Chinese Higher Education Reform and Social Justice

Edited by Bin Wu and W. John Morgan

London and New York: Routledge

2015

3 Employment equality in China's universities: Perceptions of 'decent work ' among university teachers in Beijing[1]

Junfu Li, Bin Wu and W. John Morgan

Introduction

In recent years there has been an increase in awareness of social justice, equality, and rights issues among Chinese citizens including university teachers (Li, 2011). The higher education (HE) sector is an important example of this because of its potential for developing and disseminating new ideas about a just society, and in influencing policy makers. An example is the role of university teachers in influencing students, directly or indirectly, through their lectures, public statements, and personal behaviour. University teachers influence the younger generation of Chinese professionals, the future leaders of the nation, in their understanding, development and use of the concept of social justice in China. It is important for us to observe and understand this process as a key to the development of a professional community in a post-socialist society where there is tension between the different understandings and expectations of 'professionalism' (Kurin and Morgan, 2014). In this chapter, we consider specifically the term 'decent work', which is often used by Chinese university teachers to reflect on their employment and, especially, on their working conditions, which are often seen as unfair or unjust. Based upon a survey of a number of universities in Beijing, the chapter examines the distribution of incomes among university teachers, together with their perceptions of and requests for 'decent work'.

The demand for 'decent work'

The growth of demands for 'decent work' or employment equality in China's HE sector may be seen through the online spread of reports and comments on the 'strike' of university teachers[2]which took place at Chongqing Business and Management University on the 15th March 2013. This was caused by the inadequacies of a consultation process about a proposal for wage system reform prepared by the university administration. A number of teachers, dissatisfied with the proposal and with the consultation process, came together to declare spontaneously their objections, both within the university and at the campus gate. This demonstration was reported immediately and was disseminated widely online, attracting much support, sympathy and stimulating debate nation-wide (Liu, 2013). Such an event drew public attention to the working conditions of teachers in China's universities about which many discussants expressed their concern. Below is a quote from the online comments:

> 'It may not be too bad if you take a university teacher post as a second job, because the income from a full-time post is certainly not enough to support a family [feed a child].…….Among university staff, teachers are at the bottom and nobody cares about them. What can we do?……..What we, university teachers, want is not just the livelihood security, but even more importantly, respect and dignity, we more respect for universities in society'[3].

This quote suggests that what university teachers are concerned about is not merely pay, but also fair treatment, working conditions and the distribution of rewards and benefits (e.g. workload, performance related pay, and promotion opportunities) among teachers, and between

teachers and other staff within universities. It seems that the term 'decent work' has three dimensions. First, it is about a fair balance of income and other opportunities between teachers with administrative titles and those without. This is because there is a general perception that the former are rewarded unfairly because of the centralisation of resources (including teaching, research and other opportunities) under the control of the university administration (Shi and Zhang, 2012). This determines resource distribution and rewards without the adequate participation of university teachers generally and a transparent process of decision making. Secondly, the income gap between senior and junior teachers is also seen as being too great (Zhao, 2013). This places extra pressure on the younger academic staff to cope with various challenges of teaching, research and social life. Thirdly, there is comparison of working conditions, welfare and pay between university teachers, and those equally well-qualified, for instance with a doctoral degree, who work in other sectors such as government and other public agencies. Such comparisons may make young teachers even more dissatisfied with their working conditions, incomes, and long-term career prospects (She, 2001; Li and Shang, 2009).

This chapter asks the following questions: Why is decent work, or employment equality, a concern for university teachers in China? What is their pattern of terms and conditions of work? How do they perceive these issues and how do they think they may be addressed?

The chapter offers some answers to these questions using data collected through secondary information and an empirical survey conducted in Beijing in 2011. The survey involved 1,692 teachers at 18 universities. The next section provides an explanation of the evolution of the 'decent work' concept in China. This is followed by the research design and data collection method. The data are then presented and analysed in two further sections: the distribution of the pattern of incomes; and the perceptions of respondents. Among a number of factors contributing to income inequality in the HE sector, we draw attention to the bureaucratisation and negative

impact on the professionalism among teachers and perceptions of social justice among students. This chapter ends with a set of conclusions and policy implications.

‘Decent work’ in the Chinese context

The meaning of the term ‘decent work’ (or 体面劳动 in Chinese) may differ according to the individual, while it also changes according to social contexts or times. In this chapter we use the concept both subjectively, referring to the perception of group members and others in society, and objectively, according to economic and social indicators. We consider three dimensions: job opportunity and security, fair pay, respect and dignity. Before the economic reform, generally, there were no big differences in China in terms of economic incomes, social welfare and security, or even in political hierarchy, between different groups and individual members. A Chinese term, the ‘*iron rice bowl*’, was created to refer to those who were employed in state-owned enterprises or public sectors with long term job security, relatively high wages, welfare and social security, and protected by the state via the national planned system. It was used in contrast with rural farmers and employees in local collectively owned enterprises in urban areas whose income and social welfare standards were relatively lower. However, generally speaking, there was no significant difference between different industrial sectors, occupations and job titles given the dominant ideology which emphasized loyalty, equity and collectivism among citizens. This has influenced many Chinese people including university teachers, to compare and their current pay and conditions of work with others (Sun, 1996).

Since the economic reforms of the mid-1980s a fundamental change has taken place in China in terms of the principles and working mechanisms of the public sector, including universities

generally. This has not only reshaped the wage and welfare systems, but also the perceptions of people about their group interests and position in the Chinese social system. As a result, the concept ‘decent work’ has changed in meaning, context and extent. In particular, three changes can be identified compared with three decades ago.

First, all urban sectors, including government offices, public agencies and state-owned enterprises, have experienced restructuring to match the principles of market economics which gives the priority to efficiency rather than to equity. This has resulted in significant differences among urban employees in incomes, welfare and social security, depending upon sectors, departments and the nature of enterprises. The uneven distribution of incomes among urban employees is related to the still inchoate nature of market reform e.g. the continuing monopoly of state-owned enterprises in many economic sectors (Sun, 2009) and partly to delayed political reform, which is responsible for the high level of government control of various economic and social resources (P Wang,2011; Xu,2012). As a result, unlike the homogenous ‘iron rice bowl' of the past, there are not common criteria for ‘decent work’ which can be applied to all sectors or employees in urban China. This is because people may have different expectations or interpretations about what is fair pay which varies among sectors, departments and industrial areas. It is agreed, however, that civil servants in government or other public agency employment and employees in a few monopolised state owned enterprises have ‘decent work’’. This can be seen in the high demand for such employment in the graduate labour market each year (Wang and Yu, 2014;Y Wang, 2011; Li *et al.*, 2011; Xiong,2010a). In other words, ‘decent work’ in China today is dependent upon the specific sector, industry or department.

Secondly, instead of an equal distribution of income and welfare among social members within ‘iron rice bowl’ sectors as in the past, an hierarchical system has been established, determined by occupation and job title, even in the same sector or organization. A significant gap can be seen between different ranks in which manual workers are at the bottom and senior managers at

the top in terms of pay, welfare and respect, and which determines also political power or influence in terms of resource allocation (Feng, 1993).

Thirdly, besides official wages, informal income, referring to occasional or irregular income, has become an important part of real income amongst employees in the public and state-owned enterprise sectors, and which is not available in official statistics. There are also many 'grey' incomes which are intermediate between 'white'(regulated) and 'black'(illegal) which have no clear definition in the current regulation system. Taking into account uneven distribution of economic, social and political resources among urban employees, unsurprisingly, informal income (including grey income) varies greatly according to sector, occupation and job title (X Wang, 1997; Xiong, 2010b).

This chapter offers fresh light on a particular aspect of social justice through its focus on the perceptions of university teachers on fair pay and conditions of work. The following should be noted: First, university teachers are more secure compared with other sectors, which allows a focus on fair pay, respect and dignity. Secondly, university teachers are a highly professionalised sector which offers insight into the tension or conflict between professionalism and political centralism (or *guan-ben-wei* in Chinese). Thirdly, 'decent work' as shown at the beginning of this chapter has been increasingly a matter of concern to university teachers (Tong, 2007;Yang,2010; Zhao, 2009; Xie,2011). By focusing on the distribution of incomes, both formally and informally, this chapter offers an insight into the challenges and dilemmas facing the continuing reform of the higher education sector (Liu *et al.*, 2012). Fourthly, understanding the perception of university teachers of 'decent work' could influence students in their conception of social justice. Finally, it should be noted that concern about decent work or fair pay is not limited to higher education only in China, but is significant to the international academic community. Altbach *et al.*, (2012), for instance, conducted an international

comparison of wages and social welfare amongst university teachers across 28 countries world-wide, in which it was found that Chinese university teachers came at the bottom.

Empirical data collection

It is not easy to demonstrate the distribution of real income among university teachers in China because of the complexity of the wage system. Generally, the total income (TI) of university teachers is comprised of two parts: formal and informal income. The former consists of basic wages (BW), performance related pay (PRP), bonus, book and reference allowances, and transport subsidies. The BW does not change much nation-wide, as it comes from the State financial budget. However, the PRP varies greatly from university to university, as it is the institution which decides how much to pay and how it is distributed among administrative staff, teachers and support staff. Compared with formal pay, informal income is much more difficult to identify, as it comes from a variety of sources, such as: over-time teaching, research projects, references and publications, consultancy fees, etc. Furthermore, informal income is distributed highly unevenly among teachers. A good example of 'grey income' is that of the allowances accompanying research projects commissioned by external users with or without a contract. Most teachers don't have such opportunities, while different universities have different regulations about the appropriate use of such funds (Zhang and Mao，2013). In this chapter, we use the term formal income (wages) to include BW and PRP and exclude 'grey income'.

A survey was conducted, in 2011, at eighteen universities in Beijing (Liu *et al.*, 2012; Zhao, 2013) which aimed to understand the complexity of the wage system and its impact on the perceptions and performances of university teachers. Seven of the universities were funded by

central government (Ministry of Education) and eleven by the Beijing Municipal Government. A stratified sample was used, based upon the pay lists of all staff at the universities. This enabled us to identify the candidates for the questionnaire survey, which 1,692 teachers completed. In addition four focus groups and twenty-one semi-structured interviews were held enabling us to triangulate the data.

The aim was to identify the perceptions of respondents to the issue of fair pay using three dimensions: 1) a personal perspective about whether income matched effort; 2) an organizational perspective on fair pay through comparing views of respondents with different ranks and job titles across sampled universities; 3) a sector perspective referring to a comparison of incomes with counterparts in sectors outside HE. We believe that our survey findings presented in this chapter reflects common issues among university teachers regarding the increasing income gaps found in China. The survey, however, may not be entirely appropriate to represent the position and pay of university teachers throughout China, because of the exceptional economic circumstances found in Beijing, especially for junior rank teachers e.g. high cost of housing.

Employment condition, income composition and distribution

In the current HE system of China university teachers are graded according to four ranks: professor, associate professor, lecturer and assistant lecturer. Generally, there is a decline in the numbers of assistant lecturers, the lowest rank which requires postgraduate education experience. This is because a doctoral qualification has become common practice for academic employment at almost all regular universities in Chinar. The possession of a doctorate enables

academic staff to apply for a promotion to associate professor rank after two years teaching experience, subject to the availability of posts and competition against other qualified applicants within the university. In reality, promotion may take much longer to achieve. There are also significant differences among different types of institutions. For example, at national key universities the distribution of university teachers according to rank is likely to be 20 to 30 per cent, 40 to 50 per cent, and 30 to 40 per cent between professor, associate professor and lecturer or below respectively. This is contrast with 10 per cent, 30 per cent, and 60 per cent at the majority of standard universities. The posts for senior ranks (professor and associate professors) are much fewer than in standard universities (Wang, 2012).

According to the survey, the average income of respondents in 2010 was 74,687 yuan (£7,500), which can be grouped according to job title (professional rank): 126,730 yuan (£12,700) for professors, 83,624 yuan (£8,400) for associate professors, 63,365 yuan (£6,300) for lecturers and 46,616 (£4,700) for assistant lecturer. Table 1 shows that formal incomes (basic wage plus performance related pay) account for just over three quarters (76%) of total incomes, while other incomes (excluding 'grey incomes'), accounts for nearly one quarter (23.3%). Interestingly, an increase can be seen in the share of formal incomes in total incomes from 67.9 per cent for a professor to 83.9 per cent for an assistant lecturer. This is associated with the decline of other incomes from 32.3 per cent for a professor to only 16.1 per cent for an assistant lecturer. Two conclusions can be drawn from Table 3.1. First, it is confirmed that other incomes have become an important part of the current wage system. Secondly, income gaps among university teachers are not caused by formal incomes but by other ones. For instance, the difference in total income between professors and assistant lecturers is 2.68 as much, comprising two parts: 2.12 as much formal income and 5.32 as much other income. The higher the academic rank, the higher the other incomes in both absolute and relative terms.

Table 3.1 Composition and distribution of incomes among respondents by rank (2010, yuan/year)

Rank	N	Total incomes (TI)	Basic wages (BW)	BW in TI (%)	Other	Other in TI (%)
Professor	284	124,730	84,692	67.9	40,038	32.3
Associate professor	603	83,624	66,063	79.0	17,561	21.0
Lecturer	656	63,365	49,045	77.4	14,320	22.6
Assistant lecturer	114	46,616	39,911	83.9	7,525	16.1
Total	1657	74,687	57,285	76.7	17,402	23.3

Source: All tables in this chapter are based upon the survey project 'University teacher's income distribution and stimulation mechanism in Beijing' (2011).

It is worth noting that Table 3.1 is likely to underestimate the income gaps. According to our interviews and focus group meetings, the questionnaire survey most likely under reported incomes, other than formal ones. In particular, it was unlikely that, for various personal reasons, they provided any information on 'grey income'. The higher the total incomes, the more likely it was that they were underreported. Participants in the interviews and focus groups expressed concern about the increasing share of other incomes and the impact on income inequality within universities. For instance, a professor stated: 'In my opinion, the informal incomes are a major factor driving income inequality in our HE system, because not everyone has the opportunity to access grey income. In fact, most teachers are dependent upon university wages with little chance of earning opportunities outside. This is particularly so for those who are in charge of basic course teaching whose other incomes are even less'. A younger lecturer showed his pay-slip to us: basic wage 1100 yuan, performance related pay, 2500 yuan. 'It is a shame that my income is less than that of a migrant worker in Beijing, although I have a PhD and twenty years teaching experience.'

It is reasonable to assume that people of similar age, qualifications, work - experience and job titles should have similar incomes. However, such an assumption was not supported by the empirical survey. In fact, the income gaps within the same rank were even greater than between ranks (as shown in Table 3.1). Table 3.2 shows an uneven distribution of total incomes among respondents who are of the same rank and divided equally into ten groups according to mean total incomes. Two conclusions can be drawn from Table 3.2. First, it shows the unevenness of income distribution among university teachers measured by both the ratios of standard deviation to mean incomes; and the gaps between group 1 and group 10. Taking professors as an example: the mean of total incomes in top (group 10) is 5.4 times higher than in the bottom (group 1). Secondly, the uneven distribution of incomes is caused by a few people in the top income group (group 10) whose incomes are almost twice as high as the next group (group 9). The existence of such a high income group, although very small in population, gives an image about income distribution in the HE sector that has two negative impacts. For the public, it may lead to the false perception that the incomes of university teachers are very high and comparable with other highly qualified groups. For the vast majority of university teachers it exaggerates the unevenness of income distribution within the universities.

Table 3.2 Distribution of total incomes by academic rank and income group

Variable	Professor	Associate Professor	Lecturers
Mean	124,730	83,624	63,365
Std. Dev.	98,629	48978	50,441
Ratio (%)	79.1	58.6	79.6
Group 1	59,195	42,525	32,126
Group 2	70,302	51146,	41,041
Group 3	77,620	57,437	45,359
Group 4	90,548	62,335	49,686
Group 5	101,350	68,231	52,680
Group 6	110,560	73,377	56,935
Group 7	119,340	81,266	61,887

Group 8	131,030	92,119	68,023
Group 9	156,080	109,330	79,744
Group 10	322,650	174,580	132,720
G 10/G 1	*5.4*	*4.1*	*4.1*

An important factor explaining the uneven distribution of incomes is the university bureaucratic structure which determines the distribution of resources within universities. According to our survey one quarter of professors, holding an administrative post of Head of Department, had incomes of 137,120 yuan per year, compared with 115,600 yuan for those without such an administrative title or duties. For associate professors, the figures were 100,700 yuan for the same post. Furthermore, income from research is related closely to administrative title or rank. For instance, the mean incomes from research were 34,174 yuan for professors with administrative titles and 15,719 yuan for those colleagues without an administrative title. In addition, the higher the administrative rank, the greater the incomes from such research projects. For instance, the mean incomes for all respondents at the level of Head of Department were 11,250 yuan compared with 6,359 yuan at Head of Group (a sub-section of the Department).

Perceptions of the distribution of incomes

This section examines the comments of respondents. In respect of satisfaction with incomes, almost half (49.2%) of respondents said ‘no’ with only 13.6 per cent saying ‘yes’ and a surprisingly high 35.8 per cent as ‘neutral’. Clearly, the number of those dissatisfied was higher than satisfied ones.

From a personal perspective, we asked respondents whether their current income level matched their perceived contribution. 28.9 per cent said ‘matched’ or ‘very matched’, 24.3 per cent were ‘neutral’, with 46.7 per cent saying ‘unmatched’ or ‘very unmatched’. As a result, nearly a half (46.7 %) of respondents feel ‘unfairly treated’ (unmatched), was much higher (15 %) than those who feel ‘fairly treated’ (matched) (28.9 per cent). We note, furthermore, that there were differences among respondents according to rank. Table 3.3 shows that about a half of lecturers or assistant lecturers chose ‘unmatched’, 20 per cent more than professors, as 40 per cent of the latter chose ‘matched.’ Clearly, and not unexpectedly, younger teachers are more sensitive to unfair pay issues than their colleagues in senior ranks.

Table 3.3 Are your incomes matched with your performances (%)?

Job title	Matched	Neutral	Unmatched
Professor	40.2	26.0	33.8
Associate professor	30.2	23.0	46.8
Lecturer or below	23.9	24.7	51.4
Total	28.9	24.3	46.7

We also asked respondents about the income gaps between teachers with administrative titles and ordinary teachers without administrative titles. The result shows that 19.0 per cent of respondents felt the difference was ‘too big’, 34.8 per cent for ‘big’, 40.3 per cent for ‘ok’, with only 3.8 per cent and 1.2 per cent for ‘small’ or ‘very small’ respectively. In other words, over a half of respondents (53.8%) feel the distribution of income to be unfair, 14 per cent higher than those who believe the current system to be acceptable (40 per cent). Furthermore, nearly half (48.1%) of teachers without administrative titles feel it to be unfair, which is 20 per cent higher than those who believe it to be ‘acceptable’ (28.1%). However, surprisingly, among respondents with administrative titles only 30.8 per cent said it was ‘acceptable’, with 44.7 per

cent saying it was 'unfair'. It seems that a large number of respondents with administrative roles are also concerned about unfair distribution of incomes in the HE sector.

It seems that, for the participants in the survey, the distribution pattern of incomes among university teachers was not only an internal matter within the HE sector, but involved a comparison with counterparts in other sectors. For this reason, we asked respondents how their incomes compared with professionals in other sectors. Unsurprisingly, over 60 per cent of respondents said 'unfairly', with only 7.5 per cent saying 'fairly'. Such a high level of dissatisfaction was due to their perception that the average incomes of university teachers, comparative with other sectors, was lower across Beijing. According to official statistics, the mean wages of all employees in both public and private, sectors across Beijing were 65,700 yuan in 2010 (BBS, 2011), about 15 per cent and 40 per cent higher than the average wages of university teachers and lecturers in our survey (57,285 and 49,045 yuan) respectively. In 2011, the mean wages of all employees in Beijing was 75,834yuan, of which, 198,409 yuan for finances, 114,168 yuan for IT services, 101,033yuan for research and development; 84,897 yuan for health, social security, and only 77,566 yuan for education (including HE). Given such comparisons, unsurprisingly, many participants and in particular the younger ones felt that being university teachers was not an economically rewarding job.

Bureaucratisation: An explanation for uneven distribution of incomes in HE sector

A further question arises: why has such an apparently unfair system emerged and been maintained despite the dissatisfaction of large numbers of university teachers, including some with administrative titles? We do not think it can be explained by specific parameters such as

gender, age, qualifications or personal capacity as some scholars have suggested (Wu *et al.*,2005; Zhao,2013). Instead it is explained by the various economic, social, political and cultural factors driving the reform and expansion of China's HE sector since 2000. In particular, we identify *bureaucratisation* as a major factor responsible for the uneven distribution of incomes within universities.

The term 'bureaucratisation' refers to the centralisation of key resources in administrative departments, schools and staff, leading to the marginalisation of the vast majority of teachers. The consequence of bureaucratisation is that the distribution of resources and incomes are skewed to administrative staff, including those academic staff with administrative job titles (Zhao and Zhu, 2010). Bureaucratisation is not, of course, new to China's modern universities which were developed on the Soviet model. What is new is the unexpected scale and impact on university management in an era of marketisation, decentralisation and increasing government investment. This means that senior managers in universities via the administrative departments have much more power to decide or manipulate the allocation of various resources among different departments, disciplines and groups, without a proper procedure of consultation. This has resulted in an uneven distribution of incomes, leading to increasing dissatisfaction among university teachers in general and young teachers in particular (Shi and Zhang, 2012). The process and consequences of bureaucratisation since the expansion of HE sector are shown below.

- Distribution of key resources by the administrative system without academic participation. Universities allocate scarce resources via its administrative departments such as Planning, Personnel, Research and Development, and Teaching, resulting in a total control of university teachers. A good example is the selection and distribution of various government allowances such as 'Yangze Scholarship', 'Trans-Century Talents',

which permit allowance holders to use a large proportion of the funding for personal expenditure. Given the absence of an open and transparent competition, the process has caused contradictions and debates within universities (Wang，2002).

- An uneven distribution of university resources to a few subjects and professors. This is similar to State policy which focussed government investment on a few key universities via its '985' or '211' programmes, a few subjects are selected as university priorities whilst a few senior academic staff with administrative titles become 'super-bosses' who control most of the resources which leaves little for young teachers who depend upon such 'bosses' for research opportunities and publications. The competition is intensified by the connection between project funding and the incomes of project holders and participants (an important part of informal pay or grey income) directly. An interviewee complained: 'Some professors in my view are just like project contractors who do nothing but exploit young colleagues and postgraduate students. For the same project, he may apply and gain financial support from twelve different sources. It is really corrupt indeed!'
- All administrative departments are likely to have their own 'research' budgets, which allow them to do 'research' or to commission academic staff to do so, which induces or academic staff become administrators. This is why informal incomes are more likely to be secured by teachers with administrative titles than those without.

Many consequences follow such bureaucratisation. The most salient is perhaps the erosion of professionalism as nothing is more important than political value or administrative assessment, to which academic research or publications become a means for either a share of resources or for earning more informal income. This is why the access to or distance from the administrative power become key factors determining income distribution among university teachers. Success in access to political resources or administrative power without high professional standards,

however, may not win respect from students, but will instead have a negative impact, because of less attention is paid to teaching students than to ‘research’ or ‘publications.’ Again priority is given to the quantity of research rather than to its quality, contributing to human knowledge and our understanding of the world. It gives a message to students about professionalism and about the reward system in society which erodes the social function or responsibility of universities in terms of social justice in China.

C**onclusion**

The chapter shows the uneven distribution of incomes in Beijing's universities and perceptions of teachers. What conclusions may be drawn from its empirical survey and analysis?

First, the unevenness of income distribution has become a serious issue facing China's HE sector today. This is shown by the income differences among those with the same job rank which is greater than between those with different job ranks. A few people in the top income group have not only distorted the structure of income distribution, but also given a wrong impression about the general level of university teachers' incomes.

Secondly, income inequality in universities is caused mainly by informal incomes which are distributed very unevenly among university teachers. Bearing in mind that no ‘grey income’ was included in the survey, the real situation is even more serious than is shown by our statistics. Abolishing or regularising ‘grey income’ (by increasing transparency of financial management) and reducing the proportion of other informal incomes in total incomes (by increasing of formal incomes) are important tasks for the further reform of the HE sector in China.

Thirdly, income inequality has serious consequences for the younger generation of teachers in universities, not only because they have less resources and opportunities to earn informal or grey incomes, but also because they are facing heavy pressure to access housing markets in Beijing and other major cities of China. It seems that a great increase of basic wages is an important condition for the development of a high standard of professionalism in China, which would enable academics o concentrate on research quality and teaching performance, without worrying too much about informal income.

Fourthly, employment equality or decent work for university teachers, which is related to fair pay or fair distribution of incomes within universities, can hardly be achieved unless the bureaucratisation controlling resources is broken. This requires a development and enhancement of professionalism which emphasises professional standards, quality of research and teaching on the one hand, and collegial procedures, equal opportunity, respect and dignity for all staff on the other. The desire for employment equality is not limited to the HE sector, but requires a political reform in China which would reduce the control of the political system on its organization and direction.

Finally, apart from income distribution and job satisfaction among university teachers, employment equality in its HE sector would influence, directly or indirectly the missions of universities in promoting social justice in the wider society. Further research is needed to identify the links between employment equality, professional standards and the perceptions of students of social justice.

Notes

1. The empirical data used by this chapter is drawn from a questionnaire survey conducted in a number of universities in Beijing. With a theme of income distribution and stimulation mechanism among university teachers, this survey was sponsored by the Education Department of Beijing

Municipal Government, and implemented by a team, including: Professor Zhang Jing, Professor Shi Xiuying, Dr. Li, Junfu, Dr. Zhao Weihua, Dr. Liu Jingwei, and others.

2. The media report at http://epaper.oeeee.com/A/html/2013-03/18/content_1823118.htm, (accessed, 27/8/2014).
3. More online comments on this event are available at http://news.sciencenet.cn/html/comment.aspx?id=275744 (accessed, 27/8/2014)s

References:

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., Yudkevich, M., Androushchak, G. and Pacheco, I. F. (2012),*Paying the professoriate: A global comparison of compensation and contract*, London and New York: Routledge.

Beijing Bureau of Statistics (BBS) (2011), *Annual report of economic-social statistics in Beijing*, online at: http://www.bjstats.gov.cn/

Feng, T. and Xiu, X. (1993), The inner relations and structure of China enterprise which stepping to market economy (in Chinese), *China Social Science*, 3:101-120.

Kaurin, D. and Morgan, W. J. (2014), The changing expectations of education for the professions in post-socialist Serbia: The views of lawyers and of university teachers, *International Journal of Continuous Education and Lifelong Learning*, 16(2): 59-74.

Li, F., Morgan, W. J. and Ding, X. 2011, The labour market for graduates in China, in Morgan, W.J. and Wu, B. (eds), *Higher education reform in China: Beyond the expansion*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 93-108.

Li, K. and Shang, L. (2009), On the external equity: A case study of post subsidy system in colleges and universities (in Chinese), *Journal of Zhejiang Education Institute*, 2:19-25.

Li, Z. (2011), Labour right and protection of teachers: A perspective of decent work (in Chinese)， *Theory and Practice of Education*, 5:30-32.

Liu, J.; Zhang, J.; Li, J., and Zhao, W.(2012), An analysis of the pay satisfaction and its influential factors of university faculty in Beijing—based on the sample survey of 18 universities in Beijing (in Chinese), *Fudan Education Forum*, 2: 72-77.

Liu, W. (2013), Performance appraisal programme was censured that discriminate against teaching staff (in Chinese), *Nanfang City Daily*, 18 March 2013, A20， http://epaper.oeeee.com/A/html/2013-03/18/content_1823118.htm

She, Y.(2001), The influence of income disparity on university staff and countermeasure (in Chinese), *Journal of Architectural Education Institutions of Higher Learning*, 1:69-71.

Shi, X. and Zhang, J. (2012a), Marketization reform of university and university staff, *Beijing Social Development Report* (in Chinese), (2011-2012): 93-112.

Shi, X. and Zhang, J. (2012b), University management and university staff in transformation (in Chinese), *Annual Report on of Beijing Society Building*,(2012):133-154.

Sun, H. (2009), The analysis of uneven of income distribution in China: A institutional perspective (in Chinese),*Study and Exploration*, 1:133-136.

Sun, J. (1996), The cause of perception of unfairness of distribution and it's strategies of adjustment (in Chinese),*Jiangxi Social Science*, 9:60-63.

Tong, L. (2007), Are you happy, university teachers? (in Chinese)*Henan Education*(Higher Education Edition), 7: 8-9.

Wang, C. (2002), How much are incomes of university staff? (in Chinese) *Social Science Weekly*,26 December 2002.

Wang, J.(2012), Analysis of the title structure of college teachers at different levels and types of colleges, A Master Degree Dissertation (in Chinese), Wuhan: Wuhan University of Technology.

Wang, M. and Yu, N. (2014), The cause of graduates civil servants frenzy and countermeasures (in Chinese), *Journal of Changchun University of Science and Technology* (Social Sciences Edition), 2: 172-184.

Wang, P. (2011), Analysis of depth reasons of unfair individual income distribution in China and the Countermeasures (in Chinese), *Journal of China University of Petroleum*(Social Sciences Edition), 1: 51-55.

Wang, X. (1997), Grey income enlarge the gap of income (in Chinese), *China Reform*, 7: 9-12.

Wang, Y. (2011), The sociological analyse of frenzy of register for civil servants examination (in Chinese), *Journal of Changchun University of Technology*(Higher Education Edition), 2: 84-92.

Wu, S., Chen, Q., and Yang, Q. (2005), A survey on teachers' satisfaction for their income in research-led universities(in Chinese), *Science Research Management*, 5:152-156

Xie, X. (2011), University teacher is not a decent profession (in Chinese), *Education*, 35.

Xiong, B. (2010a), Happiness and sorrow for the first choice of graduates employment is SOE (in Chinese), *Career Development*, 18: 25.

Xiong, B.(2010b),There are shady regulations in scholar's income (in Chinese), *People's Tribune*, 27:40-41.

Xu, Y. (2012), Distribution of incomes in China and cause analysis (in Chinese), *Reformation and Strategy*, 10: 30-33

Yang, X. (2010), The Marxist concept of labour and university teacher decent work, *Higher Education Forum*, 8: 97-99.

Zhang, Z. and Mao, J. (2013), Research of scale, structure, lever and affect factors of research income in universities (in Chinese), *Modern Education Management*, 6: 25-30.

Zhao, H. (2009), Decent work and right protection for teaching staff (in Chinese), *Trade Union Tribune*, 4: 54-55.

Zhao, L. and Zhu, J.(2010), China's higher education reform: What has not been changed? *East Asian Policy* 2 (4):115-125.

Zhao, W. (2013),Analysis of factors influencing income distribution in universities: Based on the data of 18 universities in Beijing (in Chinese), *Fudan Education Forum*, 2: 66-67.