DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 293 HE 027 310

AUTHOR McInnis, Craig
TITLE Academic Values under Pressure. Centre for the Study of Higher Education Research Working Papers, 93.3.
INSTITUTION Melbourne Univ. (Australia). Centre for the Study of Higher Education.
REPORT NO ISSN-1320-8438
PUB DATE Sep 93
NOTE 36p.; For related documents, see HE 027 308-318.
AVAILABLE FROM Department Secretary, Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria 3052 Australia ($5 Australian).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Admission Criteria; *College Admission; College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; *Equal Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Selective Admission; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Australia

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an account of individual and collective academic values under the pressure of government policy for social equity in selective admissions at one Australian university. A survey of faculty (N=93) from Law, Social Work, Science, and Architecture identified their goals related to the goals of the university and fairness in selective admissions. At a level of generality, the faculty in the sample could comfortably entertain values of both equity and excellence. They generally shared a preference for academic excellence but not at any price. Seventy-two percent of the sample agreed that the goal of student selection should be directed to maintaining academic values and excellence in courses. Although 54 percent of the sample agreed that higher education should be seen as an investment in the productive capacity of individuals, only 43 percent agreed that universities should select those students most likely to contribute productively to society. Faculty across the disciplines were in favor of some form of positive discrimination for disadvantaged groups. (Contains 17 reference notes.) (GLR)

CSHE Research Working Papers 93.3

Craig McInnis

Academic values under pressure

Centre for the Study of Higher Education

The University of Melbourne Parkville 3052 Vic. Australia

CSHE Research Working Papers 93.3

Craig McInnis

Academic values under pressure

published September 1993

ISSN 1320-8438

Academic values under pressure

Craig McInnis
Centre for the Study of Higher Education
University of Melbourne

Abstract

Social justice values have been central to the identity of the academic profession. This paper reports on a study of academic values under the pressure of changing emphasis in higher education policy from social justice to economic imperatives. A survey of academics in one university identified their goals related to the goals of the university and fairness in selective admissions. At a level of generality, the academics in the sample could comfortably entertain both equity and excellence values. They generally shared a preference for academic excellence but not at any price. The notion of equality of opportunity was widely supported although disciplinary differences emerged in terms of the strength of support for the social justice roles of the university.

The force of mass higher education in the last quarter century contains inherent tensions generating confusion and ambivalence amongst academics about their roles and values. For most academics, institutional purposes related to human capital and social equity are, as ever, juggled alongside the pursuit of academic goals. Untangling these values is no easy task for academics or analysts. Halsey and Trow for instance, observed that the attitudes of British academics towards expanding the higher education system as a means of broadening access, were not directly affected by either their negative experience, or by their perception of the impact of expansionism on the quality of student performance. In commenting on this finding, the authors argued that views of the impact of expansion may not directly influence attitudes towards expansion, 'but rather that both apprehensions and attitudes may reflect more *basic sentiments* about the selectivity and size of the system'[1]. The basic sentiments of academics also include views about the purposes of the university.

Although individual values and attitudes can be bound together in a variety of idiosyncratic patterns, they are usually of little political significance until they are shared with others. That is, 'to be politically meaningful, a set of attitudes has to be shared, at least to some extent, with others'.[2] For academics, the collective values of at least three cultures — disciplinary, institutional and departmental — are competing forces that shape shared values and practices. These collective sentiments of academics have profound consequences for policymakers and institutional leaders who would change the structures and functions of universities to accommodate the demands of economy and society. If diversity of purpose is to be pursued by policymakers from a centralised system, it seems critical that the differences and similarities between academics are understood. Academic resistance to change is not trivial; it begins with core values that until now have sustained universities against a myriad of external pressures. The question is, are there still underlying values that unite the profession and which are relatively impervious to the pressures of public policy ?

This paper provides an account of individual and collective academic values under the pressure of government policy for social equity in selective admissions at one university. The work reported here is part of a larger project: a comparative case study of four

academic cultures as they responded to government pressures to change the social profile of the student population.[3] Ninety three academics in four faculties of the University of Melbourne were surveyed to investigate variations in their responses to the idea of increasing the participation of disadvantaged groups in higher education. What emerged was a useful picture of the relative importance the academics attached to values about the purposes of the university.

For the purpose of the study, the faculties — Law, Social Work, Science and Architecture — were characterised as organisational cultures. The focus was broadly on the way the shared interpretative framework in each faculty influenced the responses of the academics to social justice in student selection. The study found that there were indeed differences between academic groups on certain matters — even within one relatively homogenous institution — but there were also strongly shared values amongst academics despite disciplinary and department differences. The important point is that even with the pressure of specific policy directions, and some disciplinary differences, a common core of academic values could be identified.

The policy and institutional context

The use of participation and equity as the centrepiece of the Australian Federal Government's higher education policy in 1984, in conjunction with state level proposals for radical change to the senior levels of high school, provided a challenge to the student selective admissions policies of universities. The policy of 1984 was essentially directed at the low participation rates of disadvantaged groups by increasing the opportunity for all through a program of growth. The general thrust of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission's (CTEC) program in 1984 was to promote equity by increasing the size of the cake:

> ...the best means of redressing the imbalances and inequities of past provision is to increase opportunities for the whole community.[4]

By 1987 the concept of equity as outcomes not only gave further weight to the egalitarian drive for participation and access, it also signalled the culmination of major shifts in policy that had occurred in a relatively short space of time. This was marked by pressure on higher education institutions to review their selective admissions policies. Whilst CTEC could only make recommendations suggesting that universities and colleges be requested to review their approaches to selective admissions, the implied pressure that could be brought to bear on funding was clear.

The major pressure towards change in policy for the equalisation of educational outcomes came from an anti-meritocratic move from within the Australian Labor Party. This view argued that the measures of merit used for places in higher education were simply reinforcing privilege, since those students most likely to do well happened to come from homes where the skills and understandings tested by the educational system were most likely to be valued. The focus on the social composition of students in higher education was supported because of the perceived self-perpetuating nature of the elite.

In 1987 the universities which had not made obvious inroads on the social imbalance were being openly criticised. It is now commonplace to observe that the human capital theme re-emerged most explicitly in the higher education reforms of 1988. In the White Paper distributed by the Minister for Employment, Education and Training, growth and efficiency became pre-requisites for access and equity. Utilitarian values were quite explicitly linked with social justice values. The need to improve the skill base of the population was cited: `Improving equity will do more than just assist disadvantaged groups.'[5] All tertiary institutions were asked to produce equity goals as part of an institutional profile directed at efficiency.

The older established Australian universities such as the University of Melbourne, and especially the professional schools of law and medicine, were the prime targets of government policy. The ratio of applicants for student places at Melbourne is extremely high: it is one of the most selective institutions in Australia. Long regarded as elitist by many of its critics, the University attracts the best

performing secondary school students, a high proportion of them from private schools. Thus the academics at Melbourne were especially alert to the public debate about social justice issues, and, equally, they were well-informed and have strong views about the purposes of the university.

Identifying academic values in the context of social justice values

The sample for the Melbourne study covered a representative group of academics across the four faculties using the full range of mostly tenured teaching and research staff, that is, from the lecturer to professor levels. A values scale constructed *a priori* provided the framework for the development of the 28 questionnaire items. The items were developed with the aim of covering most of the dimensions commonly raised in debates about access and equity for selective admissions in higher education, including the purposes of the university and questions of academic excellence.

Three major aspects of the political debate confronting academics were identified in developing the survey questionnaire reported here. The first of these concerned, in a general way, the goals of selective admissions for higher education. A number of items were derived directly from the public debate on changes to the selection criteria for higher education and the purposes of the university. Klitgaard's views on 'choosing elites' effectively summarised one position:

> The university should declare itself for the primary goals of academic values and intellectual excellence - even if these are insufficiently rewarded in the current social system - and should reward its students on those grounds alone. [6]

A second aspect of the questionnaire was more pointed. On the issues of fairness in selective admissions the academics were asked to rate how much support they would give to social justice principles given intense competition for limited places for entry into *their* faculty. The statements in the questionnaire represented typical views on fairness in selective admissions. For example, a principle of

selective admissions was expressed as using quotas 'to admit students with great potential from disadvantaged groups.' This derived from the widely held view that:

> The introduction of social criteria will result in the selection of some students with great potential for achievement (from certain social and ethnic groups and geographical regions) who would not previously have been selected. [7]

A number of items in this section were variations on the theme of academic merit as against social criteria. In objecting to the mechanism of quotas for disadvantaged students, some critics of the government's egalitarian policies argued that:

> ...whatever the course, selection should be based on applicants skills or attributes relevant to achievement in the course, rather than on socially-designated sub-quotas, however apparently benevolent. [8]

A third component of the questionnaire provided a backdrop of social justice issues outside the higher education context. These items covered such issues as the 'causes' of social disadvantage and sex discrimination. They also directly raised questions about the purposes of the university and notions of academic excellence.

Analysis of the questionnaire

The initial exploration of the questionnaire responses first used the Rasch approach to rating scale analysis.[9] This showed, at a descriptive level, the relative overall value positions of all respondents by calibrating both items and persons on a common interval scale. To do this the items from the three sections of the questionnaire were placed on a continuum as a predicted order, that is, as an *a priori* scale. It was then possible to match this predicted order against the actual order of items produced by the Rasch scaling technique.[10] The items were ordered by fit and the scales indicated where both persons and items were located in relation to one another (see Table 1).

The scale essentially embraced utilitarian perspectives of social justice in selective admissions at one end and egalitarian views at the other. The academic values were clustered around the centre of the scale. A strong utilitarian view from academics was predicted to typically focus on social justice policy in terms of the extent to which it maximised the general welfare or average happiness. Utilitarians should give strong support to such statements as: 'Higher education should be seen as an investment in the productive capacity of individuals.' and, 'Places should go to those most likely to return the investment society has made in them.' On equity in a competitive environment, a strongly utilitarian view would favour the principle of selecting students, on the basis of efficiency; that is, where places are limited, supporting those most likely to return the investment of higher education.

In contrast, an extreme egalitarian view would favour goals and principles of selective admissions that maximised benefits for the least advantaged, in society generally and amongst applicants in particular. Egalitarians would be likely to strongly support such statements as: 'The least advantaged students should be given the greatest opportunity for places (in higher education)' and 'Students from disadvantaged groups should be selected in proportion to their numbers within the community.' The strong egalitarian position would support an equality of outcomes principle of using social background as the criteria for selective admissions, and reject tests of academic merit as the sole criteria where places are limited.

The Rasch analysis produced a scale of responses broadly as predicted. The actual order of the items provided a different picture of both the utilitarian extreme and the middle-of-the road position from that predicted, that is, the items at the extremes of the scale appeared as opposites in a different sense. Where the predicted utilitarian position on selective admissions focussed on economic values such as productivity and investment, the actual scale shows two items at the extreme concerned with the natural talents of individuals. That is, only those academics at the extreme regarded natural talents of individuals as criteria for selection over social criteria.

Academics at the median point of the scale appeared to prefer goals related to encouraging high levels of academic performance

while at the same time giving some support to social justice goals. On general issues, individuals at the median point agreed that higher education should be seen as an investment for society; they also agreed that it is a means by which the disadvantaged should gain access to a fair share of political and economic power. This middle of the road group rejected notions that disadvantage is a natural consequence of lack of effort. The principles of fairness they most favoured were largely to do with academic criteria for selective admissions, and there was a tendency to give limited support to social justice in the context of limited places.

The single dimension of social justice values measured by the Rasch scale was complemented by a factor analysis. It is not unusual for a single value dimension to contain a number of sub-scales. The factor analysis was not primarily used to build attitude scales, although this was done; essentially it provided a systematic means of identifying some important similarities and differences in faculty responses.

The factor analysis sought to discover whether the academics viewed the issues in the same terms. It assumed that the data could be reduced to some common elements. Using the mean scores of the faculties on scales derived from the factors, it was possible to distinguish within-group value structures and so make cross-faculty comparisons. It is not uncommon in a general attitude domain to find a number of sub-scales where items combine together around more specific aspects of the basic sentiments. In the process of factor analysis the questionnaire responses were reduced to a manageable grouping on several dimensions, or sub-scales, of the hypothetical utilitarian/egalitarian scale.

The chief criterion for deciding on the number of factors was the extent to which the factors represented a conceptually sensible and meaningful arrangement of the questionnaire items. Since the items were developed with an *a priori* scale in mind it was not surprising that there was a pattern to the responses which can be connected to some major threads of the scale dimensions.

On balance, a five-factor solution appeared to provide the most useful guide to the basic sentiments with four groupings of items holding together particularly well. The five factors were given descriptive labels and then, in order to make cross-faculty

comparisons, the items were treated as scales and tested for reliability. The faculty means for these scales provided a base for the comparative discussion that follows. The five factors shown in Table 2 were labelled 'excellence', 'effort', 'equality of outcomes', 'equality of opportunity,' and 'education as investment'. The groupings are clear, although there is some overlap for some items across the five dimensions. The factors were then used to construct scales for the purpose of comparing the faculties; in some instances items were rejected since their reliability scores were low and they did not contribute to the strength of the scale.

Academic excellence

This first dimension comprised nine items, all of which contained some reference to academic performance. It is noteworthy that six of these items also loaded onto the other four factors. The extent of the overlap indicates the pervasive nature of the academic excellence dimension; clearly the most basic of the underlying values for academics.

As a scale these items held together very well. The item which most strongly defined the scale was the goal that the university should select the most academically capable students regardless of race, gender or social background. Although this was a descriptive rather than a scaling process, applying tests of reliability to the academic excellence scale showed the existence of two clear sub-scales (Table 3), which highlights two components of the excellence values.

In the sub-scale labelled 'academic standards', four of the five items have in common the word 'academic'; it is not too much to suppose that this was the primary focus of the respondents. The second of these sub-scales was made up of four items labelled as 'elements of merit' and suggests that the academics valued notions of student performance relative to others, that is with key values central to the items such as, 'better than others', 'most likely', 'best fitted', and 'those who most ...'. There was a consistent response to these central items and the alpha scores show for both sub-scales a high level of reliability.

Effort

While the first factor was largely concerned with academic ability, the second factor was labelled 'effort'; in effect this represented the other half of the meritocratic equation of 'ability plus effort equals merit'. Three of the four remaining items refer directly to the rewards of hard work, that is, 'if disadvantaged people tried harder'; disadvantage can be overcome by 'sheer effort'; and 'taxing those with high incomes only punishes the people who have worked hardest'. The fourth related item argues that 'differences in wealth and power arise naturally' and could be interpreted as an expression of a more fundamental belief that social inequalities are simply the product of different abilities and achievements. It is worth noting that none of these items loaded onto the other four factors.

Equality of outcomes

The third factor drew together the strongest egalitarian statements in the questionnaire and was labelled 'equality of outcomes'. Again, it is noteworthy that these four items did not overlap with other factors. The first two items were principles of selective admissions and expressed the view that priority should be given to the needs of the disadvantaged: first that, 'preference should be given to disadvantaged groups as a step towards increasing their share of political power', and second, the fairness principle of Rawls[11] that 'the least advantaged students should be given the greatest opportunity for places'. The third item, the principle of selecting disadvantaged students 'in proportion to their numbers', was the most immediate consequence of an equality of outcomes perspective since the respondents were asked to support the principle for their faculty where places were limited.

Giving preference for disadvantaged groups 'as a step towards increasing their share of political power' was the key item contributing most to the commonality of the outcomes scale. The last item of this dimension also expressed basic egalitarian sentiments related to outcomes, although as a general issue it did not relate directly to selective admissions. This item concerned women and jobs, referring to discrimination as the chief obstacle to equal outcomes. In the scale construction process this item too was a weak contributor to the scale, but both in terms of the commonality and

reliability of the scale, it nevertheless made a useful benchmark for some cross-faculty comparisons.

Equality of opportunity

The fourth factor, labelled 'equality of opportunity', was made up of six items (later reduced to five as a scale). Of the remaining items, the egalitarian sentiments were more moderate than for the equality of outcomes factor. The only principle of selective admissions in this factor, as distinct from goals or general issues, suggested that quotas are acceptable when directed at 'students with great potential.' Access to power for disadvantaged groups was also referred to in terms of opportunity as distinct from the stronger political goal of an equal distribution of power.

Education as investment

The fifth factor was something of a mixed bag but is of special interest in the current climate of higher education since it included some of the strongest utilitarian views of higher education. The absence of a clear response to these items is itself of interest. It was observed that the academics showed some ambivalence in the discussions of the utilitarian perspectives; they were either strongly negative in their discussion of these issues, or somewhat uncomfortable, embarrassed even, in agreeing with them. This reduced the variance and thus the intercorrelation of those items so only a weak factor could be defined. Overall, however, the lack of strong support for utilitarian principles indicated the importance of academic excellence sentiments for the sample as a whole.

Identifying the Shared Values

Having outlined the nature of the responses to the values questionnaire, the question can again be asked: Were there differences between the faculties in their shared basic sentiments? The responses of the individuals on all three sections of the questionnaire were aggregated and arranged by faculty membership. From the factor analysis the differences between the faculties, where they exist to any appreciable extent, might have emerged in a variety of ways. Table 4

shows some key differences using the faculty mean scale scores as the basis for the between-faculty comparisons.

For the first three scales there were significant differences between the faculties, but for the fourth, 'Equality of Opportunity', there were no significant differences between them. The mean scores for each faculty on the scales confirmed the Rasch analysis that there were two basic groupings in faculty outlooks. This distinction between what could broadly be characterised as a humanities/science split perhaps disguises some notable between-group variations, which are not readily explained by the 'two cultures' perspective. On the first two scales, Architecture and Science were very similar, but on the outcomes scale, Social Work was extremely egalitarian. Science was at the other extreme on this scale rejecting notions of positive discrimination while in this instance, Architecture and Law were alike.

On the academic excellence scale the differences between the faculties are less obvious and a little more complex because of the presence of sub-scales. The large number of items here obscured an important element necessary to understanding faculty differences. When this scale was broken into the two sub-scales — merit and standards — the merit scale showed almost no difference that can be attributed to faculty membership. As shown in Table 5, the component of excellence that the faculties hold in common is the notion of favouring merit in terms of ability *and* effort. This level of homogeneity is not shown in the academic standards scale where there remained some slight differences between the faculties.

It would seem that once academic excellence was directly balanced against social justice principles, the divisions between the faculties started to emerge more strongly. Of the four faculties, Architecture and Science were strongest in their support for academic excellence. Law was surprisingly less positive, and Social Work academics were only slightly negative. Overall the between-faculty differences were not as strong on excellence as they were for either the effort or the equality of outcomes scales.

In contrast, the means for the effort scale indicates some more obvious differences in faculty outlook. On the effort scale some 18 per cent of the variance can be explained by faculty membership. Collectively, Social Work least valued social justice goals and

principles related to effort. Law was marginally higher and Science and Architecture were virtually the same in their ratings, tending to slightly favour effort as a component of social justice. So while the academics across the faculties showed agreement on the importance of academic excellence values they did not agree on the importance of effort from the student.

The difference between Social Work and Science on the means of the equality of outcomes scale in Table 6 was the largest of all the between-faculty differences. Academics in Social Work were more clearly disposed towards social justice items which supported equality of outcomes than were the other faculties (although still slightly on the negative side of the scale). Architecture and Law were quite similar, and there was a very negative response from Science.

Science academics most strongly rejected the Rawlsian notion of justice as fairness — that is, favouring the least advantaged first — and almost as strongly rejected the outcomes principle of equal representation. Even with the somewhat vague political sentiment that disadvantaged groups should be given preference to indirectly increase their power. Science was far more negative than the other faculties. Architecture and Social Work shared the view that women were discriminated against in getting jobs equal to their ability whereas Science showed much less support.

Finally, the scale on which there was the greatest level of homogeneity - both within and between the faculties - was equality of opportunity. Academics in all the faculties were most positive about equality of opportunity. As Table 4 earlier showed, the differences between the faculties on the issues of equality of opportunity were minimal. That is, knowing the faculty an individual belongs to means little with regard to the equality of opportunity items.

Summary

For the majority of the sample the responses suggest that most individuals value academic excellence but not at any price. Seventy two per cent of the sample agreed that the goal of student selection should be directed to maintaining academic values and excellence in courses. Likewise, higher education was seen as an investment in the

productive capacity of individuals, but again, not at the expense of social justice. There was a consistent pattern of support for principles that support academic standards. At a level of generality the academics could comfortably entertain both equity and excellence values, but enterprise goals did not figure significantly. Overall the response of academics to the general issues of social justice were moderately supportive. Differences in either effort or natural talents were not generally accepted as adequate explanations for social inequality.

The views of the individual academics were modified by context. On the human capital perspective, and at a more general level, 54 per cent of the sample agreed that higher education should be seen as an investment in the productive capacity of individuals, however, slightly fewer (43%) agreed that universities should *select* the students most likely to contribute productively to society. And when linked to selective admissions where there was competition for limited places, only a few (16%) of the academics thought that the places should go to those most likely to return the investment; more than half clearly rejected that notion.

Collectively, the faculties were similar to one another in many respects — as shown by both the overall scale analysis and the sub-scale mean scores — but there were clear and important differences. In broad terms, academics in Law and Social Work tended to be egalitarian, while those in Science and Architecture were more utilitarian in their orientation to university purposes and to social justice issues for selective admissions. More specifically, academics across the faculties were most alike on the equality of opportunity scale where all four groups were in favour of some form of positive discrimination for disadvantaged groups. Likewise the faculties collectively were all positive on the academic excellence scale although there were some differences of emphasis; effort and equality of outcomes rated negatively for all faculties but with varying degrees.

Although it cannot be claimed that there were overwhelmingly strong differences between the faculties, there was nevertheless a sufficient degree of variation in the group means to indicate collective differences in outlook from the academics on social justice issues relevant to selective admissions. In contrast, the emphasis on the academic purposes of the university was widely

shared across disciplinary and organisational cultures of the institution.

Conclusions

Universities have never been truly free of public pressure to facilitate the goals of outside parties. While the core values are ultimately centred on the academic activities of the university, and the pursuit of academic excellence in particular, it remains to be seen if these values are as widely shared across the higher education system as they are in the traditional university that was the subject of this study.[12] The significance of the shared basic sentiments of academics is often underestimated when it comes to the implementation of public policy. It is well known that academics have long been able to resist policy initiatives through collective action — or inaction. The collegial process has typically slowed the pace of change and kept institutions focussed on their central academic purposes of advancing and disseminating knowledge.

There is little doubt that the current policy emphasis on the human capital role of universities and the pressure of market driven missions is challenging the values of academics. Some academics have embraced the entrepreneurial agenda with enthusiasm, just as others have pursued social justice goals or political reform through their work but these are not necessarily representative of the majority. Manipulating the core values of most academics may not be as easy as those from managerial cultures imagine.

What is most likely to change the underlying values of the academic profession is the fragmentation of the organisational units within institutions and the breakdown of the disciplinary cultures. Of course, any suggestion that there might be a core of values shared by the profession is open to criticism. On the one hand, it is often argued that there is no such thing as an academic profession at all[13], that there is only a loosely connected constellation of 'small worlds, different worlds' [14]. It certainly might seem that way the closer one looks at the activities and assumptions of academic cultures. But too close an inspection of any group is bound to reveal more differences than similarities. It is also argued more frequently of late that the

profession is in decline or about to disappear[15]. Perhaps it will be so if some of the basic sentiments about the academic purposes of the university are lost across the system as a whole. If the pressures for more highly differentiated universities in a largely deregulated system have effect there is the potential for individual institutions reframing the values of their academics[16]. With increasing diversity there is even greater likelihood that the profession will lose the ties that bind — the shared values that justify and reinforce preferred practices.

Added to this, the current combination of mass higher education and high levels of unemployment will no doubt revive interest in issues of equity in selective admissions but from a different perspective to the egalitarian ideology of the early 80s. At the same time, with students from the most selective universities still getting preference in the job market, questions will be raised about the value for money that less successful fee-paying students will get from higher education. The tension between the human capital and social equity goals of higher education will take a new turn as the majority of stakeholders, the students, become disenchanted with an overgrown system that effectively deluded them into thinking that getting a place in higher education guaranteed reward. As the private benefit of higher education eludes significant numbers of higher education graduates — Bourdieu and Champagne[17] describe it as a mirage — it will once more be discovered that some universities distribute more status than others. Academics will continue to be challenged to justify their role as screening agents for social privilege while at the same time trying to balance their contribution to the production of human capital against the pursuit of academic goals. With the internationalising of higher education the institutional borders are becoming more blurred while the decline of disciplinary cultures will makes the invisible college less significant. We need to know more about what the profession, such as it is, values, and whether the emerging structures will sustain those values.

Table I: Social Justice in Selective Admissions Scale Ordered by Rasch Threshold Score[1]

	SCORE	FIT	ITEM
1.	2.29	.40	Individuals should be rewarded by society according to their natural talents.
2.	2.25	.55	Differences in wealth and power arise naturally from the differing abilities and achievements of individuals.
3.	1.91	-.04	Places should go to those most likely to return the investment society has made in them.
4.	1.71	-.03	Taxing those with high incomes to help the poor only punishes the people who have worked the hardest.
5.	1.70	-.84	If disadvantaged people tried harder they could g et jobs equal to their ability.
6.	1.65	-1.17	Students' only claim to a place should be due to their individual performance on tests of academic merit.
7.	1.50	-.06	The truly determined individual can overcome any disadvantage by sheer effort.
8.	1.29	-1.68	Standards of excellence should be maintained in higher education regardless of issues of social justice.
9.	1.23	1.50	Higher education should be seen as an investment in the productive capacity of individuals.
10.	1.12	-.22	Preference should be given to those students who most deserve, by their ability and effort, the rewards gained from a university education.
11.	.86	-1.09	To select those best fitted to take advantage of the courses offered.
12.	.65	-1.35	To select the most academically capable students regardless of race, gender or social background.
13.	.57	-.53	Every applicant should be judged on the basis of academic merit regardless of race, sex, or social background.
14.	-.08	-.88	Disadvantaged groups should be given the opportunity for a fair share of political and economic power through increased access to higher education.
15.	-.33	-1.08	To maintain academic values and intellectual excellence in the courses taught by the faculty.
16.	-.39	1.17	Quotas should be used to admit students with great potential from disadvantaged groups.
17.	-1.04	-.51	To provide some opportunities for those who have been disadvantaged by factors beyond their control.
18.	-1.17	-.90	Preference should be given to disadvantaged groups as a step towards increasing their share of political power.
19.	-1.24	-.35	The least advantaged students should be given the greatest opportunity for places.
20.	-1.37	-1.93	To discriminate positively in favour of disadvantaged students by compensating for background factors.
21.	-1.42	2.04	Individuals should be given every opportunity to develop their talents to the best of their ability.
22.	-1.51	-.17	Discrimination makes it almost impossible for most women to get jobs equal to their ability.
23.	-1.64	-1.04	Students from disadvantaged groups should be selected in proportion to their numbers within the community.
24.	-2.02	-1.06	To match the social composition of the student population to that of the community served by the university.

[1]There are four thresholds on the five point scale at which respondents make choices. The threshold used for the scale was the highest i.e. where individuals select, for instance, 'strongly agree' over 'agree'.

Table II : Underlying Dimensions of Social Justice: Five Factor Solution
(Varimax Rotation:Loadings below .30 omitted)

	I	II	III	IV	V
Academic Excellence					
Rewards for ability and effort	.80				
Better on the same criteria	.69				
Most likely to excel	.66				
Academic merit not background	.51				
Best fitted to take advantage	.51			-.30	
Academically capable regardless of background	.46	.40	-.46		.41
Rewards for natural talents	.45	.30			
Maintain academic excellence	.45	.43	-.42	.33	
Develop talents fully	.40				
Effort					
Poor should try harder		.76			
Natural differences		.76			
Effort overcomes disadvantage		.71			
Taxing high incomes punishes hardest workers		.71			
Standards of excellence regardless of justice	.37	.49			
Equality of Outcome					
Power for disadvantaged			.78		
Least advantaged first			.74		
Select disadvantaged in proportion to numbers			.71		
Discrimination against women			.56		
Equality of Opportunity					
Quotas for great potential				.71	
Fair share by access				.66	.32
Positive discrimination			.43	.61	
Match social composition			.40	.57	
Opportunities for factors beyond control				.55	
Select those most likely to return investment	.34	.34		-.37	.36
Education as Investment					
Faculty determined standard					-.70
Higher education as investment					.67
Those likely to contribute most to society					.61
Performance on academic tests	.41	.35	.44		-.44

Table III: Items of two sub-scales of Academic Excellence in Criteria for Selection

Academic Standards	Elements of Merit
Academic merit not background	Rewards for ability and effort
Academically capable regardless of background	Those better on same criteria
Performance on academic tests	Those most likely to excel
Maintain academic excellence	Select best fitted to take advantage of university
Standards regardless of justice	
(Alpha .79)	(Alpha .72)

Table IV: Mean scale scores for faculties of all items on major scales with sample (defining) items

	Law	Social Work	Science	Arch	All
Excellence e.g. To select the most academically capable regardless of race, gender or social background (Eta^2 .1155 F=3.8 Sig .0125)	2.22	1.99	2.62	2.72	**2.42**
Effort e.g. If disadvantaged people tried harder they could get jobs equal to their ability (Eta^2 .1800 F=6.5 Sig .0005)	.80	.55	1.37	1.38	**1.06**
Equality of Outcomes e.g. Preference should be given to disadvantaged groups as a step towards increasing their share of political power (Eta^2 .1425 F=4.8 Sig .0038)	1.40	1.92	.91	1.47	**1.38**
Equality of Opportunity e.g. To discriminate positively in favour of disadvantaged students by compensating for background factors (Eta^2 .0387 F=1.2 Sig .3169)	2.74	2.87	2.49	2.56	**2.65**

Table V: Mean scores of faculties on sub-scales of academic excellence with sample (defining) items

	Law	Social Work	Science	Arch	All
Academic Standards e.g. To select the most academically capable regardless of race, gender or social background (Eta^2 .1290 F=4.2 Sig .0076)	2.01	1.78	2.48	2.69	**2.27**
Elements of Merit e.g. Preference should be given to those students who most deserve by their ability and effort the rewards gained from a university (Eta^2 .0689 F=1.9 Sig .1324)	2.48	2.45	2.92	2.76	**2.67**

Table VI: Mean item scores of faculties for items in the equality of outcomes scale

	Law	Social Work	Science	Architect
1. Preference should be given to disadvantaged groups as a step towards increasing their share of political power	1.81	2.31	.96	1.34
2. The least advantaged students should be given the greatest opportunity for places	1.03	1.29	.48	1.15
3. Students from disadvantaged backgrounds should be selected in proportion to their numbers in the community	.85	1.25	.50	1.31
4. Discrimination makes it almost impossible for most women to get jobs equal to their ability	1.92	2.88	1.70	2.31

Endnotes

[1] Halsey, A.H., and Trow, M. (1971). *The British academics*, London: Faber and Faber.

[2] Verba, S., and Orren, G. (1985). *Equality in America*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

[3] McInnis, C.V. (1992) *Academic cultures and their role in the implementation of government policy in higher education*. Paper presented to the Annual Conference of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers, London.

[4] Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission. (1984). *Report for 1985-87 Triennium (Volume 1 Part 1 Recommendations on Guidelines)*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

[5] Commonwealth of Australia. (1988). *Higher education: A policy statement*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

[6] Klitgaard, R. (1985). *Choosing elites*. New York: Basic Books.

[7] Beswick, D., Schofield, H., Meek, L., and Masters, G. (1984). *Selective admissions under pressure: An evaluation and development study of student selection procedures at the University of Melbourne*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne, Centre for the Study of Higher Education.

[8] Pye, W., and Kennedy, B. (1985). *Tertiary entry: A report on the effect of selection into the undergraduate courses of proposed structural assessment and curriculum changes in secondary schools*. Melbourne: Victorian Conference of Principles of Colleges of Advanced Education.

[9] Wright, B., and Masters, G. (1982). *Rating scale analysis*. Chicago: Mesa Press.

[10] Andrich, D. and Masters, G. (1988). Rating scale analysis. In John Keeves, *Educational Research, Methodology and Measurement, An International Handbook*, (297-302). Oxford: Pergamon.

[11] Rawls, J. (1973). *A theory of justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[12] A national survey of academic roles and values to be conducted in 1993 by Anwyl, McInnis and Powles will provide the basis for a comparative study of these value tensions.

[13] Finkelstein, M.J. (1984) *The American academic profession*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press;

[14] Clark, B. (1987). *The academic life: small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

[15] Halsey, A.H. (1992) *Decline of donnish dominion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[16] Karmel, P. (1992) *Quantity and quality in higher education*, The Sir Robert Menzies Oration on Higher Education, University of Melbourne, 28 October.

[17] Bourdieu P. and Champagne, P. (1992) Lip service for all at the Lycee. *The Times Higher*, September 11.

About the Centre for the Study of Higher Education

The Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne conducts research and consultancy on aspects of higher education; and provides higher degree courses on higher education, including policy, planning and leadership; teaching and learning; and interactive media and information technology. The Centre also provides a range of services designed to enhance the quality of higher education. It was created by the University in 1968.

Research presently being conducted at the Centre includes aspects of teaching and learning in higher education; evaluation and quality improvement; academic leadership; aspects of education and employment; national and international developments in higher education, including public policies; government/university relations; the academic labour markets; the academic profession and academic values; postgraduates and research policy; women in higher education; links between higher education and industry; education markets. The Centre's staff welcome collaborative research projects.

The Centre offers *services* in the following areas, with emphasis on the needs of staff at the University of Melbourne: the evaluation of courses and teaching; advice on academic leadership, and on managing a department; courses for less experienced teachers and new academic staff; seminars on postgraduate supervision, and on tutoring and demonstrating; the task force on large group teaching; assistance with visual materials used in teaching; a biennial workshop on other aspects of teaching; individual consultations on teaching; professional development seminars; departmental consultations. It also provides a full range of audio-visual services and actively collaborates with the Interactive Multimedia Learning Unit.

Director of the Centre: Professor John Anwyl

For further information on any of these matters, please contact the Departmental Secretary, Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, 3052, Australia.
Phone: 61--3--3444605. Facsimile: 61--3--3447576.

About the CSHE Research Working Papers series

The Centre for the Study of Higher Education publishes the CSHE Research Working Papers series in order to disseminate the research work of staff and students of the Centre, and to facilitate exchange on work in progress with scholars in the field of higher education studies.

Copies of individual Research Working Papers may be purchased at a cost of $A5.00 or $A10.00 each, depending on size. This charge includes mailing. A list of the CSHE Working Papers published in 1993 and previous years is provided on the next few pages. *Please ring the numbers of those CSHE Research Working Papers which you would like to receive and send this list, together with the form below, and your cheque, to:*

the Departmental Secretary
Centre for the Study of Higher Education
University of Melbourne
Parkville, Victoria, 3052
Australia.

Please contact the Centre for details of other CSHE publications.

Name_____

Address_____

_____

I would like to order _____ issues of CSHE Research Working Papers at $A5.00 each and_____ at $A10.00 each (including mailing)

Please find enclosed a cheque for $A_____ payable to the Centre for the Study of Higher Education.

CSHE Research Working Papers published in 1993

93.1 Carmel McNaught and John Anwyl
Awards for teaching excellence at Australian universities ($5.00).

93.2 Margaret Powles
Postgraduates at the interface between higher education and industry ($5.00).

93.3 Craig McInnis
Academic values under pressure' ($5.00).

93.4 Simon Marginson
Educational credentials in Australia: average positional value in decline ($5.00).

93.5 Simon Marginson and Seamus O'Hanlon
From the generalist courses to work: an annotated bibliography on generic skills ($10.00)

93.6 Ainslie Lamb
The discipline review of Australian law schools ($5.00).

93.7 Jan Webb
Academic support for non-traditional students ($10.00).

93.8 Ann Isaac
Equity or equality? students with language backgrounds other than English ($10.00).

93.9 Simon Marginson
Markets in Australian higher education ($5.00).

93.10 Craig McInnis
Graduate education in Australian law schools: some recent developments ($5.00).

CSHE Research Working Papers 1980 to 1991

(the cost of all papers published between 1980 and 1991 is $5.00 each, including mailing)

91.1 John I Balla
Learning for practice: What does a physician need to know to know medicine?

91.2 John I Balla & Margaret Balla
The evaluation of an international fellowship programme in the health sciences.

91.3 Margaret Balla & John I Balla
Student approaches to clinical diagnosis: Relationship to the process of learning.

90.1 Robert S Friedman & Renée C Friedman
A reflection on aspects of Australian research and higher education policy.

90.2 John I Balla, Margaret Balla & Andrew Stephanou
Measures of the development of clinical reasoning. The case of clinical analysis. Measures of clinical reasoning.

89.1 Margaret Powles & Kate Patrick
Recruiting honours students in the face of high demand for pass degrees: A case study.

89.2 Paul Ramsden, Geoffrey Masters, John Bowden, Gloria Dall'Alba, Diana Laurillard, Elaine Martin, Ference Marton, Andrew Stephanou & Eleanor Walsh
Speed, distance and time: A phenomenographic study of students' concepts in kinematics.

89.3 Paul Ramsden
What does it take to improve medical students' learning?

89.4 Paul Ramsden
Using aims and objectives.

88.1 Margaret Powles
Development of financial independence from the family - a model.

88.2 David Beswick
The outreach of higher education institutions in Australia.

88.3 Geoffrey Masters & Peter Hill
Reforming the assessment of student achievement in the senior secondary school.

88.4 Paul Ramsden
Learning as a change in conceptions: a relational view of language.

88.5 Gloria Dall'Alba
Two contrasting paradigms in research on student learning.

87.1 David Beswick & Paul Ramsden
How to promote learning with understanding.

87.2 Paul Ramsden
Improving teaching and learning in higher education: the case for a relational perspective.

87.3 John Bowden, Geoffrey Masters & Paul Ramsden
Influence of assessment demands on first year university students' approach to learning.

87.4 Geoffrey Masters
Comparing school-based assessments: a hierarchy of procedures.

87.5 John Bowden, Geoffrey Masters & Christopher Starrs
Student approaches to language learning.

87.6 John Bowden, Christopher Starrs & Terrence Quinn
Modern language teaching in Australian universities.

87.7 Margaret Powles & John Anwyl
Clienteles for distance education in Australia.
(Published in *Distance Education*, 1987)

87.8 Margaret Powles
AUSTUDY: taking the TAFE pulse in the early stages of the scheme.

87.9 Paul Ramsden, Geoffrey Masters, John Bowden & Elaine Martin
Assessing the elements of competence: a relational approach.

87.10 John Anwyl & Margaret Powles
Priority clienteles for external studies in Australian universities and colleges of advanced education.

87.11 Geoffrey Masters **Out of Print**
New views of student learning: implications for educational measurement.

87.12 Paul Ramsden, Elaine Martin & John Bowden
Approaches to studying in different school environments.

87.13 Viswanathan Selvaratnam
Student mobility within the Commonwealth: growing con-straints, new initiatives.

87.14 John Anwyl **Out of Print**
Adjusting to the post-binary era.

87.15 David Penington
University teaching and learning.

87.16 David Beswick
The role of government in higher education in Australia.

87.17 David Beswick
Prospects for the 90s - a new phase of development in Australian higher education.

86.1 David Beswick & Judith Boreham
Development of scientific interests and competence.

86.2 Gerald Burke
Reforming the structure and finance of education in Australia.

86.3 Margaret Powles
A matter of account: Young students' income and expenditure patterns and the development of independence from parents.

86.4 John Bowden & Paul Ramsden
Assessment practices and student learning.

86.5 John Anwyl & John Bowden
Attitudes of Australian university and college academics to some access and equity issues, including distance education.
(Published in *Distance Education*, No 1, 1986)

85.1 David Beswick
Family support for students - expectations and realities.

85.2 David Beswick **Out of Print**
Current issues in student selection.

85.3 David Beswick
Trends in Australian higher education research: a general review.

85.4 David Beswick & Judith Boreham
Women's success and perspective on careers.

85.5 Paul Ramsden, David Beswick & John Bowden
Do learning skills interventions have any effect on student learning?

85.6 Hilary Schofield & Margaret Parnaby
Sex differences in the preference for humanities or science courses: a retrospective study of tertiary students.

85.7 Urban Dahllof
Towards a contextual rationale of distance higher education: the small scale cases of Sweden and Australia.
(Published in *Distance Higher Education and the Adult Learner*, Dutch Open University, Heerlen, 1986, pp 126-146)

85.8 John Bowden
Some institutional policy issued in the development of the use of computers in tertiary teaching and learning.

84.1 * John Bowden & Christopher Starrs **Out of Print**
Language departments in Australian universities and colleges of advanced education.

84.2 Grant Harman
Australian experience with co-ordinating agencies for tertiary education.
(Published in *Higher Education*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Vol 13, No 5, October 1984, pp 501-515)

83.1 David Beswick, Hilary Schofield & Judith Boreham
The participation of women in higher education: signs of progress and regression.

83.2 David R Jones
Academic government: the creation of the civic university model.

83.3 Grant Harman
The erosion of university independence: recent Australian experience.
(Published in *Higher Education*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Vol 12, No 5, October 1983, pp 501-518)

83.4 * See 86.1

83.5 John Anwyl & John Bowden
Some characteristics and attitudes of academics in Australian universities and colleges of advanced education.
(Published in *Higher Education Research Development*, Vol 2, No 1, 1983, pp 39-62)

83.6 David Beswick
Financial support for the young in tertiary education.

83.7 David Beswick & Grant Harman
Education policy in Australia.

83.8 Donald Layton
The utilization of the policy sciences in training educational administrators.

83.9 David R Jones
Sea change: British models and colonial modifications in higher education.

83.10 Grant Harman **Out of Print**
The white paper and planned change for education in Victorian government schools.

83.11 David R Jones
A century of exoticism: Australian universities 1850 to 1950.

82.1 Edward Holdaway
The relationship between research in education and policy formation.

82.2 R J Ryan
The administration of technical and further education in the Australian Capital Territory.

82.3 R J Ryan
The administration of technical and further education in Victoria.

82.4 Grant Harman — **Out of Print**
The education policy process at state level: report of Australian-United States comparative study.
(Published in Hancock, Kirst & Grussman (eds): *Contemporary Issues in Education Policy: Perspectives from Australia and USA*. Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra and McCutcheon, Berkley, 1983)

82.5 Grant Harman
Australian management educators and the "Ralph Report".
(Abridged version published in *The Practising Manager*, Vol 3, No 1, October 1982, pp 38-42)

82.6 John Bowden & John Anwyl
Attitudes of Australian academics to staff development.

82.7 * Not published — **No Print**

82.8 Matti Urvet
Development of public educational services in the Northern Territory, 1876-1979.

82.9 David Beswick — **Out of Print**
The changing student population in Australia from the seventies to the eighties.
(Published in *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, Vol 5, No 1, May 1983, pp 5-19)

81.1 Terrence Dunn
Bias in HSC scores and equity of access to universities: a study of entry to the University of Melbourne.
(Published in *The Australian Journal of Education*, Vol 26, 1982, pp 190-208)

81.2 Lynn Meek
A theoretical model for examining the structure and function of the university as an organization or community.
(Published as a chapter in V Lynn Meek: *The University of Papua New Guinea: A Case Study in the Sociology of Higher Education*. University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1982)

81.3 Terrence Dunn
Sex differences in the prediction of first year results in arts and science at the University of Melbourne.

81.4 Lynn Meek
The case study method and the analysis of the university organization in new nations.
(Published as a chapter in V Lynn Meek: *The University of Papua New Guinea: A Case Study in the Sociology of Higher Education*. University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1982)

81.5 Grant Harman
The razor gang decisions, the guidelines to the Commonwealth Education Commission and Australian education policy.
(Published in Vestes: *The Australian Universities' Review*, Vol 24, No 2, 1981)

81.6 Grant Harman
Decision dilemmas at Barton CAE: a case study

81.7 Cicely Watson
Links between education and work: the Canadian and Ontario experience.

81.8 Leith Hancock & John Bowden
Learning skills for life at a tertiary institution.
(Published in W Appleton (ed): *Student groups and their needs*. Melbourne, 1982, Section 11, pp 101-117)

81.9 John Bowden & John Anwyl
Some correlates of attitudes of Australian university academics towards access to tertiary education.

80.1 John Bowden
Background and work patterns of teachers in Australian Technical and Further Education.
(Published in two parts in *TAFE Quarterly*, Vol 1, No 3, 1979 and Vol 2, No 1, 1980)

80.2 Grant Harman
The Financing and control of Australian tertiary education: the roles of federal and state government.
(Published in G Harman and D Smart (eds): *Federal Intervention in Australian Education: Past, Present and Future*. Georgian House, Melbourne, 1982, pp 85-111)

80.3 David Beswick
Higher education and the rural drift in Australia.

80.4 Martin Hayden
Financial assistance to tertiary education students: a review of recent literature and research.
(Published as Volume 2 in the *Studies of Tertiary Finances*. Series of the Commonwealth Department of Education, by the Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1981)

80.5 Grant Harman
Exploring politics in education: some barriers and some theoretical considerations.
(Published in P B Botsman (ed): *The Politics of Education. The Australian College of Education*. Carlton, 1980, pp 123-151)

80.6 R K Browne
Commonwealth-State relations in education: trends and tensions.

80.7 John Bowden & Loris Perry
Women teachers in Australian Technical and Further Education.
(Published in Bradley, Browne, Ducker & Moore (eds): *ACT Papers in Technical and Further Education*. Canberra, 1982, pp 95-104)

Centre for the Study of Higher Education
University of Melbourne
Parkville, Vic. 3052 Australia

The Centre for the Study of Higher Education is an academic department of the University in the Faculty of Education. Its responsibilities include:

- ☐ research into the problems of higher education institutions and systems;
- ☐ research and evaluation studies for the University;
- ☐ graduate studies, leading to the degrees of Master of Education in Higher Education, and Doctor of Philosophy;
- ☐ staff development and educational technology services to University staff; and
- ☐ consultancy services on problems in higher education.