women was higher in polytechnics (4,713; 46.6%) than in universities (5,504; 38.9%) (Carvalho and Santiago, 2010).

That women concentrate in less prestigious institutions is evident from other countries. (Baghlighole, 2000; Metcalfe and Slaughter forthcoming). In Portugal, the reasons for these differences draw on four distinct factors. First, polytechnics are recent developments. It is, then, less difficult to recruit female academic staff, given their rise in participation as students in higher education. Second, polytechnics dispense undergraduate programmes in areas traditionally more 'feminised' - the social sciences, education and more recently, nursing. Third, polytechnics focus more on teaching than on research, though conditions of employment tend to be less stable and less secure. (Santiago and Carvalho, 2008). Finally, since polytechnics are relative "newcomers", their social and symbolic capital is weaker and less prestigious than universities.

Though Portugal can boast of having a stronger presence of women in academia, the processes of horizontal and vertical segregation, identified elsewhere, are no less evident. (Bagilhole, 2000; Benschop and Brouns, 2003; Knights and Richards, 2003; Bailyn, 2003; O'Connor, 2009; Stromquist, Gil-Antón, Balbachevsky, Mabokela, Smolentseva, and Colatrella, 2007).

In 2005, horizontal segregation was to be found in teacher education and training (63 per cent women), the Humanities (54 per cent women) and Engineering (77 per cent men) (Santiago and Carvalho, 2010).

Official data from 2001 to 2005 show that, despite a small rise in the number of women teaching in public sector higher education, no visible impact had followed on for gender distribution by disciplinary field. Women's participation across all appointment levels was similar in education/teacher training - 62 per cent in 2000; 63

per cent in 2005. It had increased in social sciences - 38 per cent in 2000; 44 per cent in 2005 - and in the natural sciences - 45 per cent, in 2000; 48 per cent, by 2005. It had fallen decreased in the Arts and Humanities - 62 per cent in 2000; 54 per cent by 2005. (OCES, 2004; 2005; Santiago and Carvalho, 2010).

In addition to horizontal segregation in Portuguese higher education career patterns, vertical segregation emerged in the gender distribution across academia's rank hierarchy. Men are more numerous in all academic ranks, with differences more pronounced at the top where women account for only 32 per cent and 22 per cent amongst associate and full professors.

The scarcity of women in senior management is a well-documented and universal tendency (Marshall, 1984; Burke and Vinnicombe, 2005; Davidson and Burke, 2004). It suggests that HEIs, despite their meritocratic principles, are not neutral and replicate the same "glass ceiling" as does society itself. (Bain and Cummings, 2000; Lethwood and Read, 2009; Jackson and O'Callaghan, 2009; Machado-Taylor, Ozkanli, White and Bagilhole, 2007; Doherty and Mafredi, 2006) The metaphor of the glass ceiling is "generally viewed as a set of impediments and/or barriers to career advancement for women and peoples of colour." (Jackson and O'Callaghan, 2009. 460)

The under-representation of women at the higher levels of responsibility in Portugal may also reflect at all levels a "creeping" gender discrimination in procedures of promotion and recruitment. Unlike other European countries such as Finland, which has a high percentage of women in higher education, no national committees promote gender equality in academia. (Husu, 2000). Not dissimilar to van der Brink et al.'s (2006) conclusions about the Netherlands, Portugal would appear to show that the opportunity for equal representation of women in academia is undermined by a clear and lasting "leak in the pipeline". (Schiebinger, 1999; Stolte-Heiskanen, 1991; van der Brink et al, 2006).

Be that as it may, both women as indeed the academic profession in general are faced with new issues. Portugal has not remained unscathed or unaffected by the 'crisis of the welfare state' on the one hand and by the onset of neo-liberal economic doctrines, on the other. Whilst the new political framework may be sustainable, nevertheless, at the same time it generates a new counter-hegemonic tendency inside the academic profession.

Market Tendencies and/or Commercialization inside the Academic Profession

The Portuguese strain of Neo-liberalism in re-configuring the State took root at the end of the Nineties. As elsewhere, (Wrede, 2008; Khulmann, 2006) both its justification and its rationale were deeply critical of welfare professionalism. As Sprida Wrede noted in the Finnish case:

"welfare state professionalism was portrayed as bureaucratic, self-interested, and narrow, as well as obsolete in face of the complex problems of late modern societies. On the other hand, professionalism was discussed in technocratic terms." (Wrede, 2008, p. 29).

Pressured by this normative and ideological onslaught academics, as the ‘organic intellectuals’ of welfare professionalism, saw the terms and conditions of their work undergo a well nigh universal change. (Musselin, 2004, 2008; Enders, 2001) In its most visible form, change entailed terminating the figure of academic as civil servant and its replacement by a status akin to that of service workers. (Musselin, 2008).

The drive towards Neo-Liberalism in Portugal did not immediately bring forth legal change in the status of the academic profession. Rather, two tactics were brought to bear. The first saw the exploitation of “gaps” in earlier legislation. The second entailed modifying the financing both in science policy and in higher education. Yet, the hegemonic discourse about science policy certainly shifted both in perspective and in purpose. In doing so, it also introduced a new hegemonic discourse that applied to academic professionalism.

Amongst the “gaps” the new discourse exploited was the opening earlier legal provision made for passing contracts with individuals outside academia to act as invited lecturers. This device served to put in place a parallel – or even ‘virtual’- career structure based on sheer numbers and flexible availability. (Santiago and Carvalho, 2008). (Cross reference Teixeira chapter) By this means, changes to the conditions of appointment were injected. Some academics were engaged part-time. Full-time academics were assigned positions that did not carry permanent status. The birth of a precarious profession, its terms and conditions of employment deteriorating, was easily to be seen in polytechnics (Santiago and Carvalho, 2008).

Changes were no less evident in the key areas of knowledge production and dissemination. At the European level, European Commission had opted for higher education and research as the main vehicles for innovation and economic development in the thrust towards a knowledge society and a knowledge economy. Of no less significance, and within the same general setting, a sizeable part of knowledge production began to take on board new exogenous norms, epistemological, social and economic. Such norms had direct operational and organizational consequences of the highest importance for academia and for academic work. Both involved a complex and radical overhaul in modes of knowledge production. This shift in the basic organization of academic work, reduced to a snappy slogan, is often presented as substituting Mode 1 in academic production for various new forms, described as Mode 2. In a Mode 1 setting, knowledge production takes place within disciplinary communities and its determined therefore by institutional standards and academic values. In this context, Knowledge is produced ‘for its own sake’. In Mode 2, by contrast, knowledge production is closely aligned with problem-solving and is developed to be applicable and transferable to business and to the economy. In this second setting, knowledge is perceived as a crucial means for raising levels of economic development. (Olssen and Peters, 2005; Ziman, 1996, 2000; Santiago and Carvalho, 2008).

Falling in with the priorities of the European Commission, the Portuguese government actively took up the human resources perspective on higher education qualifications. States have always backed the acquisition of further qualifications by academics as an inseparable part of an academic career in public universities. From the Nineties, and drawing on financial support from Europe, the government embarked on the direct financing of *individuals* to improve their qualifications by individual scholarships and grants rather than, as had earlier been the case, by financing

institutions through the national budget. Thus, from 1994 to 1999, 8,375 scholarships were awarded through one specific programme - PRAXIS XXI. Of these, 3,486 supported studies at the PhD level, a massive increase compared to the years 1990 to 1993 when the corresponding statistic was 1,572 awards: (OCES, 2003) 851 to undertake research, and 728 to engage in a technical research (OCES, 2006b). Follow-up evaluation of the jobs taken up by scholarship-holders revealed that 55% found employ as academics in higher education, 14% were researchers and 12% held post-doctoral scholarships. (OCES, 2006a). In effect, this strategy did not raise private investment in R&D. Nor did it boost the private sector's employment of highly-qualified human resources. Data from 1999 showed the overwhelming majority - 74,2% - amongst the highly qualified working in R&D, were concentrated in higher education or in other state organizations. A mere 12,7% found employment in private sector industry.

Change in public policy for generating highly qualified human resources created a new professional group inside higher education – researchers. Research staff lay important issues before academia as a profession. Not only do they extend internal segmentation. They introduce a further degree of internal fragmentation for whilst they work in universities and polytechnics, they research but do not have responsibility for teaching – hitherto one of the major items in the organization of academic work. Furthermore, researchers personify the split between production and dissemination of knowledge. The advent of this new species of academics may well sunder the profession's control over knowledge production and, by the same token, undermine one of the most important pillars in the professionalism of academics. (Jonhson 1972; Larson, 1977; Freidson, 2001). The profession of the researcher accentuates the internal fragmentation of the professional. In turn, fragmentation thrusts a new group into the academics' jurisdictional field (Abbott, 1988) with all the potential, for the first time, to challenge the definition of their jurisdictional area.

By stimulating demand for post-graduated programmes, the government created a 'reserve army' having the ability to replace 'traditional' professional academics and thus giving up the traditional support the State granted to academia in the shape of that condition, known in the literature as "social closure" (Parkin, 1979; Murphey, 1988) (Footnote: see above pp.)

The onset of the recent economic recession converted the Neo-liberal doctrine into a new hegemony that changed the legal framework regulating the institutions of higher education (Law n° 62/2007) and of professionals (Decree-Law 205/2009 and Decree-Law 207/2009). The Higher Education Law of 2007 (Law, 62/2007) laid out new patterns for governance and management. It stands as a breakpoint from earlier legislation, grounded in collegiality. It brings important changes to the campus: the choice for institutions to opt for a status under public law or as a foundation regulated by private law. The establishment of a General Council, the axing of existing collegial bodies, namely Senates, the injection of external 'stakeholders' having an extended political and strategic power-base, assigning an executive responsibility to the university rector and to the polytechnic president; are clear examples of drive towards radical reform.

By strengthening accountability, together with the participation of external stakeholders', the State gave another professional group access to the hidden garden of

academia's jurisdictional area. Thus, for the first time, academic professionals found themselves facing another counter-hegemonic profession – managers. Whether academics are on the point of losing their statute of “organic intellectuals” in society, cannot entirely be dismissed.

For some scholars, changes such as these in the higher education world shift the paradigm of the modern university towards becoming a ‘market oriented university’ (Buchbinder, 1993, p.335), or a ‘corporatized’ university. (Currie et al, 2002, p. 14) Both downplay and downgrade collegiality, and, subsequently, weaken academic professionalism through loss of liberty and close institutional control over research and teaching. However, the long-lasting impact of these changes is as yet unknown. Empirical studies divide between endorsing the thesis of “de-professionalisation” (Fulton, 2003; Askling, 2001; Slaugther and Leslie, 1997; Reed, 2002, Harley, Muller-Camen and Collin, 2003) and the glorious resurgence of a new professionalism born up by strategies professions develop to ensure their survival. (De Boer, 2002; Henkel, 2000; Kogan, 1999, Kogan et al. 2000; Carvalho and Santiago, 2009; Enders, 1999).

In the logic of the latter prospect, Wrede (2008) and Henriksson (Henriksson et al, 2006) given the changes in health sector argue that what is happening amounts to reframing state professionalism so that it is now aligned upon groups held to be technical experts. In short, the profession is not homogeneous and, in keeping with the same logic that shaped the previous moments of historical change, all one may look forward to is the redefinition of the dominant sub-group inside academia. As with other professional groups, medical doctors (Ferlie et al, 1996; Wrede; Henriksson et al, 2006) and nurses, for instance (Carvalho, 2009), whose identity is more akin to technocratic expertise, we may anticipate see new opportunities emerging and with them new “organic intellectuals” within the group who, once again, negotiate new normative identities into hegemony.

CONCLUSIONS

This Chapter has argued that the academic profession is not homogeneous. On the contrary, internal diversity is one of the main determinants in sustaining the process of professionalisation within a group that faced no competition in or over, its jurisdictional field.

Following a line of argument first developed by Gramsci (1971) the directions academic profession in Portugal has taken derives from a “series of unstable equilibria”. Status, power and autonomy in the academic profession is generated by a series of temporary alignments in a set of social forces, which include government, stakeholders but also different sub-groups of academics. Concentrating on the internal struggles of academics to legitimate a hegemonic normative identity does not deny the influence of external factors, still less of institutions and state power. Rather, such concentration clarifies the internal equilibrium between different forces and how close is the interplay between them. The dominant notion of academic professionalism is always the outcome of political struggle – internal and external.

The trend towards segmentation within the group has been pronounced and sustained. It assumed at least four forms; first in the shape of the polytechnics; second,

with setting up private higher education; third, through feminization of the academic profession and finally, in the rise of the group of professional researchers and managers. Inevitably, an increase in internal differences may interfere with the established equilibrium dominant, with different groups contesting their hegemonic identity. Such internal cohesion is, as Filc suggested, (2006), a pre-condition to be recognized by Society as “traditional intellectuals”, or, following Gramsci’s line of argument, (1971) ideas are transformed into ‘organic intellectuals’ by the acknowledgement of their expertise by civil society.

At different times different hegemonic ideologies break surface in the academic profession as the result of internal contradictions and contentions. These struggles are not confined to internal relations. They embrace socio-cultural frames as well as the ability of other groups to assert their own agenda within society.

For a very long time indeed, hegemonic ideology identified the academic profession with men. Even when the participation of women in academia became an undeniable reality, dominant notions of masculinity still hung out, concentrating women in “soft” subject areas and holding them to mid-level careers.

Other professional groups coalesced and attempted to oust academics as “organic intellectuals”. The counter-hegemonic agenda of managers seems to be successful in projecting themselves as the primary competitive group in the jurisdictional field. The instrumentalization of higher education around the social and economic ends of forwarding knowledge society and the knowledge economy, in the Foucaultian interpretation, divides the academy into a plethora of experts, a condition which accentuates the academic profession’s internal fragmentations still further. Academics as experts are assigned new responsibilities in relation to external demands. The upshot has their own criteria of professionalism – truth and competence – replaced by external criteria defined by the choices by stakeholders acts and ‘consumers’. (Rose, 1996).

This sociological and historical analysis of the academic profession in Portugal has shown that the shaping of the professional group’s cognitive and normative framework cannot today be explained in terms a simplistic relation between profession and State. Rather, constructing the profession is a political process in which professionals along with other and different actors and agents have all an important part to play. (8,500)

References:

Abbott, A (1988). *The System of Professions. An Essay on the Division of Expert Labour*, London, The University Of Chicago Press.

Altbach, P.; Reisberg, L. and Rumbley, L. (2009). *Trends In Global Higher Education: Tracking An Academic Revolution: A Report*. UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education. Paris: UNESCO.

Altbach, P (2000). *The Changing Academic Workplace: Comparative Perspectives*. (Ed.) Boston, Center for International Higher Education.

- Amâncio, L. and Ávila, P. (1995). O género na ciência. In J. Jesuino (Ed.), *A Comunidade Científica Portuguesa nos Finais do Séc. XIX*. Oeiras: Celta Editora. 47-71
- Amaral, A. and Magalhães, A. (2007). Market Competition, Public Good And State Interference. In Jürgen Enders, and Ben Jongbloed (Eds.), *Public-Private Dynamics In Higher Education. Expectations, Developments And Outcomes*, Transcript Verlag, 89-110.
- Amaral, A. (2003). Consolidation of Higher Education's Legislation", In Barblan, A. (ed.). *Academic Freedom and University Institutional Responsibility in Portugal*. Italy, Bononia University Press, 17-34.
- Amaral, A. and Carvalho, T. (2003). Autonomy and change in Portuguese Higher Education", In Barblan, A. (ed.). *Academic Freedom and University Institutional Responsibility in Portugal*. Italy, Bononia University Press, 35-46.
- Amaral, A. and Teixeira, P. (2000). The rise and fall of the private sector in Portuguese Higher Education. *Higher Education Policy*, 13(3), 245-266.
- Amaral, A., Magalhães, A., and Santiago, R. (2003). The Rise Of Academic Managerialism In Portugal. In Alberto Amaral, Lynn Meek, and Ingvild, *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Araújo, H. (1990). As mulheres professoras e o ensino estatal. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 29, 81-103.
- Araújo, H. (1991). As professoras primárias na viragem do século: Uma contribuição para a história da sua emergência no Estado. *Organizações & Trabalho*, 5(6), 127-146.
- Askling, B. (2001). Higher education and academic staff in a period of policy and system change. *Higher Education*, 41, 157-181.
- Bagilhole, B. (2000). Too little too late? An assessment of national initiatives for women academics in the British university system. *Higher Education In Europe*. 23(2), 139-145.
- Bailyn, L. (2003). Academic careers and gender equity: Lessons learned from MIT. *Gender, Work and Organisation*. 10(2), 137-153.
- Bain, O. and Cummings, W. (2000). Academe's Glass Ceiling: Societal, Professional-Organizational and Institutional Barriers to the Career Advancement of Academic Women. *Comparative Education Review*, 44(4): 493-514.
- Becher, T. and Trowler, P. (2001) *Academic Tribes And Territories. Intellectual Enquiry And The Culture Of Disciplines*. Second Edition. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Bell, D. (1976), *Vers La Société post-industrielle*, Paris, Laffont.

- Benschop, Y. and Brouws, M. (2003). Cumbling ivory tower: Academic organizing and its gender effects. *Gender, Work and Organisation*. 10(2), 194-212
- Bourdieu, P. (1996) *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge. Polity Press.
- Buchbinder, H. (1993). 'The market oriented university and the changing role of knowledge', *Higher Education* 26, 331–347.
- Burke, R. and Vinnicombe, S. (2005). Advancing Women's Careers. *Career Development International*, 10(3), pp.165-167.
- Carvalho, T. (2009). *Nova Gestão Pública e Reformas da Saúde. O profissionalismo numa encruzilhada*. Lisboa. Edições Sílabo.
- Carvalho, T. and Santiago, R. (2010). New Public Management and 'middle-management': How do deans influence institutional policies? In Meek, L.; Goedegebuure, L.; Santiago, R. & Carvalho, T. (Eds.) *The Changing Dynamics of Higher Education Middle Management*. Heidelberg, London, Springer.
- Carvalho, T. and Santiago, R. (2008). Gender Differences on Research: Perceptions and Use of Academic Time *Tertiary Education and Management*, 14(4): 317-330.
- Clark, B. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/ London, University of California Press.
- Clark, B. (1987). Introduction. In Clark, B. (ed.). *The Academic Profession. National, disciplinary & Institutional Settings*, Berkeley/ Los Angeles/London, University of California Press.
- Cohen, M.; March, J. and Olsen, J. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of Organisational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 1-25.
- Currie, J., Thiele, B. and Harris, P. (2002). *Gendered universities in globalized economies. Power, career and sacrifices*. Oxford. Lexington Books.
- Davidson, M. and Burke, R. (2004). Women in Management Worldwide: Facts, figures and analysis – An overview, In Marilyn, D. and Ronald B. (Ed), *Women in Management Worldwide: Facts, figures and analysis – An overview*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1-18.
- Davies, C. (1996), The sociology of professions and the profession of gender, *Sociology*, 30(4), 661-78.
- De Boer, H. (2002), Trust, The Essence of Governance? In Amaral, A., Jones, G and Karseth, B. (Eds.) *Governing higher education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 43-62.
- Decree-Law, N° 38:692 Of 23rd March (1952)

- 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.
- Derber, C. (1983). Ideological Proletarianization And Postindustrial Labour, *Theory And Society*, N° 12, 281-308.
- Doherty, L. and Manfredi, S. (2006), Women's Progression To Senior Positions in English Universities. *Employee Relations*. 28(6), 553-572.
- Dubar, C. (2003), "Sociologie Des Groupes Professionnels En France: Un Bilan Prospectif", In Menger, Pierre Michel (Dir.), *Les Professions et Leurs Sociologues*, Paris, Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 51-59.
- Dubar, C. and Tripier, P. (1998), *Sociologie des Professions*, Armand Colin, Paris.
- Enders, J. (1999), Crisis? What crisis? The academic profession in 'knowledge' society, *Higher Education*, 38(1), 71-81.
- Enders, J. (2001). Between State Control And Academic Capitalism: A Comparative Perspective On Academic Staff In Europe. In Enders, J. (Ed). *Academic Staff In Europe. Changing Contexts And Conditions*, Westport, CT Greenwood Press.
- Escobar, L. (2004). *O sexo das profissões. Género e identidade socioprofissional em enfermagem*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento.
- EU European Commission. (2006). *She Figures 2006. Women and Science: Statistics and Indicators*. Brussels. European Commission.
- EU European Commission. (2009). *She Figures. Statistics and Indicators on gender equality in Science*. Brussels. European Commission.
- Evetts, J. (2002). New Directions In State And International Professional Occupations: Discretionary Decisionmaking And Acquired Regulation", In *Work, Employment and Society*, Vol. 16(2): 341-353.
- Evetts, J. (2003). "The Sociological Analysis Of Professionalism", In *International Sociology*, Vol. 18 (2): 395-415.
- Ferlie, E., Ashburner, L., Fitzgerald, L. and Pettigrew, A. (1996). *The New Public Management In Action*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foucault, (1991a). Politics And The Study Of Discourse. In Graham Burchel, Collin Gordon And Peter Miller, *The Foucault Effet, Studies In Governmentality*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press: 53-72
- Foucault, M. (1991b.) Governmentality. In Graham Burchel, Collin Gordon And Peter Miller, *The Foucault Effet, Studies In Governmentality*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, .87-104
- Foucault, M. (2004). *Vigiar E Punir*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes (29° Edition)

- Foucault, M. (2006). *Vigiar E Punir*. Petrópolis Editora Vozes
- Freidson, E. (1977). The futures of professionalisation. In M. Stacey, M. Reid, C. Heath & R. Dingwall (Eds.), *Health and the division of labour* London: Croom Helm 14-38
- Freidson, E. (1978). *La Profesión Médica*. Barcelona. Ediciones Península.
- Freidson, E. (1986), *Professional Powers*, Chicago, The University Of Chicago Press.
- Freidson, E. (2001), *Professionalism. The Third Logic*, Chicago, The University Of Chicago Press.
- Fulton, O. (2003). Managerialism in UK universities: unstable hybridity and the complications of implementation. In A. Amaral, L. Meek & I. Larsen (Eds.), *The higher education managerial revolution?* Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 205-229.
- Gallagher, T. (1981). Os oitenta e sete ministros do Estado Novo de Salazar, *História*, 28, p. 7.
- GPEARI. (2004). *Recusa De Provimento Definitivo – Carreira Docente Do Ensino Universitário E Politécnico- 1988-1989 A 2003-2004*. MSTHE
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections From The Prison Notebooks*, London, Lawrence and Wishart..
- Gramsci, A. (2000.) *Cadernos do Cárcere*. Vol. 3: Maquiavel. Notas sobre o Estado e a política; edição e tradução, Carlos Nelson Coutinho; co-edição, Luiz Sérgio Henriques e Marco Aurélio Nogueira. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- Hall, R., (1975), *Occupations And The Social Structure*, Princeton, Prentice-Hall.
- Harley, S.; Muller-Camen, M. and Collin, A. (2003). From academic communities to managed organisations: The implications for academic careers in UK and German universities. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(2), .329-345.
- Henkel, M. (2000). *Academic identities and policy change in higher education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Henriksson, L., Wrede, S. and Burau, V. (2006). ‘‘Understanding professional projects in welfare service work: revival of old professionalism?’’, *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 174-92.
- Hughes, E. (1958), *Men And Their Work*, Westport CT, Greenwood.
- Hughes, E. (1963), ‘‘Professions’’, In *Daedalus*, 92 (4):655-668.

- Husu, L. (2000). Gender discrimination in the promised land of gender equality. *Higher Education in Europe*. 25(2), 221-228.
- Jackson, J. O’Callaghan, M. (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): 460-482.
- Johnson, T. (1972). *Professions and power*. London: Macmillan.
- Johnson, T. (1982), “The State And The Profession: Peculiarities Of The British”, In Giddens, A. E Mackenzie, G. (Orgs.), *Social Class And The Division Of Labour*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 45-67.
- Jones, S. (2006). *António Gramsci*. London: Routledge.
- Knights, D. and Richards, W. (2003). Sex discrimination in UK academia. *Gender, Work and Organisation*. 10(2), 213-237.
- Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I., & Henkel, M. (2000), *Transforming higher education: A comparative study*, London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Kuhlmann, E. (2006). *Modernising Health Care. Reinventing Professions, the State and the Public*, The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Larson, M. (1977). *The Rise of Professionalism. A Sociological Analysis*, London, University Of California Press.
- Leathwood, C. and Read, B. (2009). *Gender and the Changing face of higher education. A feminized future?* London. The Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Lima, L. (2002). O Paradigma da Educação Contábil: Políticas Educativas e Perspectivas Gerencialistas No Ensino Superior. In Licínio C. Lima and Almerindo Janela Afonso, *Reformas Da Educação Pública, Democratização, Modernização, Neoliberalismo*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento, 91-110
- Machado-Taylor, M Ozkanli, O White, K and Bagilhole, B. (2007), “Breaking the Barriers to women achieving seniority in Universities”, *Paper presented to EAIR Forum*, Innsbruck.
- Magalhães, A. (2004). *A Identidade Do Ensino Superior: Política, Conhecimento E Educação Numa Época De Transição*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian/ Fundação Para A Ciência E Tecnologia.
- Magalhães, A., and Amaral, A. (2007). Changing Values And Norms In The Concept Of Governance In Portuguese Higher Education. *Higher Education Policy*, 20: 315-338.
- Makler, H. (1968). *The Portuguese Industrial Elite*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

- Marques, O. (1981). *História De Portugal*. Lisboa: Palas Editores (Vol. III).
- Marshall, J. (1984). *Women managers travellers in a male world*. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons.
- Meira-Soares, V. (2001). *The Academic Profession in a Massifying System: The Portuguese Case*. In Enders, J. (Ed), *Academic Staff in Europe Changing Contexts and Conditions*. Westport, CT. Greenwood Press.
- Metcalfe, A. and Slaughter, S. in press. Academic capitalism. In Banks, B. (Ed.), *Gender and Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Moscato, R. (2002). Italy: A Hard Implementation of a Comprehensive Reform. *International Higher Education*, 26 (Winter), 3-4.
- MTSS. (2009). Statistics indicators of women and men in labour market. Retrieved from <http://www.mtss.gov.pt/>
- Murphy, R. (1988). *Social Closure. The theory of monopolization and exclusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Musselin, C. (2004). Towards A European Labour Market? Some Lessons Drawn From Empirical Studies On Academic Mobility. *Higher Education*, Vol.48(1): 55-78.
- Musselin, C. (2008). Towards A Sociology Of Academic Work In Amaral, A.; Musselin, C. And Ivar Bleikie (Eds). *From Governance To Identity. A Festschrift For Mary Henkel*. Springer. 47-56.
- Neave, G. and Rhoades, G. (1987). 'The academic estate in Western Europe', in Clark, B. (ed.), *The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings*. Los Angeles: University of California Press. 211-270.
- Neave, G., and van Vught, F. (1994). *Changing relationship between government and higher education in Western Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Nogueira, C.; Constança, P. and Amâncio, L. (1995). Women in management in Portugal. A demographic overview. *Gender, Management and Science*. 207-218.
- O'Connor, P. (2009). Are Universities Really Male Dominated? Limits and Possibilities for Change, *Paper presented at International Women's Day Conference University of Limerick, 3rd March 2009*.
- OCES. (2003). *Programa De Formação Avançada Recursos Humanos Em C&T (1990-1993)*. Lisboa MSTHE.
- OCES. (2004). *O Sistema De Ensino Superior Em Portugal: 1993-2003*. Lisboa: MCIES.
- OCES. (2005). *Evolução Da Qualificação Do Pessoal Docente No Ensino Superior Universitário Público: 1993-2004*. Lisboa: MCTES.

- OCES. (2006a). *A Situação Profissional Dos Ex-Bolseiros de Doutoramento*. Lisboa MSTHE.
- OCES. (2006b). *Programas De Formação Avançada de Recursos Humanos Em C&T (2000-2004)*. Lisboa MSTHE
- OECD. (2006.) *Women in Scientific Careers: Understanding the Potential*. Paris, OECD.
- Olssen, M. and Peters, M. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 20(3), 313-345.
- Oppenheimer, M. (1973), The Proletarianization of The Professional, *Sociological Review Monographes*, N° 20: 213-227.
- Parkin, F. (1979). *Marxism and class theory*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Parsons, T. (1958). “The Professions And Social Structure”, In *Essays In Sociological Theory*, Glencoe, The Free Press, Pp. 3450 (1ª Edição De 1939).
- Parsons, T. (1972). “Professions”, In *International Encyclopedia Of The Social Sciences*, London, Macmillan Company, 12:536-546.
- Perkin, H. (1987). Academic Profession in the United Kingdom. In Clark, B. (Ed.), *The Academic Profession*. London, The University of California Press, 13-59.
- Perkin, H. (1990). *The Rise of Professional Society*. London. Routledge.
- Pinto, J. (2004). Formação, Tendências recentes e perspectivas de desenvolvimento da sociologia em Portugal. *Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas*, nº 46, 11-31.
- Pinto, A. (2000). O Império do professor: Salazar e a elite ministerial do estado Novo (1933-1945). *Análise Social*. Vol. Xxxv (157), 1-22.
- Reed, M. (2002). New managerialism, professional power and organisational governance in UK universities: A review and assessment. In A. Amaral, G. Jones and B. Karseth (Eds.), *Governing higher education: National perspectives on institutional governance* (pp. 163-185). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Rees, T. (2001). Mainstreaming gender equality in science in the European union: The ‘ETAN report’. *Gender and Education*, 13(3), 243–260.
- Rose, N. (1996). Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies. In Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne And Nikolas Rose (Ed.), *Foucault And Political Reason, Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism And Rationalities Of Government*. Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press, 37-64
- Sagaria, M. and Agans, L. 2006. Gender equality in U.S. higher education: International framing and institutional realities. In Yokoyama, K. (Ed.). *Gender and Higher*

- Education: Australia, Japan, the UK and USA. Hiroshima: Higher Education Institute Press. 47-68.
- Santiago, R. and Carvalho, T. (2004). Effects Of Managerialism On The Perceptions Of Higher Education In Portugal”, *Higher Education Policy*, 17(4): 427-444.
- Santiago, R. and Carvalho, T. (2008). Academics In A New Work Environment: The Impact Of New Public Management On Work Conditions. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(3):204-223.
- Santiago, R., Magalhães, A., and Carvalho, T. (2005). *O Surgimento Do Managerialismo No Sistema Do Ensino Superior Português*. Matosinhos: Cipes.
- Santiago, R.; Carvalho, T; Amaral, A. and Meek, L. (2006). Changing Patterns In The Middle Management Of Higher Education Institutions: The Case Of Portugal. *Higher Education*, 52(2): 215-250.
- Santos, B. (1993). O Estado, as relações salariais e o bem-estar social na semiperiferia: O caso português. In B. Santos (Ed.), *Portugal: Um retrato singular*, Porto: Afrontamento. 16-56
- Schiebinger, L. (1999). *Has Feminism Changed Science?*, Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press,
- Simões, J., and Lourenço, O. (1999). As políticas públicas de saúde em Portugal nos últimos 25 anos. In P. P. Barros and J. Simões (Eds.), *Homenagem a Augusto Mantas* Lisboa: APES. 99-134
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. (1997), *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, And The Entrepreneurial University*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Stolte-Heiskanen, V. (1991). *Women in Science: Token Women or Gender Equality?*, Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Stromquist, N.; Gil-Antón, M; Balbachevsky, E; Mabokela, R; Smolentseva, A.; and Colatrella, C. (2007). The academic profession in the globalisation age: Key trends, challenges, and possibilities, In P. Altbach, and P. Peterson, (Eds.) *Higher Education In the New Century. Global Challenges and Innovative Ideas*, Boston, Massachusetts: Center for International Higher Education: Boston College.
- Tavares, J. (1999). Formação do professor universitário em Portugal. *Revista Interuniversitária de Formación del Profesorado*, nº 34, Enero/Abril. 209-218.
- Taylor, J.; Ferreira, J.; Machado, M.; Santiago, R. (ed.). (2008). *Non-university higher education in Europe*. Dordrecht, Netherlands, Springer. XV. Vol.23. 260 p.
- Van der Brink, M.; Browns, M. and Waslander, S. (2006). Does excellence have a gender? A national research study on recruitment and selection procedures for professoriat appointments in The Ntherlands. *Employee Relations*. 28(6), 523-539.

van Vught, F. (1997). The effects of alternative governance structures. In B. Steunenberg and F. van Vught (Eds.), *Political institutions and public policy* Dordrecht: Kluwer, 115-137.

World Economic Fórum. (2009). *Global Gender Gap Report*. Geneva, Switzerland.

Wrede. S. (2008). Unpacking gendered professional power in the welfare state. *Equal Opportunities International*. Vol. 27 No. 1, 19-33.

Ziman, J. 1996. "Post-academic science": Constructing knowledge with networks and norms', *Science Studies* 9(1), 67–80.

Ziman, J. 2000. *Real Science: What it is and it means*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.