politans'. Their responsibility towards students harnesses them also to the institution, but they are free of having to prove themselves in 'service'. Universities which acknowledge teaching and preparation for the profession by emphasising the interrelationship between research, professional praxis and teaching aspiring professionals will also be able to steer their academic staff selection and academic staff development in such a way that academics can take up choices and grow and contribute as scholars and professionals.

The government pressure for more efficiency and better management in universities has led to a more managerial style of institutional leadership, a style more akin to that prevalent in the old CAE sector. If applied throughout the UNS there is a danger that strong institutional leaders with a managerial bent will emphasise the entrepreneurial, short-term, commercial, community, industry or profession-linked programs, whether in teaching or research, at the expense of some of the traditional values. They demand commitment to institutional mission, faculty goals, departmental goals - the individual scholar is firmly placed into a group context. Is individualism, eccentricity, non-conformity to be unacceptable in the new university environment?

In Australia, we are moving towards the American model where 'university' only denotes an institution of higher learning with at least four-year courses. Elite higher education in its pure form (Trow 1974) has hardly existed in Australia; but we are still not sure how to organise within one nation-wide system academic work in such a way that all functions can be carried out in a civic, responsive and forward looking way within any one institution and/or across the system.

In this new system of different kinds of universities we need to allow a diversity of staff roles, including those that integrate us internationally and thus save us from being parochial. The tensions between the different demands of the discipline and the institution are not resolved by equal weighting of different academic activities, only by an acknowledgment that the academic profession consists of professionals with different strengths; of those with broad competence and those who are highly specialised, of cosmopolitans and locals.

But in all universities in the UNS and as part of our professionalism we need to accept that university teaching itself must be a scholarly and responsive activity, and that teaching is the one function which all academics share. And all academics need to accept that research is vital for the advancement of science, for the preparation of our next generation of scientists, and for contributing to the currency of advanced teaching and learning. But not everyone needs to do it, though all academics should be able to appreciate its significance and evaluate and integrate research findings in their teaching. Some university teachers, then, inform, nourish and enliven their teaching by their own research or by the research of others.

For staff without research experience, coming from professional practice, the question arises: what nourishes their teaching? The professional experience will be dated unless kept alive through ongoing high level consultancy. Just as research skills date and researchers need to keep active and informed, professional experience prior to appointment to a university position needs to be up-dated, and critically evaluated. The new academic classification system makes clear that every academic teacher in the UNS at every level will need to engage in research, scholarship and/or professional work of some kind.

The new position descriptions in the new industrial award have outlined a career path for all academics. There are difficulties with it - while there is still freedom to change one's emphasis between the different aspects of academic work, this freedom is not enshrined any more in just being an academic. It depends on how individuals' contracts are negotiated and will, no doubt, be influenced by the appraisal procedures to come. Advice and directions given to staff at one time may disadvantage them later. Is a research degree necessary or are equivalent qualifications acceptable? If these are acceptable now, will they be later? And will they enable staff to move to other universities, other countries?

We are witnessing and shaping in our responses and work practices the new academic role. We need more debate about what is appropriate academic work and how staff may be prepared for it (Moses 1992).

Note
The group of universities established in the 1960s and 1970s were organised to transcend disciplinary boundaries. They, in their organisation, were more akin to some of the colleges than to the older universities. The pressures for disciplinary groupings became stronger over time.

References
Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee (AVCC) (1991), *Foundations for the "Clever Country"*, Canberra.

Baldwin, P. (1991), *Higher Education: Quality and Diversity in the 1990's*, Canberra, AGPS.

DEET, Selected Higher Education Statistics (1989, 1990, 1991), Canberra, AGPS.

Gouldner, A.W. (1957). 'Cosmopolitans and Locals: Towards and Analysis of Latent Social Roles', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, pp. 281-306.

Moses, I. (1991a), 'Devaluing of Teaching? Pressures on Teachers in Amalgamating Institutions', *Teaching for Effective Learning*, ed B Ross, *Research and Development in Higher Education*, 13, 432-439.

Moses, I. (1991b), 'The Binary Experience - Success or Wasted Effort?', *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration* 13(2), pp 153-163.

Moses, I. (1991c), 'How are we Teaching?' Invited address to the Symposium sponsored by the AVCC and Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training, Canberra, December 1991.

Moses, I. (1992), 'The Development of Knowledge and Skills of Academic Staff', Invited Paper to the OECD/IMHE Thirty-Second Special Topic Workshop *Staffing of Higher Education*, Paris, 18-20 May 1992.

Moses, I. and Ramsden, P. (in press), 'Academics and Academic Work in Colleges of Advanced Education and Universities' in L Meek (ed) *The Binary Experiment of Higher Education: an Australian Perspective*, UNE.

Trow, M. (1974), 'Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education', *Policies for Higher Education*, Conference on Future Structures of

Changes in the nature of academic work

Craig McInnis
University of Melbourne

Few academics have been unaffected in their work by the turbulence of the recent structural changes in higher education. Over the next decade academics in the workplace will not only be reoriented but resocialised. These processes will combine with recruitment on a scale not seen since the expansion of the 1960s producing changes in the ways academics work. The work practices will most likely become at the same time more fragmented, uniform, instrumental and highly regulated. The composition of the workforce too will reflect these changes with greater specialisation and further divisions of labour. A more desirable, but less likely possibility for change might involve the profession itself redefining the meaning of scholarship, seriously recognising diversity through changes in the reward system, and valuing 'wholeness' or integrity as a primary quality of academic work.

Since the Dawkins reforms, analysis of academic work has referred to privatisation, deskilling, accountability, and control of performance (Barlow 1989; O'Brien 1990). Not much has been said about the impact of these changes on the everyday work of academics. In the final analysis the reforms should be judged at least partly by the extent to which they change the ways in which the main participants - academics and students - work with one another. Underlying the structural changes are the competing forces of fragmentation and integration which are creating role strains for academics as their work is reshaped well beyond the immediate and obvious crisis of large classes and reduced resources (Clark 1987). The current problems are not simply, or only, a matter of doing more with less as most of the public comment from academics would suggest.

There is no question though that staff-student ratios and funding per student have worsened considerably in the last 5 years. For some academics stretched resources have meant putting research programs on hold in the face of heavier teaching loads and larger classes. For others, the structural shifts have meant reducing time devoted to teaching as they grapple in unfamiliar territory with research grant applications. But calls for accountability and productivity especially have placed new demands on academics and have heightened tensions (Austin and Gamson 1983). This is not the place to catalogue the many overlapping factors contributing to the changing nature of academic work. Instead, I want to point to some patterns of change still emerging from long-term trends.

Rather than focusing on the Dawkins policy reforms as the root cause of changes in the academic workplace, it is more accurate to view the introduction of the Unified National System as an acceleration of trends which had their beginnings in the 1960s with the first moves from a university system of 'boutique providers' to a higher education system of 'mass producers' (McGaw 1991). The trends are not confined to Australia; any examination of academic work in the UK and US reveals shared problems and prospects. Halsey for instance, recently characterised the change in the atmosphere in British universities as: '... both busier and more apathetic, newer and more neglected, more impersonal, more fragmented ... Erstwhile dons are now the managers of the higher education industry' (Halsey 1992). Halsey would also recognise in the Australian higher education system the loss of informality and the potentially serious decline in the self-regulation of academic work which quite unnecessarily has accompanied demands for accountability and productivity.

The basic elements
The basic elements of academic work - teaching, research, administration and public service - have not changed much since the 1960s. But there have been changes to the emphasis given to these activities and to the ways in which they are carried out. Evidence to salary tribunals over the last twenty years provides examples of the commonly cited pressures and their consequences. In 1973 FAUSA submitted to the Academic Salaries Tribunal that university work was changing because of the 'knowledge explosion', the increase in specialist subjects, changes in student assessment, the increasing burden of administrative functions, and the increasing role of postgraduate teaching (Campbell 1976). In 1991 the case for award restructuring and increases to academic salaries before Commissioner Frawley of the Industrial Relations Commission was argued on structural efficiency principles and work value tests (AIRC 1991)

Changes to teaching figured prominently in the 1991 case with reference to technological innovations, worsening staff-student ratios, and the increased number of overseas students which made teaching more demanding. There was also reference to changes in research activity which included the increased competition for resources and more work involved in preparing research proposals as well as responding to greater monitoring of research activities. Heads of departments were singled out as having new pressures on them with devolution of power and line management responsibilities. Increased accountability was seen as demanding, particularly the work associated with developing institutional profiles. Moves towards non-award courses and community interaction was identified as a major trend, especially with regard to the skills required for developing new links with industry and the community, at local, national and international levels. The demands of export education and the pressures of establishing corporate identity were seen to require new skills. It was not argued, but certainly implied by the evidence, that the number of discrete tasks was increasing (AIRC 1991)

The allocation of time
No discussion of academic work would be complete without some reference to the undeservedly poor image academics have in the community. Under the guise of beating off public criticism some politicians, and even academic leaders, have referred to the perceived leisured existence of academics as justification for centralised control and accountability procedures. This is not new. The roots of the criticism may well be part of the general baggage of anti-intellectualism in Australia; it may also be partly self-inflicted by the profession. Just as the salaries tribunal argued in 1973 that the recreation leave of academics should be formalised because of the 'usually unwarranted criticism emanating from members of the community' (Campbell 1976), we now find the daily work of academics under pressure to be justified.

The perception that academics lead a free and easy working life rests partly on a view of work as something that only occurs in a time and place controlled by someone else. Correcting a pile of essays at home usually prompts the neighbours to ask if one is having another day off! And the underlying misconception in the community that the academic working year is limited to a short period of teaching between long holidays seems unshakeable. Academic work is like housework, private and under-acknowledged. Yet according to those who have spent a lot of time watching academics the 'commitment to

work for its own sake is immense'; they have a powerfully internalised standard of professional performance (Bowen and Schuster 1986). As Justice Campbell pointed out in 1976, '... despite their ability to work flexible hours, their real working week is greater than forty hours. This is not a surprising conclusion to anyone familiar with university teaching or with the professions (Campbell 1976). Many academics argue they are hardly ever not working.

For the record, there has been a fairly consistent pattern to both the estimates academics make of the overall hours they work as well as the emphasis they give to specific activities (Campbell 1976). The working week for academics in Australia has probably increased only slightly since a 1977 national survey found an average of 44.6 hours, a figure which corresponds closely with patterns in the US and UK (Williams 1979 and McInnis 1990). More recently, the National Review of Accounting reported an average of 45.4 hours per week for that discipline. The figures, however, disguise quite a range of disciplinary and institutional differences and the range for individuals could be anywhere between 35 and 65 hours per week. Those who do more research report longer hours. It should be said in passing that the emphasis on binary differences by commentators has obscured the range of differences across the system. Some notable variations between five categories of institutions showed the 'average teaching week of the large, established universities as the highest with 48.2 hours, and the teaching week of the large technological CAEs with the lowest at 42.9 hours ...' (Powles and Day 1990). While the time academics spend on their work is not easy to document, on average the total hours worked in teaching weeks are unlikely to have changed markedly since 1988. There are thresholds of total time individuals are prepared or able to commit and the work is shaped accordingly. Academics right across the system will say that they are busier, and in the former CAE sector they will report longer working weeks as the academic drift towards the traditional university model continues.

There is no doubt that changes have been observed in the way academics broadly allocate their time but they must be considered in the context of the binary sector differences. The chief difference has been the relative emphasis given to teaching and research. University academics in the past typically had fewer formal student contact hours, less time overall was spent on teaching and administration, and significantly more time on research. In 1977 just over half the time of university staff was spent on teaching and a quarter of the time on research. In the CAEs about two-thirds of the total time was given to teaching activities and only 8 per cent of time on research.

The evidence is not yet in, but it is likely that most university staff are teaching more and doing more of their research in 'spare' time. It remains to be seen which corners are being cut. However, the time worked in the non-teaching period has increased and tasks like reading and research that once were done in teaching weeks have been juggled out. What is obvious from interviews with academics is that the annual patterns of activities are changing with greater consequence than the increases in weekly workload. The academic year in the past has been characterised by peaks of preparation, teaching and marking with some regular time set aside for research and writing, followed by periods of concentrated catching up. Now it seems that activities such as summer schools, research grant applications, conferences, short courses for industry, consultancy work, and other entrepreneurial work are filling out the time once given to course preparation or actually researching or writing.

Self-regulation

The high level of self-regulation that academics have over both their time and the content of their work, the power of peer judgement, and a considerable degree of job security makes academics 'professionals with a difference' (Finkelstein 1984; Austin and Gamson 1983) It has also been frequently noted that academics are distinguished from most professionals by their exceptional preoccupation and satisfaction with the intrinsic rewards of the work itself. Piecing together the empirical studies of academics to make usable generalisations is of course a risky business. Disciplinary and institutional differences are reflected in a diversity of academic roles, values and practices, so much so that in some respects the notion of one profession makes little sense. The proposition that there is a profession made of many professions - 'small worlds, different worlds' - gives little comfort to analysts and policy makers in a Unified National System (Clarke 1987). The impact of structural change on universities will naturally vary according to their size, status, profile and the extent to which the mission has been reshaped. Mediating factors affecting individuals will include discipline, rank, age, gender and career stage.

On the other hand, the ties that bind the profession are powerful shared values - myths perhaps, but the more powerful for that - about academic freedom, collegiality, and the pursuit of truth. In my view self-regulation in daily work practices stands out - regardless of teaching or research orientation - as the most distinctive feature of academic work and one of the most attractive aspects of the job (Saha 1975). The flexible work schedule rates almost as highly as the freedom to carry out original ideas. Both of course add up to a working life largely independent of close supervision. The dangers of generalisations about the everyday patterns of academic work were made clear in a recent field study I conducted where the most striking characteristic was the idiosyncratic nature of the ways academics arranged their working days.

The self-regulation of academic work has been supported by the informal and almost token supervision of staff. While the important debates about academic freedom are being pursued the formalisation of work practices is increasing. Changes in expectations about when and where work will take place can be traced to structural pressures. The demands of multi-campus teaching, for example, keep academics to more rigid timetables and planning meetings. Formality is even being bolstered by litigation concerns; academics who go to work on weekends without the knowledge and approval of their heads have now been informed that they run the risk of not being recognised under the Accident Compensation legislation.

A decline in self-regulation over time and tasks is inevitable as individuals meet the demands of discrete activities and the growth in associated administrative 'housekeeping' duties. Being involved in teams for teaching and research, making limited 'guest appearances' in a range of unconnected courses, and conducting research and consulting with private bodies outside the university demands a different kind of commitment to work. Even in the well-resourced research universities the decline of self-regulated research will continue to change the way projects are initiated and managed (Anderson and Louis 1991). Academics will also become less idiosyncratic in their approaches to work. For example, the range of hours spent on preparing lectures will narrow. Few will be able to get by with an hour or so of preparation and survive student evaluations, while at the other end of the scale, few will continue to have the time or indeed incentive to devote many hours to each lecture.

Fragmentation

Fragmentation and integration of higher education have been the major competing forces in higher education most evident in the inexorable drift towards specialisation, the rapid growth in course types and subjects and the changing division of labour (Clark 1987). Paradoxically, fragmentation of academic work in Australia can be seen primarily as an outcome of the attempt at integration through amalgamations. The fragmentation of work commitment into many discrete tasks is likely to increase. While academics reportedly enjoy the variety of tasks the work offers, it is only so long as the combined activities have an integrity or wholeness. When there are too many discrete activities there comes a point when academics complain that they are busy but not achieving much. Administration associated with accountability and productivity is seen as an intrusion and a distraction from the main purpose of the work. Serious role strain emerges. One solution that individuals might apply is simply to give token commitment to the least meaningful parts of the work or to those in which they are least threatened by accountability measures. That could include such important pedagogic work as non-timetabled talk with students. Academics are getting mixed signals about where to direct their energy.

Teaching larger classes and running fewer tutorials generally means less contact with students. Spreading the effort over a wider range of fragmented courses, sometimes on different campuses, makes it worse. Reducing contact with students effectively robs academics of one of their major sources of intrinsic reward. For those academics not primarily motivated by the rewards of research and publication this represents a serious threat to their job-satisfaction. This is especially true of many from the former CAE sector who were employed only to teach, but it is also true of those academics in the established universities who have shifted their interest from research to teaching during their careers.

Fragmentation is occurring in the composition of the academic workforce as well as in the roles academics take. In addition to disciplinary specialisation, the 'local'/'cosmopolitan' distinction has been widely used broadly to categorise two types of academics and their approaches to academic work (Gouldner 1957). Amongst other things, locals focus their concern in their work activity on the well-being of their institution, while cosmopolitans are of two types: those who look to the 'invisible college' of the international discipline as their source of satisfaction; and careerists on the lookout for advancement outside and who therefore tend to have less commitment to the institution. The influence of locals is reducing and the nature of their work is changing as their roles in keeping the wheels of the university turning are being taken on by specialist support staff and administrators. These changes amount to a subtle process of 'colonisation' of higher education by workers from non-academic backgrounds who have been employed to deliver the promises of accountability and productivity and to keep the institution competitive.

This is not simply a matter of growth in the bureaucracy of institutions; we have had large institutions with large bureaucracies for some time but most of the complaints about size have been ill-founded. The new class of bureaucrats - some with academic appointments - has for some time been replacing the academic 'locals' on tasks such as marketing, counselling, and links to industry. Their style of work, from the hours they keep to the priorities they set, are more in keeping with market individualism. Their practices and values will influence the culture of the universities - clearly they are critical players in the highly competitive environment that now faces universities. It is difficult to imagine that styles of academic work will be unaffected by their presence.

The locals will not disappear of course, but their influence will generally be limited to the level of the course or department. There will be an increasingly overworked small core of academics responsible for administration and coordination at the course or department level. A second group will comprise the growing number of part-time and sessional staff who will fill in teaching spots and who will not surprisingly have less commitment to the department or institution. In the meantime the 'cosmopolitans' are on the ascendancy. Market forces now clearly favour entrepreneurial individuals (sometimes criticised as cuckoos in the institutional nest) who can take short-term contracts, offer specialised skills for specific projects, and use the institutional base for mutual benefit. For the cosmopolitans it is the best of times as they are able to take advantage of their negotiable skills in the market place by developing new courses, or perhaps for the first time legitimately turning their attention to consultancy or research in institutions where such activity was once regarded as a distracting indulgence.

Integration and uniformity

Although there has been some talk of diversity and the valuing of institutional differences, academics see themselves as a result of integration being pushed towards uniformity in their orientation to research and teaching. The most widely discussed change is the strong pressure on former CAE staff to develop a research orientation (Harman and Wood 1990; Moses and Ramsden 1991). One national survey found this academic drift already quite marked over the period 1978 to 1984 when the CAE staff reported more interest in research as their institutions moved towards the university model (Everett and Entrekin 1987). More recent studies have found the aspirations from former CAE to do research quite high although the shift in preferences does not of course indicate the match between the ideal and the actual amount of research that gets done (Ramsden and Moses 1992). Academics may well say they like doing research and would like to publish but the productivity is still usually far less than hoped and the frustration invariably high.

Up to now it has been possible for academics to give token acknowledgment to institutional goals and to decide for themselves the time they allocate to activities beyond their basic teaching contact hours. The self-expectations of academics have always been more important than the expectations of the organisation or even the pressure of colleagues, a phenomenon which does not sit well with goals of central control and uniformity (Austin and Gamson 1983). The uniform model of the professional towards which academics now should aspire is based on the scientific research scholar. But this is essentially a fiction for most academics, and quite unrelated to the everyday reality of what most do or are likely to do.

Relative to research, teaching in higher education has long been undervalued in academic careers. Recent attempts to raise the status of teaching find the prestige of research a major obstacle to any reform of the reward system (Anwyl, Balla and McInnis 1992). The differences in the rewards to individuals and institutions are obvious: academics who do a lot of research get promoted faster, ultimately get paid more, and research-based institutions are likewise wealthier. As Thomas Sowell so bluntly put it: 'Money talks in academia as elsewhere, and what that money says on most campuses is "do research" ' (Sowell 1990)

The growing insistence that academics model their work on what only a minority have normally done is leading to a 'schizoid condition' - a growing source of doubt, ambivalence and role strain. The momentum is too strong to ignore; institutional status depends on a research profile. It has been said that academics feel trapped by a system in which the work and the reward system are disconnected; the Unified National System and the press for uniformity already has them viewing the work of teaching and the rewards of research as opposing forces, thus compounding the sense of fragmentation.

Recruitment

Change to work patterns from within is only part of the picture. Academic work cultures are quite powerful, yet recruitment on a large scale has the potential to influence existing work practices and values. In the current state of flux the model provided for new recruits is already less certain. When the large group of academic opinion leaders soon retire, the legacy they leave will be a pale version of the one they started with, golden age myths and all. How new recruits interpret and shape the academic work environment will be important to monitor; to date the 'deeply socialised existence' of academics and their 'remarkable depth of commitment' have maintained a strong sense of stability and continuity in the approaches of the profession to work (Bowen and Schuster 1986). Will this be true of the next generation of academics and will it be reflected in its work practices?

As more academics come into the profession from the public and private sectors industry in mid-career to fill the gaps facing many disciplines, they will bring with them experiences and outlooks that will almost inevitably shift the work culture of the university further towards the cosmopolitan values and practices referred to earlier. In disciplines like Chemistry, with almost 60 per cent of academic positions requiring replacements in 10 to 15 years, the critical mass is important (Hush and Sternhill 1992). The process of professional socialisation in such disciplines typically takes at least 10 years, and so in the short term such disciplines are faced with recruiting from a pool that is less likely to have internalised the values and practices of the disciplinary culture. If the turnover in this and other disciplines is as large and as rapid as predicted, then a period of anomie or

normlessness seems inevitable. What then will emerge is difficult to say, but unless academics take charge of the agenda the result will most certainly not be to their liking.

Prospects

Despite the rapid changes in the system, the relative loss of salary and the decline in working conditions, academics on the whole remain satisfied with their work (Harman and Wood 1990). For the moment, even though they have been described as dispirited, fragmented, and devalued, academics remain dedicated. But job satisfaction and morale are not the same thing. Satisfaction with work bears on an individual's sense of personal well-being, while morale refers to the relationship with the organisation. Sooner or later, when work prac-tices change to the point that the job applied for is no longer recognisable, low morale starts to impinge on the daily rewards of the work, especially when the primary motivation is the work itself.

The challenge for academics and academic leaders is to match individual preferences in work with institutional goals such that both are enhanced. Perhaps it is time to reassess the appropriateness for all academics of the 'dominant fiction' of the academic as the cosmopoli-tan research scientist, and introduce - not revive - a broader image of scholar for the profession (Rice 1992). The first step to overcoming the growing mismatch between what academics do best and perhaps unrealistic expectations is to redefine scholarship to acknowledge and legitimate the diversity of academics and institutions in the system. The alternative outcome - the one that resulted from middle level universities in the US imitating the research universities - is an 'undistinguished comprehensiveness' (Ruscio 1987). This can apply to individual academics as well as to institutions.

Notes

1   Despite the centrality of academic work to the operation of higher educa-tion, the academic life in Australia has been largely unexamined. We tend to rely on studies from overseas to find what makes academics work. The local research has for the most part focused on the values of academics rather than their practices, and particularly their preferences for research and teaching. This paper is partly based on a study of the work practices of 40 academics to be reported elsewhere.

2   For an analysis of the effects of institutional size see: Peter Blau, *The organisation of academic work*, New York: John Wiley.

References

Anderson, M. S. and Louis, K. (1991), 'The changing focus of control over faculty research: from self regulation to dispersed influenced', in J. C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Practice*, Vol. VIII, New York, Agathon Press.

Anwyl, J; Balla, M. & McInnes C. (1992), *Recognition of Teaching in Promotion Policy and Practice*, Canberra, AGPS.

Austin, A. and Gamson, Z. (1983), *Academic Workplace: New demands, heightened tensions*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10.

Australian Industrial Relations Commission (AIRC) (1991), *Report of Commis-sioner B.J. Frawley on Applications to Vary Academic Salaries*. 18 June.

Barlow K (1989), 'The White Paper and restructuring the academic labour market', *Australian Universities' Review*, No. 1.

Blau, P. (1973), *The Organisation of Academic Work*, New York, John Wiley.

Bowen, H. R. & Schuster, J. H. (1986), *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Campbell, W. B. (1976), *Academic Salaries Tribunal 1976 Review*, Canberra, AGPS.

Clark, B. R. (1987), *The Academic Life*, Carnegie Foundation: Princeton, NJ.

Everett, J. & Entrekin, L. (1987), *Academic Attitudes*, North Ryde, Methuin.

Finkelstein, M. J. (1984), *The American Academic Profession*, Columbus, Ohio State University Press.

Gouldner, A. W. (1957), 'Cosmopolitans and locals: Towards an analysis of latent social roles', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, No. 2.

Halsey, A.H. (1992), *Decline of Donnish Dominion*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Harman, G. & Wood, F. (1990), 'Academics and their work under Dawkins: A study of five NSW Universities', *Australian Educational Researcher*, 17, 2.

Hush, N. S. & Sternhill, S. (1992), 'Academic demography in Australian Chemistry Departments', *Chemistry in Australia*, 59, 5, May.

McGaw, B. (1991), Mass access and quality, *Proceedings of the National Invitational Workshop on the Quality of Higher Education*, Centre for Higher Education, University of Melbourne.

McInnis, C. (1990), *Academic staff activities*, Report for the Higher Education Council, NBEET.

Moses, I. & Ramsden, P. (1991), 'Academics and academic work in colleges of advanced education and universities', paper presented at the *Conference 25 Years after the Martin Report*, University of New England, 3-5 February.

O'Brien, J. (1990), 'Privatising State Workers: The case of academics', *Austral-ian Universities' Review*, Nos 1 and 2.

Powles, M. & Day, N. (1990), 'Staff in the Accounting Discipline in Higher Education", in R. Matthews (chair), *Accounting in Higher Education: report of the review of the accounting discipline in higher education*.

Ramsden, P. & Moses, I. (1992), 'Associations between research and teaching in Australian higher education', *Higher Education* 23, 3, April.

Rice, R. E. (1992), 'Toward a broader conception of scholarship: The American model', in T. G. Whiston & R. L. Geiger, *Research and Higher Education: The United Kingdom and the United States*, SRHE, Open University Press.

Ruscio, K. P. (1987), 'Many sectors, many professions' in B. Clark (ed.), *The Academic Profession*, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Saha, L. J. (1975), 'Job attraction and job satisfaction: A study of academics at an Australian University', in D. Edgar (ed.), *Sociology of Australian Education*, McGraw Hill, Sydney.

Sowell, T. (1990), 'On the higher learning in America: Some comments', *The Public Interest*, 99, Spring.

Williams, B. (1979), *Education, training and employment: Report of the committee of inquiry into education and training*, Canberra, AGPS.

Academic perceptions of their roles pre and post the new higher education policy

Linda Hort and Harry Oxley
University of Canberra

During the first semester of 1987, while the new Higher Education Policy Paper was still a gleam in some politicians eye, we sent out almost 1500 questionnaires to a sample of Australian academics from 25 higher education institutions, large and small universities and large and small colleges of advanced education (CAEs). The aim of our research was to determine academics' perceptions of their roles and their careers, and look for sectoral and size differences in those things (Oxley and Hort, 1987; Hort and Oxley, 1989). However, we were also sitting on a gold mine of information. Quite by chance we had an enormous amount of data on academics in institutions just before the release of the new policy on higher education, the abolition of the binary divide, and the commencement of a series of institutional amalgamations.

At the end of the first semester in this year we repeated part of our study. We say part because this second survey was a small one, and only two thirds of the proportion who responded to the first one completed and returned its questionnaires. While the results of our recent survey, then, certainly need to be regarded with caution, we do not believe that we have here the phenomenon of 'garbage in, garbage out'. Just as gardeners say 'a weed' is not a special kind of plant but any plant allowed to grow in the wrong place, so is 'garbage' not a particular kind of data but data allowed to masquerade as that which it is not. Here we are not masquerading. What we present is sugges-tive. Insofar as most of it fits a clear pattern, and that pattern would probably be fairly widely suspected without benefit of surveys, it is strongly suggestive. It does not, however, settle matters once and for all with any 'scientific certainty'.

Method

Questionnaire

The questionnaire that we used in 1987 was reprinted and sent out again this year. It contained 20 questions. These included five questions on role orientation and 7 questions on job satisfaction, as well as "background" questions.

Sample

Samples in both 1987 and 1992 were drawn from institutional staff lists. The first was drawn so as to get sufficient representation from 2 by 2 'sectors'; large universities, small universities, large CAEs ('Institutes of Technology') and small CAEs. This second one aimed at the same balance, because we were interested in the presence or absence and (if present) nature of changes in these 'sectors' under their new names. But these new sectorially-denying names are often accompanied by sectorially-confusing handbook staff lists. We picked our sector-representatives from where the staff-lists were clear. We did not attempt to sample from all the particular institutions which we sampled before but used a smaller number of institutions. This was partly because we want to use the greater number of them again for another study and do not want to over-survey; but it was mostly for relative ease in a work-context of constant rush. The problem with this way is that (a) not only sectors but individual institutions differ in the amount of satisfaction they offer their staff, (b) we realised after we had sent the questionnaires out that one of the institutions we had picked had come up in the earlier survey as more unhappy than the rest, so that, if its miseries have stayed the same over the interim

period, this may have made this particular sub-sector as a whole appear more unhappy than it more generally is.

The 1987 and 1992 samples were both proportionally stratified by institution type (prior to 1988) and by faculty (Arts, Science, and the "professions" - Commerce, Law and Economics).

Procedure

The survey was mailed, with a reply paid envelope and covering letter to all selected academics during the mid first semester break in 1992. Only a single mailing was used.

Results

At the time of this analysis a total of 100 completed questionnaires have been returned. To meet deadlines it has been necessary to truncate the sample returning, and to analyse those questionnaires we have at this time. Questionnaires continue to be returned but have not been included in our analysis. Because of this constraint the response rate is unfortunately low at 34%.

The hypothesis

Dawkins restructured higher education. But he restructured it at a time already well-begun of changes afflicting higher education across the whole of the older English-speaking part of an economically depressed Western world, where many things were falling apart (see also Dummett, 1992). Given this general trend towards what used to be the CAE world, we expected the bulk of CAEs to continue much as before whatever name they got, with an addition of 'research' as an additional management imposition upon staff duties as a possibility. Otherwise, we expected the differences between the original 'univer-sities' and these CAEs to be much the same today regardless of new names.

The only places we saw real change as a possibility were the larger 'Central Institutes of Technology', which had the size and the special expertise - and parallels in highly respected American institutions - and which were beginning to seek and get the label 'university' before Dawkins changes.

Thus we expected to find certain tendencies which would probably have occurred if Dawkins had never existed. These tendencies we expected to involve a general trend towards acceptance of pedagogy as the prime university duty, an increasing bureaucratisation, and a general lessening of work satisfaction.

Demographics

The demographics of contemporary higher education are better covered by studies of figures already present in the institutions' personnel offices if they are not already in official statistics. But, for analyses of more complexity than we need (or feel able to do from the small 1992 sample) to do here, we asked such questions and give our answers. They have nothing to do with what Dawkins would no doubt have seen as 'restructuring' and we have come to see as mere 're-naming', and are all as were to be expected.

As regards to time served in the institutions, the original universi-ties (especially the smaller ones) show an increase in the more recently employed; this is to be expected from staff increases and needs to replace retiring academics. Small universities have acquired a lot of new blood with expansions and turnover. The ex-CAEs have