

Foreign Accounting Faculty's Career Satisfaction: Evidence from Australia

Amrinder Khosa
Tasmanian School of Business and Economics
University of Tasmania, Australia
Amrinder.khosa@utas.edu.au

Carla Wilkin*
Monash Business School
Monash University, Australia
carla.wilkin@monash.edu

Christophe Van Linden
Oslo Business School
Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway
chlinden@oslomet.no

Balkrushna Potdar
Tasmanian School of Business and Economics,
University of Tasmania, Australia
balkrushna.potdar@utas.edu.au

* corresponding author

Foreign Accounting Faculty's Career Satisfaction: Evidence from Australia

ABSTRACT

This study, exploring diversity in accounting academic faculty, focuses on issues affecting foreign academics' career satisfaction. Our survey of 161 accounting academics in Australian universities shows evidence of diversity, with 40% female and 53% foreign (born outside Australia and originating from 33 countries), of which 56% self-identify as racially under-represented and 7% as LGBTQIA+. Findings show that in general, foreign accounting faculty report more career satisfaction than their Australian-born colleagues, and that this satisfaction is unaffected by variation in cultural distance between country of birth and country of employment. Of importance are organizational support, and the procedural justice component of organizational justice. This implies that at some universities, there is room for improvement with respect to demonstrating how much the institution values the contribution of faculty academics, cares about their well-being, and administers procedures accurately, consistently, and free of bias.

Keywords: career satisfaction; organizational justice; organizational support; foreign accounting faculty

I. INTRODUCTION

Despite the longevity of equality legislation (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2024; Quillian et al., 2019; Schaerer et al., 2023), racial and ethnic inequalities are shown to be a pervasive feature of modern societies (Bécares et al., 2024). In organizations, this discrimination may be evident through workplace bullying and incivility (Ozturk and Berber, 2022), prejudiced performance ratings (Hekman, Johnson, Foo and Yang, 2017), lower compensation, social

exclusion, and/or fewer career opportunities (Pedulla and Pager, 2019). The motivation and consequence of these actions translate as institutional systems of inequality (e.g., Avery, Hall, Preston, Ruggs and Washington, 2023; Walby, 2021). While discrimination exacts significant harm on affected individuals, it is similarly harmful to institutions and organizations. For example, gender biases are shown to have a negative impact on organizational performance (Hardy et al., 2022). When subtly expressed, discrimination is hard to pin down, and remedies equally difficult to enact (Alterman et al., 2021). In contrast, individuals' workplace-belonging is associated with improved job performance (56% increase) and reduced job turnover (Kellerman and Reece, 2023). Similarly, increased racial diversity is associated with better organizational outcomes, such as improved performance (Smulowitz, Becerra and Mayo, 2019; Rafaqat, Rafaqat, Rafaqat and Rafaqat, 2022).

In this context, there are a range of reasons to investigate the issue of discrimination in tertiary educational institutions. Our reasons include the economic importance of these institutions, the evident diversity of academics, and the societal impact of their institutional values through their teaching and research. For example, spending on higher education equated to 2.5% of GDP in the USA, 1.9% in Australia, 2.4% in Canada and 2% in the United Kingdom in 2020 (Statistica, 2024). In Australia, they currently employ approximately 64,434 full-time equivalent academics and 78,826 non-academic (Department of Education, 2024a). In one state of Australia alone (Victoria), the eight public universities “contributed significantly to Australia's economy, directly accounting for AUD 27.4bn in economic activity” in 2023 (University of Melbourne, 2024). In the USA, for the 2022-2023 academic year, one million international students contributed USD 40.1 billion to its economy (Forbes, 2023). In 2023-2024, international education was valued at AUD 51.0 billion to the Australian economy (Department of Education, 2024b).

We focus on accounting academics for three reasons. First, foreign academics now constitute considerable numbers in accounting departments in the USA (Boyle and Hermanson, 2020), Australia (Tharapos, O’Connell, Dellaportas, and Basioudis, 2019), and the UK (Smith and Urquhart, 2018). Second, a recent study of the USA accounting talent shows that diversity is under-represented at executive levels as “[f]or every 10 of the profession’s most senior leaders [in the USA accounting profession], nine are white, eight are male, and few openly identify as LGBTQIA (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, and asexual)” (IMA, 2021, 7). Similarly, a recent Canadian study shows that gaining promotion to professorial status is slower for foreign accounting faculty (Oler, Skousen, Smith, and Talakai, 2022). Third, discrimination related to accounting academics includes some USA minorities¹ being under-represented at faculty level in top ranked institutions and on editorial boards of accounting journals (Brown-Liburd and Joe, 2020). This discrimination will have significant effects, as accounting faculty’s locus of control, role certainty, tenure and university status affect their career satisfaction (Fleischman, Stephenson, Walker and Cook, 2017; Smith, Davis, Malone and Owens-Jackson, 2023).

To appreciate the status and value of diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging (DEIB) in accounting academia requires investigating three challenges, namely “*the structural (e.g., policies, practices), relational (e.g., power dynamics), and individual (e.g., biases, beliefs, assumptions) challenges*” (Brown-Liburd, Ghio, and Roberts, 2022, 1). Accordingly, we focus on accounting academics’ current perceptions of diversity and career satisfaction in university institutions (Rosentstock and Schenkman, 2021). In this manner, we seek to advance “the development and utilization of accounting faculty” (Boyle and Hermanson, 2020, 75). Specifically, we focus on one aspect of diversity, namely foreign academics (being born in a country other than which is their

¹ Black, Hispanic/LatinX, and Native American.

current country of employment²). Our aim is to investigate how they perceive their faculty culture, as well as the professional development and management support that they receive. Accordingly, we pose four research questions:

RQ1: Is there a difference in career satisfaction between foreign accounting faculty and non-foreign accounting faculty?

RQ2: Does intersectionality affect foreign accounting faculty's career satisfaction?

RQ3: Is cultural distance associated with foreign accounting faculty's career satisfaction?

RQ4: Which organizational characteristics affect foreign accounting faculty's career satisfaction?

While acknowledging differences in accounting workplaces, our study is situated in Australia. Besides convenience, the Australian accounting profession exhibits practices consistent with other countries (IFRS, 2021). We control for whether respondents received their highest university degree in a country other than where they are currently employed, as well as for race, gender and sexual orientation. As such, the study extends prior research that has primarily focused on race (Brown-Liburd and Joe, 2020) and/or gender (Callahan, 2018; Campbell, Mehtani, Dozier, and Rinehart, 2013; Weisenfeld and Robinson-Backmon, 2007).

Our findings contribute new knowledge through measuring whether distance in national origin links with career satisfaction, and showing what institutional practices are important for foreign accounting faculty. As foreign employees' diverse knowledge and experiences are important benefits for employers (i.e., Rysakova and Panibratov, 2022), and since career satisfaction is negatively associated with turnover intentions (Fleischman et al., 2017), our findings

² A foreign academic may have citizenship or permanent residency status in their current country of employment.

that foreign accounting faculty have greater career satisfaction than non-foreign faculty, implies higher retention rates of foreign faculty as a benefit to their universities.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The second and third sections detail background to the study, and our research method. Following this, in Section Four we detail the survey results and in Section Five supplementary analyses. We present our discussion in Section 6 and conclusions in Section 7.

II. BACKGROUND

Our study focuses on one aspect of diversity, namely accounting academics who are foreign to Australia as their country of employment. Prior research in the field of labor economics reveals how subtle discrimination affecting foreign employees (Mooten, 2021) may relate to perceived verbal proficiency in the spoken language of their host country, as well as more limited access to social networks (Salleh, Mohi, Nordin, Mohamad, and Razali, 2021; Siebers, 2018). For foreign academics, where under-representation may be reflected in cultural distance (Fiset, Bhave and Jha, 2024), language unfamiliarity is particularly important with respect to workplace policies and performance criteria, as these affect academics' career satisfaction (Mehta and Kaur, 2024).

Aspects of Academics' Roles Affecting Career Satisfaction

Academics' perceptions of their work-related role and performance, which together may significantly affect career satisfaction, are affected by: (1) organizational characteristics; (2) factors in the immediate work environment; and (3) their relationship and exchanges with their peers and leaders (Boamah, Hamadi, Havaei, Smith, and Webb, 2022; Thomas and Gupta, 2021; Tran, 2025).

Organizational characteristics affecting faculty's commitment and career success include how well their organizational workplace is perceived as equitably affording opportunities for training, development and showcasing achievements, as well as supporting them to adjust to the culture evident in their institution (Boamah et al., 2022; Seibert and Kraimer, 2001). In their new institution, perceived cultural differences may affect how social exchanges are conducted, the availability of mentorship, and the willingness of acceptance by peers, i.e., integration (Fiset et al., 2024).

Hence, in their more immediate work environment, academics' career satisfaction is associated with factors such as their work-life balance, workplace interactions, their locus of control, and role certainty (Steenkamp and Roberts, 2020). While satisfaction is shown to be positively associated with time spent on research (Denson, Szelényi and Bresonis, 2018), research and teaching are intrinsic components of academic performance. With teaching and research accountabilities being substantially self-managed, academics' required performance impacts their personal lives (Fleischman et al., 2017).

In this regard, academics' perceptions of roles and career satisfaction are affected by their perceived locus of control. As a perception of how much control academics believe they exert, dissatisfaction is associated with unclear performance criteria, undue influence affecting promotion, and unfair workload allocations (Fleischman et al., 2017). Similarly important is role certainty, which is linked to certainty about work-related duties and responsibilities, as well as clear and consistent guidelines and policies, such as promotion criteria, so that academics are clear about how to perform successfully (Ellinas, Fouad, and Byars-Winston, 2018).

Here, foreign academics may experience insecurities in coping with an unfamiliar environment and its associated effects on identity (Knights and Clarke, 2014). They are likely to

be advantaged by activities that enhance cultural skills and intergroup relations (Ward, Bochner and Furnham, 2020). For example, social support is shown to affect employee engagement among faculty members in public universities in Punjab (Mehta and Kaur, 2024) and Thailand (Kim, Pongsakornrungrungsilp, Pongsakornrungrungsilp, Horam and Kumar, 2023).

Social Exchange Theory

To explore our context, we adopt Social Exchange Theory for several reasons. First, it offers a conceptual framework for investigating reciprocal relationships among individuals and leaders (Cropanzano, Anthony, Daniels and Hall, 2017; Thomas and Gupta, 2021). In particular, the theory recognises the importance of reciprocity and fairness in social exchanges for delivering trust and cooperation, which in turn generate commitment and engagement. Thus, it is relevant to understanding whether our academics perceive their efforts are being fairly regarded (Tran, 2025).

These exchanges between leaders and individuals can build organizational citizenship behavior that fosters a mutually reinforcing culture of continuous learning, collaboration and trust (Yu and Choi, 2016). This benefits both individuals (Sharma, Bajpai and Holani, 2011) and their organization (Tran, 2025). These benefits from individuals' organizational citizenship behavior include improved knowledge and attitudes: benefits from organizations' citizenship behavior include individuals' increased motivation to comply with policies and procedures (Coleman and Borman, 2000). Important are the roles of organizational leaders in ensuring that these exchanges are perceived as fair, transparent and equitable (Cropanzano et al., 2017; Thomas and Gupta, 2021).

Organizational Justice

An important determinant of employees' well-being is organizational justice, which is linked to individuals' perceptions of how fairly they are treated in the workplace (e.g., Colquitt et al., 2013; Malla and Malla, 2023; Törnroos et al., 2019; Tran, 2025). In general, it is perceived in terms of four dimensions, namely: (i) procedural justice; (ii) distributive justice; (iii) interpersonal justice; and (iv) informational justice (Colquitt, Hill and De Cremer, 2023; Hoang, Suh and Sabharwal, 2022). Procedural justice relates to the extent to which an individual perceives they had influence upon an outcome, with procedures that are accurate, consistent and lacking bias (Thibaut and Walker, 1975; Colquitt et al., 2013). Distributive justice, being associated with equity, relates to perceptions that judgments about performance truly and justifiably reflect individuals' work in terms of effort and skills (Törnroos et al., 2019). Interpersonal justice concerns individuals' perceptions of organizational practices and behavior such that they are treated with dignity and respect (Bies and Moag, 1986). Informational justice concerns the perceived fairness by which decisions are enacted, including the truthfulness, thoroughness, and reasonableness of the explanations (Colquitt et al., 2013).

In summary, in terms of Social Exchange Theory, when organizational support and organizational justice are positively perceived, faculty members are likely to reciprocate with greater commitment and job satisfaction.

Intersectionality

Given calls to simultaneously explore multiple dimensions of diversity (i.e., Boyle and Hermanson, 2020; Collins and Bilge, 2020; Hoang et al., 2022), we consider the extent to which the effect of intersectionality (i.e., the different aspects of an individual's identity) can expose them

to problems in social exchanges. In this regard, under-represented foreign faculty may experience counter-productive behaviors affecting their performance and satisfaction. These problem behaviors may include incivility, exclusion from informal networks, aggression, bullying and unfair treatment (Cropanzano et al., 2017). In order to investigate how intersectionality between national origin and other dimensions of diversity links with foreign faculty's perceptions of organizational justice and career satisfaction, we consider the effects of six related variables. These variables are elite vs non-elite institutions, gender, sexual orientation, age, race, and employment status. They align with the diversity dimensions identified by Shore et al. (2009).

Drawing upon prior research related to each variable, their use is considered as follows:

- *Elite vs non-elite institutions* – Elite universities are defined by their excellence in teaching and research but criticized for their lack of staff diversity and racism (Bhopal, 2022). Findings by Fleischman et al. (2017) show that cultural differences between these categories of institutions contribute to career satisfaction (particularly for work-life balance and salary). In our Australian context, we distinguish elite institutions as Go8 universities (as they are most research-intensive Australian universities), and non-elite as non-Go8 universities (The Group of Eight, 2024).
- *Gender* – gender differences are shown as apparent in work issues such as the quality of life (Alves, Oliveira, and Paro, 2019), and performance effects such as uneven representation on editorial boards of accounting journals (Dhanani and Jones, 2017).
- *Sexual orientation* – job satisfaction for gay men is shown to be higher than that for heterosexual men, while lesbians appear to have lower job satisfaction than heterosexual women (Aldén, Hammarstedt and Swahnberg, 2020).

- *Age* – younger academics are more prone to stress (Horta, Jung, Zhang, and Postiglione, 2019).
- *Race* – under-represented minorities achieve research contributions comparable with all faculty, but fewer leadership roles in accounting journals (Brown-Liburd and Joe, 2020).
- *Employment status (permanent versus fixed term)* – the differences between tenured and non-tenured academics vary (Fleischman et al., 2017).

III. RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

In developing the survey instrument, where possible dimensions and items from prior instruments were used, with some modifications to improve relevance to our Australian context.

Our instrument comprised four sections, namely:

- Section 1 – organizational size and characteristics including: perceived organizational support (Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli, 2001); and organizational justice (Colquitt, 2001)³;
- Section 2 – perceptions regarding career satisfaction, work-life balance between research; teaching and personal life, locus of control, and role certainty (Fleischman et al., 2017);
- Section 3 – respondents' demographics and background, including age, race, sexual orientation, country of birth, where highest degree is awarded, academic position, teaching experience and research output; and
- Section 4 – three optional questions about best practices and/or challenges that the respondent perceives are affecting integration of diverse academics into their university.

³ The items were tailored by adjusting the wording from second to first person (i.e., Alterman et al., 2021).

he survey instrument is detailed in Table A of Appendix A. Where items sought perceptual data, a seven-point Likert scale is used⁴. Other questions (such as age and publications) require respondents to select a box from a list of options. Where appropriate, some items were reverse scored. In exploring the data, we proxy for cultural distance in terms of:

- the six dimensions of national culture developed by Hofstede, Pedersen, and Hofstede (2002);
- use of English as the first language, including at home; and
- geographical distance between the country of birth and employment.

In the pre-pilot stage, feedback from four colleagues generated some refinements to the survey. Next, pilot testing⁵ with 28 finance academics showed the constructs to be reliable, since Cronbach's Alphas for all constructs except one⁶ were well above 0.7 (Sharma and Nambudiri, 2020).

Data Collection

Following ethics approval, the voluntary survey was administered via Qualtrics in a manner that preserved confidentiality⁷. After excluding Honorary, Emeritus, and Adjunct Professors, our initial list comprised 688 accounting academics who were identified by their email addresses evident from staff listings on the websites of 40 Australian universities⁸. Later, 25 were excluded for various reasons⁹. Thus, our research sample comprises 663 accounting academics in Australia.

⁴ The Likert scale was 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

⁵ To establish construct validity and reliability.

⁶ The construct, Teaching & Life Interference with Research, was the lowest with a Cronbach Alpha of 0.746.

⁷ Ethics approval includes requirements to protect respondents' confidentiality and manage data ethically.

⁸ 37 public Australian universities, two international, and one private specialty university. This approach was used by Tharapos et al. (2019).

⁹ Six academics declined to participate, having responded that whilst they are in an accounting department, they are not accounting academics. Three recipients' email address no longer existed. Automatic replies were received from 16 academics on extended leave (e.g., long-service, sabbatical, parental or personal leave).

To increase the response rate, one reminder email was sent after two weeks and printed copies of the survey were distributed at an Accounting Educators' Conference in Melbourne¹⁰. In total, 161 completed responses (155 online, 6 paper-based) were received, i.e., a 24.28% response rate. This is higher than recent studies involving accounting faculty as research subjects, i.e., 12% (Burton, Heninger, Summers, and Wood, 2022) and 9.1% (Steenkamp and Roberts, 2020). Regarding non-response bias, no statistically significant differences were noted in the t-test ($t = 0.919$, $p = 0.359$) comparing responses received before the follow-up email with later and hard copy responses.

Model Specification

To investigate RQ1 and RQ2, we use linear regression analysis for the full sample of accounting faculty. We regress accounting faculty's career satisfaction on diversity characteristics and control variables by adopting the following model:

$$\begin{aligned} CareerSatisfaction = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 Foreign + \beta_2 Foreign \times RaceURM + \beta_3 Foreign \times LGBTQIA \\ & + \beta_4 RaceURM + \beta_5 LGBTQIA + Controls + e \end{aligned}$$

Here, Foreign equals 1 if a faculty member is born in a country other than Australia, RaceURM equals 1 if the faculty member self-identifies as a racially under-represented minority (in a similar manner to Brown-Liburd and Joe, 2020) and LGBTQIA+ equals 1 if the faculty member self-identifies as LGBTQIA+. Control variables (see Appendix A for details) are based on prior studies of faculty career satisfaction (Fleischman et al., 2017).

To investigate RQ3 and RQ4, we use linear regression analysis for the subsample of foreign accounting faculty wherein accounting faculty's career satisfaction is regressed on cultural

¹⁰ The conference had an attendance of approximately 100 delegates, although not all were academics.

distance, organizational support, organizational justice and control variables. We adopt the following model:

$$\text{CareerSatisfaction} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{CulturalDistance} + \beta_2 \text{Support} + \beta_3 \text{ProcJust} + \beta_4 \text{DistrJust} + \beta_5 \text{InfJust} + \beta_6 \text{IntJust} + \text{Controls} + e$$

Here, CulturalDistance is a distance measure of Hofstede's (2016) cultural dimensions. It measures the cultural distance between the foreign faculty member's country of birth and Australia, and is calculated in accord with Huang and Crotts (2019). Our test variables for organizational characteristics are organizational support and organizational justice¹¹.

IV. RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for all variables. Of our respondents, 53% are foreign (born in a country outside Australia), and 47% non-foreign (born in Australia). Foreign respondents originate from 33 different countries (see Appendix A, Table B). For the full sample, approximately 40% respondents are female, 31% self-identify as a racially under-represented minority, and 5% self-identify as LGBTQIA+.

¹¹ In line with Rhoades et al. (2001), support is a composite measure of organizational support based on 6 survey questions (see Appendix A). ProcJust, DistrJust, InfJust and IntJust are composite measures of the four dimensions of organizational justice: procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice and interpersonal justice.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics – Full sample

<u>Variables</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Min.</u>	<u>Max.</u>	<u>Mean</u> <u>Foreign</u>	<u>Mean</u> <u>Non-foreign</u>	<u>p-value</u>
CareerSatisfaction	161	4.40	1.28	1.33	6.83	4.77	3.98	0.001 ***
Foreign	161	0.53	0.50	-	1.00			
CulturalDistance	161	1.76	2.29	-	8.30	3.33	-	
Support	161	4.48	1.24	1.00	7.00	4.67	4.27	0.021 **
ProcJust	161	4.73	1.30	1.43	7.00	4.77	4.68	0.323
DistrJust	161	4.90	1.37	1.00	7.00	4.93	4.86	0.372
InfJust	161	4.97	1.55	1.00	7.00	5.06	4.87	0.221
IntJust	161	5.68	1.53	1.00	7.00	5.83	5.53	0.107
LocusControl	161	4.39	1.08	1.33	6.56	4.35	4.44	0.297
RoleCertainty	161	4.78	1.01	1.75	6.88	4.95	4.59	0.011 **
InterfResearch	161	4.34	1.42	1.00	7.00	4.26	4.42	0.027 **
InterfTeachLife	161	3.94	1.55	1.00	7.00	4.16	3.69	0.239
Female	161	0.40	0.49	-	1.00	0.38	0.42	0.283
RaceURM	161	0.31	0.46	-	1.00	0.56	0.03	0.001 ***
LGBTQIA+	161	0.05	0.22	-	1.00	0.07	0.03	0.100
Age	161	3.39	1.06	1.00	5.00	3.05	3.76	0.001 ***
Dependents	161	2.42	1.27	1.00	5.00	2.56	2.25	0.058 *
DegreeOtherCountry	161	0.24	0.43	-	1.00	0.35	0.11	0.001 *
PubsTop	161	2.57	1.11	1.00	5.00	2.66	2.46	0.129
Go8	161	0.37	0.49	-	1.00	0.42	0.32	0.080 *
AcademicPosition	161	4.14	1.15	1.00	6.00	4.06	4.22	0.182
Permanent	161	0.88	0.33	-	1.00	0.93	0.82	0.015 **

Analysis of the mean values of a split sample in Table 1 indicate that foreign faculty score significantly higher on career satisfaction than non-foreign faculty (CareerSatisfaction 4.77 versus 3.98, $p = 0.01$). More foreign faculty members self-identify as racially under-represented minorities (RaceURM 0.56 versus 0.03, $p = 0.01$) compared to the non-foreign faculty subsample. Compared to non-foreign faculty, foreign accounting faculty are younger (3.05 compared to 3.76, $p = 0.01$), perceive greater research interference with teaching and life (InterfTeachLife 4.16 versus 3.69, $p = 0.239$), and more likely to work for a prestigious university (Go8 0.42 versus non-Go8 0.32, $p = 0.080$). Unsurprisingly, foreign faculty are more likely to obtain their highest degree in a country other than Australia (DegreeOtherCountry 0.35 versus non-foreign 0.11, $p = 0.001$).

Univariate Results

Table 2, Panel A presents the Pearson correlation matrix for the variables in the full sample. The correlation between Foreign and CareerSatisfaction equals 0.307 and is significant ($p < 0.05$). None of the VIF scores exceed 1.854 in our regression model for RQ1, indicating no multicollinearity issues (Johnston, Jones and Manley, 2018).

TABLE 2
Panel A: Pearson Correlation Matrix – Full sample*

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>
1. CareerSatisfaction	1.000															
2. Foreign	0.307	1.000														
3. LocusControl	0.435	-0.042	1.000													
4. RoleCertainty	0.577	0.181	0.545	1.000												
5. InterfResearch	-0.257	-0.056	-0.211	-0.169	1.000											
6. InterfTeachLife	-0.258	0.152	-0.253	-0.090	0.514	1.000										
7. Female	-0.068	-0.045	0.016	-0.011	0.128	0.049	1.000									
8. RaceURM	0.162	0.581	-0.120	0.100	0.038	0.193	-0.051	1.000								
9. LGBTQIA+	0.018	0.102	0.003	0.067	-0.020	0.005	-0.127	0.094	1.000							
10. Age	-0.134	-0.340	0.092	-0.051	-0.011	0.034	0.065	-0.271	-0.192	1.000						
11. Dependents	0.159	0.124	0.027	0.101	0.118	0.051	-0.147	0.002	-0.166	-0.027	1.000					
12. DegreeOtherCoun	0.192	0.291	0.082	0.020	-0.154	-0.101	-0.153	0.164	0.075	-0.092	0.083	1.000				
13. PubsTop	0.086	0.090	0.057	0.092	-0.265	0.049	-0.117	-0.003	-0.091	0.134	0.063	0.113	1.000			
14. Go8	0.223	0.111	0.020	0.188	-0.094	-0.002	-0.101	0.038	0.060	-0.038	0.071	0.207	0.013	1.000		
15. AcademicPosition	0.020	-0.072	0.258	0.116	-0.008	-0.136	-0.130	-0.115	-0.152	0.364	0.042	0.113	0.598	0.031	1.000	
16. Permanent	-0.003	0.172	-0.082	-0.002	0.054	-0.024	0.037	0.131	-0.001	-0.238	-0.040	0.076	-0.097	0.018	-0.070	1.000

*Coefficients in bold are significant at $p < 0.05$. All variables are detailed in Appendix A.

Panel B: Pearson Correlation Matrix – Foreign faculty sample*

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>
1. CareerSatisfaction	1.000									
2. CulturalDistance	0.180	1.000								
3. Support	0.580	0.344	1.000							
4. ProcJust	0.607	0.009	0.558	1.000						
5. DistrJust	0.542	0.129	0.683	0.795	1.000					
6. InfJust	0.510	0.110	0.584	0.782	0.708	1.000				
7. IntJust	0.438	0.144	0.534	0.636	0.585	0.840	1.000			
8. LocusControl	0.487	-0.011	0.345	0.444	0.433	0.456	0.427	1.000		
9. RoleCertainty	0.536	0.030	0.653	0.676	0.692	0.605	0.527	0.461	1.000	
10. InterfResearch	-0.365	-0.035	-0.163	-0.166	-0.198	-0.035	0.009	-0.342	-0.101	1.000
11. InterfTeachLife	-0.320	-0.064	-0.098	-0.186	-0.277	-0.023	0.033	-0.147	-0.109	0.573
12. Female	-0.070	-0.159	-0.038	-0.193	-0.125	-0.067	-0.060	0.008	-0.049	0.078
13. RaceURM	-0.041	0.414	0.174	-0.067	0.003	0.046	0.001	-0.191	-0.023	0.101
14. LGBTQIA+	-0.036	0.108	-0.048	0.033	-0.014	-0.044	0.024	0.006	0.049	-0.018
15. Age	-0.006	-0.333	-0.135	-0.062	-0.130	-0.100	-0.184	0.048	-0.058	0.092
16. Dependents	0.236	0.281	0.195	0.026	0.127	-0.012	0.023	0.093	0.127	-0.072
17. DegreeOtherCoun	0.185	-0.053	-0.052	0.013	-0.037	-0.039	-0.136	0.134	-0.101	-0.244
18. PubsTop	0.146	0.112	0.115	0.158	0.075	0.124	0.079	0.086	0.131	-0.232
19. Go8	0.237	0.071	0.225	0.243	0.213	0.245	0.278	0.056	0.170	-0.157
20. AcademicPosition	0.062	-0.136	-0.029	0.009	0.009	-0.041	-0.027	0.257	0.071	-0.025
21. Permanent	-0.124	-0.182	-0.223	-0.236	-0.240	-0.250	-0.208	-0.134	-0.158	0.003

*Coefficients in bold are significant at $p < 0.05$. All variables are detailed in Appendix A.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Panel B: Pearson Correlation Matrix – Foreign faculty sample (continued)*

	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>21</u>
1. CareerSatisfaction											
2. CulturalDistance											
3. Support											
4. ProcJust											
5. DistrJust											
6. InfJust											
7. IntJust											
8. LocusControl											
9. RoleCertainty											
10. InterfResearch											
11. InterfTeachLife	1.000										
12. Female	0.156	1.000									
13. RaceURM	0.193	-0.052	1.000								
14. LGBTQIA+	0.081	-0.119	0.057	1.000							
15. Age	0.145	0.136	-0.127	-0.247	1.000						
16. Dependents	-0.175	-0.204	-0.182	-0.188	0.071	1.000					
17. DegreeOtherCoun	-0.265	-0.117	-0.047	-0.011	-0.035	-0.018	1.000				
18. PubsTop	0.084	-0.067	-0.056	-0.122	0.144	0.156	0.182	1.000			
19. Go8	-0.048	-0.125	-0.064	-0.050	-0.138	0.048	0.114	0.177	1.000		
20. AcademicPosition	-0.081	-0.085	-0.146	-0.139	0.343	0.098	0.138	0.560	0.062	1.000	
21. Permanent	0.020	-0.070	0.036	-0.103	0.013	-0.126	0.011	0.039	0.050	0.139	1.000

*Coefficients in bold are significant at $p < 0.05$. All variables are detailed in Appendix A.

Table 2, Panel B presents the Pearson correlation matrix for the foreign accounting faculty subsample. The correlation between CulturalDistance and CareerSatisfaction equals 0.180 and is significant ($p < 0.05$). The correlation between Organizational Support and CareerSatisfaction equals 0.580 and is significant ($p < 0.05$). The correlation between the four organizational justice variables and CareerSatisfaction is positive and significant ($p < 0.05$). None of the VIF scores exceed 2.159 in our regression model for RQ3 and RQ4, indicating no multicollinearity issues (Johnston et al., 2018).

Foreign Faculty Versus Non-foreign Faculty and Intersectionality

To test RQ1, we regress the respondent's perceived career satisfaction on whether they are foreign or non-foreign and a set of control variables. The results (see Table 3, Panel A) show that foreign accounting faculty have significantly higher career satisfaction (Foreign: $\beta = 0.506$, $p = 0.015$) than non-foreign accounting faculty.

TABLE 3
Regression Results - Career Satisfaction All Faculty

	Panel A: Foreign versus non-foreign faculty				Panel B: Intersectionality			
Variable	β	Stand. B	t-stat.	p-value	β	Stand. B	t-stat.	p-value
Constant	1.668		2.461	0.015 **	1.636		2.397	0.018 **
Foreign	0.506	0.199	2.461	0.015 **	0.460	0.180	2.112	0.036 **
Foreign x RaceURM					0.372	0.134	0.493	0.623
Foreign x LGBTQIA+					0.493	0.073	0.586	0.559
RaceURM	0.134	0.049	0.652	0.515	-0.205	-0.0743	-0.287	0.775
LGBTQIA+	-0.285	-0.049	-0.771	0.442	-0.651	-0.111	-0.890	0.375
LocusControl	0.241	0.203	2.595	0.010 **	0.243	0.205	2.604	0.010 **
RoleCertainty	0.490	0.386	5.064	0.000 ***	0.489	0.385	5.033	0.000 ***
InterfResearch	-0.171	-0.206	-2.751	0.007 ***	-0.179	-0.2166	-2.819	0.006 ***
InterfTeachLife	-0.013	-0.015	-0.192	0.848	-0.007	-0.008	-0.103	0.918
Female	-0.063	-0.024	-0.385	0.701	-0.062	-0.024	-0.376	0.707
Age	-0.016	-0.013	-0.190	0.850	-0.010	-0.008	-0.112	0.911
Dependents	0.077	0.077	1.210	0.228	0.082	0.08115	1.243	0.216
DegreeOtherCountry	0.170	0.057	0.862	0.390	0.186	0.062	0.934	0.352
PubsTop	0.099	0.085	1.060	0.291	0.099	0.086	1.043	0.299
Go8	0.282	0.107	1.709	0.090 *	0.300	0.114	1.787	0.076 *
AcademicPosition	-0.148	-0.133	-1.580	0.116	-0.151	-0.1359	-1.578	0.117
Permanent	-0.142	-0.037	-0.591	0.556	-0.123	-0.032	-0.504	0.615
Adjusted Rsq			0.439				0.433	

*, **, *** indicate coefficients' significance at $p < 0.10$, $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$

To test RQ2, we interact foreign faculty with respondents self-identifying as a racially under-represented minority and with respondents self-identifying as LGBTQIA+. Neither of these interactions are significant (see Table 3 Panel B) and may reflect LGBTQIA+ being only 5% of the total sample.

Cultural Distance

To test RQ3, we regress foreign accounting faculty's career satisfaction on a cultural distance measure based on Hofstede's dimensions of culture (see Appendix A) and the control variables. As indicated in Table 4 Panel A, Hofstede's cultural distance between Australia and the respondent's country of birth is insignificant. As alternative proxies for cultural distance, we

measure whether the respondent's first language is different from English and the geographical distance between Australia and the respondent's country of birth. These two alternative measures show similarly insignificant results (un-tabulated). Therefore, we do not find evidence (RQ3) that variation in cultural distance between country of birth and country of employment affects foreign accounting faculty's career satisfaction.

Organizational Characteristics

To test RQ4, we regress foreign accounting faculty's career satisfaction on perceived organizational support (see Table 4, Panel B) and perceived organizational justice (see Table 4 Panel C). Organizational support is significantly positive (Support: $\beta = 0.307$, $p = 0.009$), suggesting that foreign accounting faculty who feel supported by their institution, experience higher career satisfaction.

TABLE 4
Regression Results - Career Satisfaction Foreign Faculty

<u>Variable</u>	Panel A: Cultural Distance				Panel B: Organizational Support			
	<u>β</u>	<u>Stand. B</u>	<u>t-stat.</u>	<u>p-value</u>	<u>β</u>	<u>Stand. B</u>	<u>t-stat.</u>	<u>p-value</u>
Constant	1.046		1.013	0.314	1.156		1.200	0.234
CulturalDistance	0.089	0.161	1.405	0.165				
Support					0.307	0.328	2.703	0.009 ***
ProcJust								
DistrJust								
InfJust								
IntJust								
LocusControl	0.254	0.229	2.098	0.040 **	0.242	0.218	2.074	0.042 **
RoleCertainty	0.499	0.398	3.881	0.000 ***	0.245	0.196	1.654	0.103
InterfResearch	-0.117	-0.155	-1.254	0.214	-0.084	-0.111	-0.921	0.360
InterfTeachLife	-0.082	-0.102	-0.902	0.370	-0.103	-0.129	-1.173	0.245
Female	0.074	0.030	0.331	0.742	0.027	0.011	0.124	0.902
RaceURM	0.049	0.020	0.197	0.845	0.033	0.014	0.149	0.882
LGBTQIA+	-0.063	-0.014	-0.147	0.884	0.106	0.023	0.255	0.800
Age	0.167	0.138	1.359	0.178	0.137	0.113	1.205	0.232
Dependents	0.080	0.088	0.866	0.390	0.097	0.107	1.178	0.243
DegreeOtherCountry	0.358	0.144	1.538	0.129	0.343	0.137	1.538	0.129
PubsTop	0.029	0.028	0.233	0.816	0.030	0.028	0.253	0.801
Go8	0.302	0.125	1.394	0.168	0.215	0.089	1.016	0.313
AcademicPosition	-0.121	-0.113	-0.977	0.332	-0.107	-0.099	-0.892	0.376
Permanent	0.086	0.018	0.204	0.839	0.153	0.033	0.380	0.705
Adjusted Rsq			0.406				0.447	

*, **, *** indicate coefficients' significance at $p < 0.10$, $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$

Of the four dimensions of organizational justice (see Table 4, Panel C), only procedural justice is significantly positive (ProcJust: $\beta = 0.359$, $p = 0.024$). Therefore, we conclude (RQ4) that organizational support and procedural justice affect foreign accounting faculty's career satisfaction.

TABLE 4 (Continued)
Regression Results - Career Satisfaction Foreign Faculty

<u>Variable</u>	Panel C: Organizational Justice				Panel D: Full model			
	<u>β</u>	<u>Stand. B</u>	<u>t-stat.</u>	<u>p-value</u>	<u>β</u>	<u>Stand. B</u>	<u>t-stat.</u>	<u>p-value</u>
Constant	0.723		0.716	0.477	0.427		0.424	0.673
CulturalDistance					0.071	0.128	1.153	0.253
Support					0.256	0.273	2.049	0.045 **
ProcJust	0.359	0.399	2.311	0.024 **	0.416	0.463	2.753	0.008 ***
DistrJust	-0.070	-0.079	-0.493	0.624	-0.195	-0.220	-1.335	0.186
InfJust	-0.004	-0.006	-0.029	0.977	-0.006	-0.007	-0.038	0.970
IntJust	0.096	0.121	0.749	0.456	0.056	0.070	0.447	0.656
LocusControl	0.155	0.139	1.240	0.219	0.148	0.133	1.227	0.224
RoleCertainty	0.212	0.169	1.361	0.178	0.123	0.098	0.757	0.452
InterfResearch	-0.122	-0.162	-1.345	0.183	-0.071	-0.094	-0.789	0.433
InterfTeachLife	-0.090	-0.112	-0.966	0.337	-0.129	-0.160	-1.405	0.165
Female	0.274	0.112	1.216	0.228	0.240	0.097	1.093	0.279
RaceURM	0.280	0.116	1.328	0.189	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.998
LGBTQIA+	0.097	0.021	0.230	0.819	0.058	0.013	0.143	0.887
Age	0.108	0.089	0.922	0.360	0.142	0.117	1.212	0.230
Dependents	0.197	0.217	2.315	0.024 **	0.134	0.148	1.533	0.130
DegreeOtherCountry	0.365	0.147	1.614	0.111	0.391	0.157	1.783	0.079 *
PubsTop	-0.013	-0.012	-0.102	0.919	-0.090	-0.084	-0.729	0.469
Go8	0.173	0.072	0.810	0.421	0.105	0.044	0.505	0.615
AcademicPosition	-0.051	-0.047	-0.410	0.683	-0.004	-0.004	-0.037	0.970
Permanent	0.267	0.057	0.654	0.516	0.419	0.090	1.048	0.299
Adjusted Rsq			0.456				0.496	

*, **, *** indicate coefficients' significance at $p < 0.10$, $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$

V. SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES

As organizational support and procedural justice are shown to affect foreign accounting faculty's career satisfaction (Boyle and Hermanson, 2020), we reviewed answers to the three open-ended questions in Section 4 of the instrument. These asked about the challenges and best practices for diversifying the academic cohort in the respondent's university. The identified issues include:

reasonable performance goals for promotion (identified by 18 foreign accounting faculty); a stable job design rather than having to cope with increasing workloads (identified by 11 foreign accounting faculty); diverse leadership that supports faculty (identified by 7 foreign accounting faculty); and team building activities (identified by 4 foreign accounting faculty). Faculty training about culture, inclusive language training, DEI (Diversity, Equity and Inclusion) committees, and a DEI officer, are mentioned as important initiatives.

Finally, as a sensitivity check, we impose a bootstrapping technique (Number of samples = 1000, Confidence interval 95%) on our analysis. This did not affect the significance of each of our test variables.

VI. DISCUSSION

In our study that looks at issues affecting foreign academics' career satisfaction in Australian universities, diversity is evident as in our sample, 40% are female and 53% are foreign (born outside Australia and originating from 33 countries), of which 56% self-identify identify as racially under-represented and 7% as LGBTQIA+. By developing our instrument with its range of concepts that are demonstrably important to academics' career satisfaction and job performance, our study sought an integrated perspective of the perceived challenges related to intersectionality and insecurity in accounting academia (Knights and Clarke, 2014).

Findings show that in Australian universities, foreign accounting faculty generally report more career satisfaction than their Australian colleagues, and that variation in cultural distance between country of birth and country of employment does not affect career satisfaction. Of interest is that in comparison with their Australian counterparts (see Table 1), foreign faculty have higher perceptions of organizational support and justice, role certainty and how teaching interferes with

research and life. While both groups' perceptions of fairness regarding promotion and salary (the locus of control) are similar, the lower scores for the non-foreign group about how research interferes with teaching and life are interesting. In highlighting these differences, our findings nuance prior research showing that a lack of balance between work and personal life affects academics' job stability and career satisfaction (Boamah et al., 2022). Our findings may reflect the importance accorded by foreign faculty to research output for career success (see Denson et al., 2018), or a difference in career orientation and/or the stage of career as foreign faculty are younger (see Table 1).

Whilst organizational justice is typically regarded as an important determinant of employee well-being and career satisfaction (e.g., Colquitt et al., 2013; Hoang et al., 2022), our findings offer new insights. Of its four dimensions, only procedural justice is significantly positive. This suggests that while foreign faculty positively regard communication and treatment by the department head (informational and interpersonal justice) and performance appraisal (distributive justice), they perceive the need for improvement regarding procedural justice. Since this dimension encompasses perceptions that procedures should be accurate, consistent, and lacking bias (Thibaut and Walker, 1975; Colquitt et al., 2013), findings should be interpreted in the context of foreign faculty's lower mean scores regarding support (mean 4.48, SD 1.24) and locus of control (mean 4.39, SD 1.08). Together these findings contribute knowledge regarding the relative importance of procedural and distributive justice (Alterman et al., 2021).

Findings about foreign faculty's higher career satisfaction are driven by foreign faculty who do not self-identify as racially under-represented or LGBTQIA+. This suggests some issues with inclusivity and belonging and that the intersectionality between DEIB is more nuanced than simply being attributable to cultural distance. However, since language unfamiliarity and country of birth

are not shown as significant factors, addressing issues that affect this group requires more nuanced organizational support.

Policy Implications for University Administrators

Responses from foreign faculty suggest some need to foster diverse leadership and team building activities to enhance integration, belonging and career satisfaction. Our findings showing the importance of organizational support suggest benefit from more faculty training about culture and inclusive language training to ensure a more integrated workplace. Our findings showing the importance of procedural justice suggest benefit from universities implementing formalized mentorship programs, ensuring equitable access to research funding, ensuring a stable job design with transparent workload models and performance goals, and establishing diversity oversight committees that actively track faculty career progression.

VII. CONCLUSION

Despite continued growth in foreign accounting faculty, to the best of our knowledge, our research is the first to focus on their perceptions of career satisfaction. Racial and ethnic inequalities are a pervasive feature of modern societies (Bécares et al., 2024) with discrimination evident as workplace bullying and incivility (Ozturk and Berber, 2022), prejudiced performance ratings (Hekman et al., 2017), actual lower compensation, social exclusion, and fewer career opportunities (Pedulla and Pager, 2019). The consequences translate as institutional systems of inequality (e.g., Avery et al., 2023; Walby, 2021). This discrimination exacts significant harm on both affected individuals and their institutions through decline in morale and decreased productivity (Heiserman and Simpson, 2023). When expressed through subtle means,

discrimination is hard to pin down, with remedies equally difficult to enact (Alterman et al., 2021). In this context, our motivation to investigate the issue of discrimination in tertiary educational institutions relates to the evident diversity of their academics and the economic importance of these institutions.

In our study that investigates what foreign faculty in accounting departments at Australian universities perceive as affecting their career satisfaction, findings show no effect of variation in cultural distance between country of birth and country of employment. As previous studies (Piekkari, Vaara, Tienari and Santti, 2005) indicate that workplace climate and mentorship opportunities may mediate this relationship, future research could explore these mediating effects. Given an important benefit for employers is foreign employees' diverse knowledge and experiences (i.e., Rysakova and Panibratov, 2022), and evidence that career satisfaction is negatively associated with turnover intentions (Fleischman et al., 2017), foreign accounting faculty's increased career satisfaction suggests that their higher retention rates is an additional benefit to universities. Further, we provide insights regarding how intersectionality between national origin and other dimensions of diversity links with foreign accounting faculty's perceptions of organizational justice and career satisfaction. These findings differ from prior research indicating that racial and sexual minorities in academia experience higher workplace discrimination and exclusion from leadership roles (Brown-Liburd and Joe, 2020).

There are some limitations to our findings. First, results are based on quantitative data and could be enhanced through qualitatively exploring these matters. This may include exploring factors affecting the career satisfaction of foreign accounting faculty who self-identify as racially under-represented or LGBTQIA+. Second, although diversity issues are reported for accounting faculty in the USA and Canada (Rosentstock and Schenkman, 2021; Brown-Liburd and Joe, 2020;

Oler et al., 2022), our focus on accounting faculty in Australian universities limits the generalizability of our findings.

In summary, our study contributes to the literature by documenting the national origin of Australian accounting faculty and measuring whether this distance in national origin links with career satisfaction and perceived organizational justice. As such, our study provides insights concerning the institutional support perceived as important by foreign accounting faculty.

REFERENCES

- Aldén, L., Hammarstedt, M., and H. Swahnberg. 2020. Sexual orientation and job satisfaction: survey-based evidence from Sweden. *Journal of Labor Research* 41: 69-101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12122-019-09297-w>
- Alterman, V., P. Bamberger, M. Wang, J. Koopman, E. Belogolovsky, and J. Shi. 2021. Best not to know: pay secrecy, employee voluntary turnover, and the conditioning effect of distributive justice. *Academy of Management Journal* 64(2): 482-508. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2019.0231>
- Alves P.C., A. de F. Oliveira, and H.B.M. da S. Paro. 2019. Quality of life and burnout among faculty members: How much does the field of knowledge matter? PLoS ONE 14(3): e0214217.
- Australian Human Rights Commission. 2024. [An Anti-Racism Framework: Experiences and perspectives of multicultural Australia](https://humanrights.gov.au/our-work/race-discrimination/publications/anti-racism-framework-perspectives-multicultural). At <https://humanrights.gov.au/our-work/race-discrimination/publications/anti-racism-framework-perspectives-multicultural>
- Avery, D.R., A.V. Hall, M. Preston, E.N. Ruggs, and E. Washington. 2023. Is justice colorblind? A review of workplace racioethnic differences through the lens of organizational justice. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10(1): 389-412.
- Bécares, L., H. Taylor, J. Nazroo, D. Kapadia, N. Finney, N. Begum, and N. Shlomo. 2024. The persistence and pervasiveness of racial discrimination in Great Britain: capturing experienced racial discrimination over time and life domains. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2024.2372043>
- Bhopal, K. 2022. Academics of colour in elite universities in the UK and the USA: The ‘unspoken system of exclusion’. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(11), 2127-2137.

- Bies, R.J., and J.S. Moag. 1986. Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations* 1(1): 43–55.
- Boamah, S.A., H.Y. Hamadi, F. Havaei, H. Smith, and F. Webb. 2022. Striking a Balance between Work and Play: The Effects of Work–Life Interference and Burnout on Faculty Turnover Intentions and Career Satisfaction. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19(2): 809. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19020809>
- Boyle, D., and D. Hermanson. 2020. Research initiatives in accounting education: developing and utilizing faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education* 35(4): 75-86. <https://doi.org/10.2308/ISSUES-2020-015>
- Brown-Liburd, H., A. Ghio, and A.A. Roberts. 2022. Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Belonging Practice Problems of Real Consequence. *Accounting Horizons*. At aaahq.org/portals/0/documents
- Brown-Liburd, H. and J. Joe, 2020. Research initiatives in accounting education: toward a more inclusive accounting academy. *Issues in Accounting Education* 35(4): 87-110. <https://doi.org/10.2308/ISSUES-2020-059>
- Burton, F.G., W.G. Heninger, S.L. Summers, and D.A. Wood. 2022. Accounting Academics' Perceptions of 12 Research Journals. *Issues in Accounting Education* 37(3): 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.2308/ISSUES-2021-038>
- Callahan, C.M., 2018. Self-reflective insights on what I have learned in an evolving academic career model: accounting scholarship, administration and diversity. *Issues in Accounting Education* 33(3): 5-16. <https://doi.org/10.2308/iace-52145>
- Campbell, L.G., Mehtani, S., Dozier, M.E. and J. Rinehart, 2013. Gender-heterogeneous working groups produce higher quality science. *PLoS ONE* 8(10): 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0079147>
- Collins, P.H., and S. Bilge. 2020. Intersectionality. 2nd edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Coleman, V.I., and W.C. Borman. 2000. Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(1): 25–44.
- Colquitt, J.A., 2001. On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86: 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>

- Colquitt, J.A., E.T., Hill, and D. De Cremer. 2023. Forever focused on fairness: 75 years of organizational justice in Personnel Psychology. *Personnel Psychology*, 76(2): 413-435.
- Colquitt, J. A., B.A. Scott, J.B. Rodell, D.M. Long, C.P. Zapata, D.E, Conlon, and M.J. Wesson. 2013. Justice at the millennium, a decade later: a meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *The Journal of Applied Psychology* 98(2): 199–236. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031757>
- Cropanzano, R., E.L. Anthony, S.R. Daniels, and A.V. Hall. 2017. Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1): 479-516.
- Denson, N., K. Szelényi, and K. Bresonis. 2018. Correlates of Work-Life Balance for Faculty Across Racial/Ethnic Groups. *Research in Higher Education*, 59(2): 226–247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9464-0>
- Department of Education. 2024a. *Selected Higher Education Statistics | Staff Summary, Full-Time Equivalence by Selected Categories*. <https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoibGZkNmUyZGZlMmY1MC00Nzk3LWI4OTMtNmI0MDkyYzAyOGM4IiwidCI6ImRkMGNmZDE1LTQ1NTgtNGIxMi04YmFkLWVhMjY5ODRmYzQxNyJ9>
- Department of Education. 2024b. *Education Export Income – Financial Year*. At <https://www.education.gov.au/international-education-data-and-research/education-export-income-financial-year>
- Dhanani, A., and M. J. Jones, 2017. Editorial boards of accounting journals: gender diversity and internationalisation. *Accounting, auditing & accountability journal* 30(5): 1008-1040. DOI 10.1108/AAAJ-08-2014-1785
- Ellinas, E. H., N. Fouad, A. Byars-Winston. 2018. Women and the decision to leave, linger, or lean in: predictors of intent to leave and aspirations to leadership and advancement in academic medicine. *Journal of Women's Health* 27(3): 324-332. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2017.6457>
- Fiset, J., D.P. Bhawe, N. Jha. 2024. The effects of language-related misunderstanding at work. *Journal of Management*, 50(1): 347-379.
- Fleischman, G., Stephenson, T., Walker, K., and K. Cook, 2017. Factors that influence accounting faculty career satisfaction: comparisons by program prestige and tenure status. *Accounting Horizons* 31(3): 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.2308/acch-51713>

- Forbes. 2023. *One Million International Students Contributed \$40 Billion To U.S. Economy*. At <https://www.forbes.com/sites/annaesakismith/2023/11/13/one-million-international-students-contributed-40-billion-to-us-economy/>
- Hardy III, J.H., K.S. Tey, W. Cyrus-Lai, R.F. Martell, A. Olstad, and E.L. Uhlmann. 2022. Bias in context: Small biases in hiring evaluations have big consequences. *Journal of Management*, 48(3): 657-692.
- Heiserman, N., and B. Simpson. 2023. Discrimination reduces work effort of those who are disadvantaged and those who are advantaged by it. *Nature Human Behaviour* 7(11):1-9
- Hekman, D. R., S.K. Johnson, M.D. Foo, and W. Yang. 2017. Does diversity-valuing behavior result in diminished performance ratings for non-white and female leaders?. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(2): 771-797.
- Hoang, T., J. Suh, and M. Sabbharwal, 2022. Beyond a Numbers Game? Impact of Diversity and Inclusion on the Perception of Organizational Justice. *Public Administration Review* 82(3): 537–555. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13463>
- Hofstede, G.J., Pedersen, P.B. and G. Hofstede. 2002. *Exploring Culture*. Intercultural Press Inc.
- Hofstede, G. 2016. *National Culture*. Hofstede Insights Available at <https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture>
- Horta, H., J. Jung, L.F. Zhang, G.A. Postiglione. 2019. Academics' job-related stress and institutional commitment in Hong Kong universities. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 25: 327-348.
- Huang, S., and J. Crofts. 2019. Relationships between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and tourist satisfaction: A cross-country cross-sample examination. *Tourism Management* 72: 232-241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.12.001>
- IFRS. 2021. *Why global accounting standards?*. At <https://www.ifrs.org/use-around-the-world/why-global-accounting-standards/>
- IMA (Institute of Management Accountants). 2021. *Diversifying U.S. Accounting Talent: A Critical Imperative to Achieve Transformational Outcomes* At <https://www.imanet.org/insights-and-trends/the-future-of-management-accounting/diversifying-us-accounting-talent-a-critical-imperative-to-achieve-transformational-outcomes?ssopc=1>

- Johnston, R., Jones, K., and D. Manley. 2018. Confounding and collinearity in regression analysis: a cautionary tale and an alternative procedure, illustrated by studies of British voting behaviour. *Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology* 52:1957-1976. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0584-6>
- Kellerman, G.R., and Reece, A. 2023. The Value of Belonging at Work: Investing in Workplace Inclusion. At <https://grow.betterup.com/resources/the-value-of-belonging-at-work-the-business-case-for-investing-in-workplace-inclusion-event>
- Kim, L., P. Pongsakornrungrungsilp, S., Pongsakornrungrungsilp, N. Horam, & V. Kumar. 2023. Key determinants of job satisfaction among university lecturers. *Social Sciences*, 12(3): 153. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12030153>
- Knights, D., and C.A. Clarke. 2014. It's a Bittersweet Symphony, this Life: Fragile Academic Selves and Insecure Identities at Work. *Organization Studies* 35(3): 335-357. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613508396>
- Malla, S.S., and S. Malla. 2023. Does the perception of organizational justice determine employees' affective commitment? The mediating role of organizational trust. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 30(2): 603-627.
- Mehta, P., and H. Kaur. 2024. Investigating the Relationship Between Perceived Organisational Support and Employee Engagement in Public Universities: Moderating Impact of Gender and Designation. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2024.2359465>
- Mooten, N. 2021. *Racism, discrimination and migrant workers in Canada: Evidence from the literature*. Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada= Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada.
- Oler, D., C. Skousen, K. Smith, and J. Talakai. 2022. An international comparison of the academic accounting professoriate. *Accounting Perspectives* 21(1): 131-146. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3838.12271>
- Ozturk, M.B., and A. Berber. 2022. Racialised professionals' experiences of selective incivility in organisations: A multi-level analysis of subtle racism. *Human Relations*, 75(2): 213-239.
- Pedulla, D.S., and D. Pager. 2019. Race and networks in the job search process. *American Sociological Review*, 84(6): 983-1012.

- Piekkari, R., E. Vaara, J. Tienari, and R. Santti. 2005. Integration or disintegration? Human resource implications of a common corporate language decision in a cross-border merger. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 16: 330– 344.
- Quillian, L., A. Heath, D. Pager, A. H. Midtbøen, F. Fleischmann, and O. Hexel. 2019. Do some countries discriminate more than others? Evidence from 97 field experiments of racial discrimination in hiring. *Sociological Science*, 6: 467-496.
- Rafaqat, S., S. Rafaqat, S. Rafaqat, D. Rafaqat. 2022. The impact of workforce diversity on organizational performance: a review. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 14(2 J): 39-50.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., and S. Armeli. 2001. Affective Commitment to the Organization: The Contribution of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86: 825-836. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.825>
- Rosentstock J., and M. Schenkman. 2021. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in the Accounting Profession. The CPA Journal. At <https://www.cpajournal.com/2021/10/29/diversity-equity-and-inclusion-in-the-accounting-profession/>
- Rysakova, L., and A. Panibratov. 2022. Leveraging Diaspora Opportunities for Destinations: The Triadic Bonds to Global Ethnic Diversity Analysis. In Latukha, M. (Ed.) *Diversity in Action* (pp. 169-179). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Salleh, M. M., Z. Mohi, N. Nordin, N.A. Mohamad, N.A.S. Razali, 2021. The impact of language barriers and discrimination issues on work productivity of foreign workers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(16): 42-52.
- Schaerer, M., C. Du Plessis, M.H.B. Nguyen, R.C. Van Aert, L. Tiokhin, D. Lakens, and Gender Audits Forecasting Collaboration. 2023. On the trajectory of discrimination: A meta-analysis and forecasting survey capturing 44 years of field experiments on gender and hiring decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 179: 104280.
- Seibert, S.E., M. L. Kraimer. 2001. The Five-Factor Model of Personality and Career Success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 58 (1): 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1757>
- Sharma, A., and Nambudiri, R. 2020. Work engagement, job crafting and innovativeness in the Indian IT industry. *Personnel Review* 49(7): 1381-1397. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2019-0607>

- Sharma, J.P., N. Bajpai, and U. Holani. 2011. Organizational citizenship behavior in public and private sector and its impact on job satisfaction: A comparative study in Indian perspective. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(1): 67.
- Shore, L., B. Chung-Herrera, M. Dean, K. Holcombe Ehrhard, D. Jung, A. Randel, and G. Singh. 2009. Diversity in organizations: Where are we now and where are we going? *Human Resource Management Review* 19(2): 117–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.10.004>
- Siebers, H. 2018. When nationalism meets soft skills: Towards a comprehensive framework for explaining ethno-migrant inequality in the Dutch labour market. In C. Rijken, and T. de Lange (Eds.), *Towards a decent labour market for low waged migrant workers*, Amsterdam University Press, pp. 247-266.
- Smith, K.W., M. Davis, C. Malone, and L. Owens-Jackson. 2023. Faculty that Look Like Me: An Examination of Historically Black Colleges and Universities Accounting Faculty Motivation and Job Satisfaction. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 38(1): 35-58.
- Smith, S. J., and V. Urquhart, 2018. Accounting and finance in UK universities: Academic labour, shortages and strategies. *The British Accounting Review* 50 (6): 588-601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2018.03.002>
- Smulowitz, S., M. Becerra, and M. Mayo. 2019. Racial diversity and its asymmetry within and across hierarchical levels: The effects on financial performance. *Human Relations*, 72(10): 1671-1696.
- Statista 2024. *Expenditure on higher education as a share of GDP in selected countries worldwide in 2020, by source of funding*. At <https://www.statista.com/statistics/707557/higher-education-spending-share-gdp/>
- Steenkamp, N., and R. Roberts. 2020. Does workload and institutional pressure on accounting educators affect academia at Australian universities? *Accounting & Finance* 60 (1): 471-506. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12340>
- Tharapos, M., B. T. O'Connell, S. Dellaportas and I. Basioudis. 2019. Are accounting academics culturally intelligent?: An empirical investigation. *The British Accounting Review* 51(2): 111-129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2018.08.002>
- The Group of Eight 2024. *Australia's Leading Universities, leading excellence, leading debate*. At <https://go8.edu.au/>

- Thibaut, J.W., and L. Walker. 1975. *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thomas, A., and V. Gupta. 2021. Social capital theory, social exchange theory, social cognitive theory, financial literacy, and the role of knowledge sharing as a moderator in enhancing financial well-being: from bibliometric analysis to a conceptual framework model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12: 664638.
- Törnroos, M., M. Elovainio, T. Hintsala, M. Hintsanen, L. Pulkki-Råback, M. Jokela,... and L. Keltikangas-Järvinen. 2019. Personality traits and perceptions of organisational justice. *International Journal of Psychology* 54 (3): 414-422. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12472>
- Tran, Q.H.N. 2025. Exploring relationships among leadership behaviors, organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice and person–organization fit in Vietnamese academic libraries. *The Learning Organization*, 32(3): 479-502.
- University of Melbourne. 2024. *Economic Impact of Victoria's Public Universities*. At https://www.unimelb.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/4994333/SPP-Economic-Impact-Assessment-of-Victorian-Universities-external.pdf
- Walby, S. 2021. Developing the concept of society: Institutional domains, regimes of inequalities and complex systems in a global era. *Current Sociology*, 69(3): 315-332.
- Ward, C., S. Bochner, and A. Furnham. 2020. *The Psychology of Culture Shock*. Routledge.
- Weisenfeld, L.W. and I.B. Robinson-Backmon. 2007. Accounting faculty perceptions regarding diversity issues and academic environment. *Issues in Accounting Education* 22 (3): 429-445. <https://doi.org/10.2308/iace.2007.22.3.429>
- Yu, P.S., and H.S. Choi. 2016. The effect of a librarian's organizational commitment and organization citizenship behavior on organizational effectiveness. *Journal of the Korean Society for Information Management*, 33(2): 7–32.

Table A: The survey instrument

Dependent Variable	Explanation	Alpha	Source
CareerSatisfaction	Composite measure of career satisfaction based on following 6 survey questions: 1. I am very satisfied with being an academic at my university. 2. I am satisfied with my work as an academic. 3. I recommend to my students that they get a doctorate and become an academic. 4. Most academics I know are very satisfied with their career choice. 5. Most academics I know often think about quitting this profession.* 6. I frequently think about quitting the academic profession.*	0.857	Fleischman et al. (2017)
Test Variables	Explanation	Alpha	Source
Foreign	Equal to 1 if the respondent's country of birth does not equal Australia, 0 otherwise.		Self-constructed
RaceURM	Equal to 1 if the respondent self-identifies with a racially under-represented minority.		Self-constructed based on Brown-Liburd and Joe (2020)
LGBTQIA+	Equal to 1 if the respondent self-identifies as LGBTQIA+.		Self-constructed
CulturalDistance	Distance measure of Hofstede's (2016) cultural dimensions which measures the cultural distance between the foreign faculty member's country of birth and Australia calculated in line with Huang and Crofts (2019).		Huang and Crofts (2019)
Support	Composite measure of organizational support based on following 6 survey questions: 1. My university takes pride in my accomplishments. 2. My university really cares about my well-being. 3. Help is available from my university when I have a problem (i.e., counselling). 4. My university strongly considers my goals and values. 5. My university shows little concern for me.* 6. My university is willing to help me if I need a special favor.	0.881	Rhoades et al. (2001)
ProcJust	Composite measure of procedural justice based on following 7 survey questions: 1. During my performance evaluation, I was able to express my views and feelings. 2. During my performance evaluation, I had some influence over the outcome that was arrived at. 3. During my performance evaluation, the procedures used were applied consistently. 4. During my performance evaluation, the procedures used are free of bias. 5. During my performance evaluation, the procedures used are based on accurate information. 6. During my performance evaluation, if required, I am able to appeal the outcome of my performance evaluation. 7. During my performance evaluation, the procedures used uphold ethical and moral standards.	0.919	Colquitt (2001)
DistrJust	Composite measure of distributive justice based on following 5 survey questions: 1. My performance appraisal reflects the effort I have put into my work. 2. My performance appraisal is appropriate given the work I have completed. 3. My performance appraisal reflects what I have contributed to the organisation. 4. My performance appraisal is regarded by me as justified, given my performance. 5. My performance appraisal is unfair and inequitable.*	0.911	Colquitt (2001)
InfJust	Composite measure of informational justice based on following 5 survey questions: 1. My department head is candid in his/her communication with me. 2. My department thoroughly explains the procedures used in my performance evaluation. 3. My department head provides reasonable explanations regarding the procedures used in my performance evaluation. 4. My department head communicates details regarding my performance evaluation in a timely manner. 5. My department head tailors his/her communication to the specific needs of each individual.	0.945	Self-constructed based on Colquitt (2001) Item 5 was added by the authors
IntJust	Composite measure of interpersonal justice based on following 4 survey questions: 1. My department head treats me in a polite manner. 2. My department head treats me with dignity. 3. My department head treats me with respect. 4. My department head refrains from making improper remarks or comments to others.	0.961	Colquitt (2001)

Table A: The survey instrument (continued)

Control Variables	Explanation	Alpha	Source
LocusControl	Composite measure of locus of control based on following 9 survey questions: 1. In order to get a really good job, you need to have friends in high positions.* 2. Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune.* 3. I understand what is required to get promoted. 4. My current workload is conducive to getting promoted in a reasonable timeframe. 5. When it comes to landing a really good job, who you know is more important than what you know.* 6. To make a lot of money, you have to know the right people.* 7. In most departments, it takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding academic.* 8. People who regularly publish quality papers in good journals generally get rewarded. 9. The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make little money is luck.*	0.823	Self-constructed based on Fleischman et al. (2017) and Spector (1988). Items 3 and 4 were added by the authors.
RoleCertainty	Composite measure of role certainty based on following 8 survey questions: 1. For my current position, I have clear, planned goals and objectives about research and teaching. 2. I know exactly what my research responsibilities are. 3. I know exactly what my teaching responsibilities are. 4. I know exactly what my service/engagement responsibilities are. 5. I know exactly what I need to do to meet my department/faculty's research standards. 6. The tenure and promotion standards at my department/faculty are clear. 7. The tenure and promotion standards at my department/faculty are consistently and predicably applied. 8. Promotion and tenure policies have changed significantly in the last five years.*	0.824	Fleischman et al. (2017) and Rizzo et al. (1970). Items 3,4 and 6 were added by the authors.
InterfResearch	Composite measure of teaching and life interference with research based on following 4 survey questions: 1. My personal demands are so high that it takes away from my research. 2. My home life frequently keeps me from spending the amount of time I would like to spend on my research. 3. I find it difficult to balance my time between teaching and research. 4. My teaching takes too much time away from my research.	0.746	Fleischman et al. (2017)
InterfTeachLife	Composite measure of research interference with teaching and life based on following 4 survey questions: 1. My research frequently keeps me from spending the amount of time I would like to spend with my family or other outside interests. 2. My family/friends dislike how often I am preoccupied with my research while I am at home. 3. My research takes up time that I would like to spend with family/friends. 4. My research takes too much time away from my teaching.	0.866	Fleischman et al. (2017)
Female	Equal to 1 if female respondent, 0 otherwise.		Fleischman et al. (2017)
Age	Categorical variable based on survey question about age (1: 20-29 years old; 2: 30-39 years old; 3: 40-49 years old; 4: 50-60 years old; 5: +60 years old).		Self-constructed based on Fleischman et al. (2017)
Dependents	Equals to 1 if the respondent has 1 or more dependents, 0 otherwise.		Self-constructed based on Fleischman et al. (2017)
DegreeOtherCountry	Equals to 1 if respondent earned highest degree outside Australia, 0 otherwise.		Self-constructed
PubsTop	Categorical variable based on survey question number of publications in ABDC A or A*-ranked journals in the past five years (1: 0; 2: < 5; 3: 5-10; 4: 10-15; 5: >15).		Self-constructed based on Fleischman et al. (2017)
Go8	Equals to 1 if respondent is employed at a university part of the Group of Eight (https://go8.edu.au/), 0 otherwise.		Self-constructed
Permanent	Equals to 1 if respondent is employed on a permanent full-time basis, 0 otherwise.		Self-constructed based on Fleischman et al. (2017)

Table B: Frequency table – Country of birth

<u>Country</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Afghanistan	2
Albania	1
Australia	76
Bangladesh	2
Brazil	1
China	15
Croatia	1
Denmark	1
Egypt	1
Fiji	3
Germany	3
Ghana	1
Hong Kong (S.A.R.)	2
India	2
Indonesia	5
Iran	2
Luxembourg	1
Madagascar	1
Malaysia	7
Monaco	1
New Zealand	3
Pakistan	2
Russian Federation	1
Samoa	1
Singapore	1
Slovakia	1
South Africa	4
Sri Lanka	2
Sweden	1
Thailand	3
Turkey	1
United Kingdom	8
United States of America	4
Vietnam	1
Total	161