

want a structure like the public service or the metal industry but that is what we've had to negotiate.

AHEIA was willing to consider a model based on a superior lecturer with similar functions. This model would be similar to the notion of master teacher. The higher levels would perform the same functions, but would be superior in quality. Therefore institutions would pay for higher quality not for performing particular functions. However, the unions and DEET wanted a career structure based on different functions that would include promotion on merit as well. What eventuated was a system about half way in between these two notions but one closer to the unions' and DEET's position. The PCSs incorporate both different functions and higher levels of merit as an academic progresses up the hierarchy.

A potential disadvantage of the functional model is that it may create a more hierarchical structure instead of a flatter structure. This could have been a mistake on the part of the unions in following the metal industry model. Perhaps they were forced into it by DEET and the Commission based on previous agreements that have emphasised particular models that are deemed appropriate for all industries. A union industrial officer commented:

My main criticism of the ACTU in its handling of the Accords is that there has been one approach for everyone. This does not allow for distinguishing between the public and private sector or within those by different industries. How do you measure efficiency in the public sector? They based efficiency on measures taken from manufacturing. Once a sector is broadbanded for multi-skilling, what else is there for them to do to show efficiency?

It is important to note that an advantage of functional hierarchies, such as those that exist in the public service, is that when an individual is performing a higher function, they can demand a higher allowance. In the past, academics have been given tasks regardless of their rank. With award restructuring, if individuals are lower in rank than the functions demand, a higher salary can be paid. Although this may benefit the individual academic, the overall structure may lead to difficulties in trying to create a more democratic decision-making process within universities.

Staff Development and Staff Appraisal

With award restructuring, there is more incentive to develop training programs. After the granting of the second tier awards, the government provided staff development funds on a competitive basis to institutions. Many institutions began to examine their staff development policies and applied for national funds to assist the development of programs. Both the unions and AHEIA saw advantages to staff development. The Chair of the AHEIA, Professor David Penington, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne, commented that 'there should be improved staff development for junior academics during their probation period'. Overall, academics acknowledge the need to improve many of their skills: word processing, accounting, personnel management and teaching, to name a few.

On the question of staff appraisal, however, there has been disagreement and considerable confusion. On 23 July the Full Bench resolved that there was to be 'on a trial basis for 12 months, a system of compulsory regular staff appraisal for staff development purposes. At this stage, appraisal is not linked with salary increments. However, the Bench said that incremental advancement should be based upon 'objective criteria' to be developed by the parties, though not, at this stage, with development appraisal schemes.

AHEIA had hoped to take staff appraisal further than in the second tier awards and link it to incremental advance. The Bench went against this idea. A number of institutions are trying to institute staff appraisal systems. There are often objections to the kind of scheme management would like to implement, so few institutions have established their staff appraisal procedures to date.

The fact that the Full Bench decided not to link staff appraisal with salary increments can be seen as a victory for the unions that presented considerable evidence on this matter before the Commission. The Commonwealth did not intervene on this issue which was another

factor leaning in the direction of the unions' position. Linking staff appraisal with staff development should be of benefit to academics. However, it may lead to dismissal for a few staff who are deemed to be performing at an unsatisfactory level. No case of dismissal or disciplinary action has succeeded to date but there may be cases that supervisors will identify through these procedures in the future.

Concluding Comments

With the emergence of higher education as an industry and the subsequent unionisation of academics, the relationship between academics and university management was altered. Decision-making within universities has also been affected by the White Paper reforms which restructured universities. Nevertheless, individual institutions still maintain considerable autonomy. For this reason, the long term effects of both the second tier awards and award restructuring can only be assessed at the institutional level. It would be fair to report that on many campuses little progress has been made in the implementation of most aspects of the 1988 second tier awards. Some of the officers interviewed suggested that the process of implementing award restructuring may take at least a decade.

Even though award restructuring may have put more pressure on the management of universities, at the same time Vice-Chancellors have gained greater flexibility in controlling staff and dismissing them where they succeed in introducing stricter policies for probation, incremental advance and their preferred model of staff appraisal. Tenured academics may have benefited the most with greater salary increases, broader promotion criteria and the likelihood that they will benefit more from staff development. Some junior academics will benefit from the confirmation of tenure; yet many will still be untenured and like casual academics, will have few of the benefits and a greater workload and much less pay than tenured and senior academics.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Australian Research Council's Small Grants Scheme. Revisions of this paper have benefited from the comments of Russell Blackford, Cora Baldock, Ray Fells, Joan Hardy, Simon Marginson, Herb Thompson and Julie Tracy. I appreciated the time given by the individuals interviewed in UACA, FAUSA and AHEIA and their valuable perspectives on award restructuring.

References

- ACTU (1989), *Blueprint for Changing Awards and Agreements*. Melbourne: Australian Council of Trade Unions.
- Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission (1988), National Wage Case. (August) DEC 640/88 in Print H4000, 1-15.
- Australian Industrial Relations Commission (1989), National Wage Case. (August) DEC 530/89 in Print H9100, 1-28.
- Barlow, K. (1991), 'Restructuring the Australian Labour Market' in O'Leary, J. and Sharp, R. (eds). *Inequality in Australia: Slicing the Cake*. Port Melbourne: William Heinemann Australia.
- Ewer, P., Hampson, I., Lloyd, C., Rainford, J., Rix, S. and Smith, M. (1991), *Politics and the Accord*. Leichhardt, NSW: Pluto Press.
- Marginson, S. (1990), 'Academic salaries in Australia, 1967 to 1990', *Australian Universities' Review*, 27 June, pp 1-10.
- McCulloch, G. (1991), 'Salaries decision an initial victory but problems lie ahead' *Journal of Higher Education*, 14, 4 (September) p 1-5.
- O'Brien, J. (1992), 'The emergence of the collective organisation of Australian academic staff 1949-1983'. Paper delivered at the Annual Conference of the Association of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia and New Zealand, 29 January-1 February.
- R vs Coldham; Ex parte Australian Social Welfare Union (1983), 47 ALR 225.

The state of the academic profession

An Australia - United Kingdom comparison

Henry Miller,
Aston University

Introduction

This article attempts to convey something of the current state of the academic profession in the United Kingdom with some comparisons with the situation in Australia. I shall seek to outline some salient features of the way state and economy, and their interaction, affect policy and management in higher education and hence the situation of academics' and changes in the nature of their academic work in the context of the United Kingdom State which is now entering its fourth period of governance by a conservative administration.

One way to understand the changing pressures on the academic profession would be to start with individual experience and work². How many of us dream of applying performance indicators to marking or doing terrible things to the Vice-Chancellor; the pressures may manifest themselves at the unconscious level. At the conscious level for the individual there are the strains and stresses of handling increasing teaching and administrative loads, the pressures to produce more research and to compete for limited funds. All this has to be done on salary levels that fall increasingly behind that of 'professional' and 'managerial' colleagues. There is circumstantial evidence for the reality informing this experience and feeling. In the UK case the AUT survey on stress (AUT 1990), reports by management and unions on pay and conditions and the Halsey surveys (Halsey 1992) provide ample evidence of low morale, motivation and pessimism. However, while personal and peers' work experience, surveys and the institutional plans of specific universities in both Australia and the United Kingdom focus on the near picture, there needs to be an attempt at a broader analysis which encompasses developments at the level of the economy and the State. This is for two reasons.

Firstly, what is happening on the ground - increased student numbers, modularisation of courses, changes in procedures for bidding for research funds - is mainly a product of decisions not initiated at the department or institutional level, but rather flowing from the response of academic managers to changes in funding and control mechanisms emanating from the State. The changes in State policy are themselves the product, not only of political and administrative and legal decisions initiated by government, but also the response of government political parties, mediated by ideology, to movements in the national and world economies. These initiatives from the State are mediated, resisted and sometimes modified by institutional organisations, committees of vice-chancellors and principals, research councils and associations of academic staff as well as other interest groups. This complex of forces is the material grounding, the field, the environment, the set of constraints within which academics seek to organise their work.

Secondly, related to the above but not determined by it in a simple base/superstructure model - rather informing, mingling, mediating it - is the realm of ideas, of discourse; the language, the set of symbols which affect, inform, infuriate and sometimes facilitate academics in their attempts to make sense of, justify or merely live with their everyday work activities. However, English academics are usually seen as pragmatic professionals rather than critical intellectuals³ and this may inhibit critical sensitivity to international social, political and intellectual movements. Nevertheless, the non-conferment of a degree on Margaret Thatcher at Oxford in 1984 was partly at least a protest at the impact of conservative education policies on the whole of the higher education system⁴.

If we now turn to a sketch of the main features of economy, politics, legislation and discourse affecting UK and Australian academics, we can see that some of them are common, or at least comparable. Despite the variations, as between the managerial cultures in different institutions of higher education in Australia and the United Kingdom, there are elements which would seem to relate to deep structures of economy, polity and language which affect both countries and also Canada, and fairly similarly the United States, but to a lesser extent other advanced industrial societies such as Germany, Japan or France.

In varying degrees there has been a continuing economic crisis and restructuring since the mid-1970s. In the main, this has weakened manufacturing industry and not changed the traditional reluctance of business to invest in research or development either on its own account or through universities. At least this seems to be true if we compare with major industrial competitors like Germany, Japan or even the United States. This economic crisis or weakness more or less dramatically portrayed has been taken on board by governments and advisers. There has been the rhetoric, if not always the actuality, of the need for research and development in industry and in the universities to meet the needs of the economy.

So that underlying the particular dynamics of management of a higher education institution, lie not only the characteristics of the culture of the nation state and region in which it is located, but a much broader set of external movements which in its cultural aspects are becoming increasingly similar so that the language of management is familiar to academics across continents and is regarded by many with similar suspicion.

Not only has there been a substantial movement of academics between Australian Universities and Colleges of Advanced Education and UK Universities and Polytechnics, but also that the ideas that inform the dominant political discourse flow between - and often find common ground between - the two countries. The influence of political and economic analysis developed in the United States of America - the Chicago School, Milton Friedman, and Reagonomics - sometimes directly, sometimes mediated by Thatcherism or by home grown new Right or Corporate advocates in Australia, is certainly significant⁵. These educationally influential discourses are connected with the dynamics and problems that the economies of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia, have all experienced in similar, but varying forms.

Higher Education in the UK

The expansion in British Higher Education failed to keep pace with all the other industrialised countries from the early 1970s, and in the mid 1970s, faced by the energy crisis and pressure from the International Monetary Fund, the Labour Government started the process of cuts in education and other social services⁶. This was dramatically accelerated by the Thatcherite Conservative government which was influenced by a monetarist doctrine. The 1981 cuts in university funding were a product of a process of cuts in public expenditure. The cuts fell most heavily on the technological universities and hit science as well as social sciences. (M & D Kogan 1983)

As the 1980s drew on, it became clear that the 1981 financial cuts were only the first stage of a larger plan to reduce universities' dependence on government funding. Universities were encouraged to build stronger links with industry and to seek alternative sources of financial support. In 1974 block grants accounted for 77% of income

and by 1987 only 55%. From 1986 onwards the basis for funding was separated into two parts. It was based on student numbers for teaching and on research reputations and amount of awards from independent Research Grant awarding bodies for research. About this time the conversion of the government to the need for increased graduate numbers to meet the needs of the economy became clear. It was set out clearly in the White Paper entitled *Higher Education: Meeting the Challenge* (1987).

The impact of these changes on academics in both parts of the binary sector have been complex and profound, but certain trends are clear. Firstly, a relative worsening of salary and promotion prospects⁷ which the settlements in 1987, 1989, 1990 and proposed 6% 1992 AUT - CVCP settlement have done little to improve. The situation has been worsened by government intervention vetoing the agreed 6% and imposing 4.2% with .75 reserved for performance-related pay. A similar settlement of 3.9% was imposed on 'new university' academic staff and all public sector employees now face a 1.5% ceiling on increases in 1993. Secondly, a growth in the number and proportion of staff employed on short-term, part-time, or temporary contracts with no tenure provision. Amongst academic non-clinical UK university staff between 1977/78 and 1987/88 the numbers of part-time staff more than doubled from 1,501 to 3,162 as did staff not wholly funded by the University Grants Committee (UGC) from 7,015 to 14,315 whereas wholly funded staff actually dropped from 30,459 to 29,169.

The 1988 Education Reform Act was a confirmation and crystallization of the policies that have been signalled over the decade. Polytechnics and other higher educational institutions were removed from local authority control. Their staff ceased to be local authority employees and became employees of the new corporate institutions which are overwhelmingly State funded, so they became national rather than local State employees. The UGC was replaced by the Universities Funding Council (UFC) and arrangements were initiated by the appointment of University Commissioners to abolish the tenure of academics. The 1991 Further and Higher Education Act takes the process further of unifying the governance of higher education.

The reform, or rather reconstitution of, funding bodies for universities and polytechnics and other colleges providing higher education, together with a changed emphasis on the criteria for funding was central to the current changes in policy and structure of higher education. The UFC was smaller than the UGC, statutorily incorporated and with a strong industrial and commercial element. Only half of the fifteen members are drawn from the academic world. In some respects we can see the current measures as formalising in legal form existing power relations. The strong emphasis on business involvement is relatively new and fits with government ideology, policy and practice as it has developed through the 1980s.

The proposals to change the criteria relating to academic tenure were seen by many as a threat to the freedom of academic research and teaching. The 1988 Act appointed Commissioners who will ensure that university statutes make provision for the dismissal of staff due to redundancy. The danger is that dissenting or unpopular staff may be dismissed by simply defining their area of work redundant within an academic plan. The first batch of University Charters are currently being amended in line with the proposals of the Commission.

The most recent developments in the government of Higher Education in the UK are contained in its White Paper, *Higher Education: A New Framework*, published on 22 May 1991, and the *Further and Higher Education Act*, March 1992. The Government stressed that its chief aim is to increase participation rates in higher education from one in five eighteen-year-olds in 1990, to one in three by the year 2000. The Paper and the Act proposes a series of structural reforms which the Government believes will facilitate this expansion, the most important of which is removal of the "binary line" separating 47 universities in England, Wales and Northern Ireland and 8 in Scotland, from 28 English and Welsh polytechnics, 5 Scottish Central Institutions and other higher education colleges.

The Act abolishes the Universities Funding Council and the Polytechnics and Colleges Funding Council, and replaces them by a single

funding structure for universities, polytechnics and other colleges consisting of separate Higher Education Funding Councils for England, Scotland and Wales which will distribute funding for teaching and research. It extends the title of university, and degree-awarding powers, to polytechnics and potentially other suitable institutions which meet certain criteria. The White Paper stressed the need for increased efficiency in higher education, but in order to attempt to achieve expansion without loss of quality the Government proposes to institute new arrangements for quality assurance and quality audit of teaching and research which will be common across the restructured higher education system.

Competition and selectivity in research funding is being promoted. The SR element of research funding, currently allocated to universities by reference to student numbers, is being phased out. Resources for research will be allocated by the Higher Education Councils, against judgemental criteria, for use at institutions' discretion, and by Research Councils, on a competitive basis, for specific projects.

Pressures and problems

Professor Martin Harrison, Vice-Chancellor of Essex University and Chairman of the C.V.C.P. in an article entitled "Crisis deepens on Britain's campuses" wrote:

The central problem springs from an attempt to achieve simultaneously three policy objectives: to increase access to higher education, to constrain public expenditure severely and to maintain quality (Harrison 1991).

A Dean at the University of Ulster assessed the pressures from central government like this "The pressures will continue to be of a conflicting kind, namely a desire for expansion of student numbers and more industry oriented-research coupled with a continued unwillingness to pay for either." (ibid.)

The failure of governmental funds to keep pace with the existing and expected activities, both teaching⁸ and research, of the University has meant there is a continuing and increasing search for funds elsewhere. This can partly be done by providing research consultancy and tailored courses which cover costs and provide profits for the institution. There can be real tensions between an imperative for higher education to provide the research and development which will modernize and increase the competitiveness of firms or whole sections of the economy and the simple search for funds; sometimes these dynamics coincide but not always. There is a further paradox in that there are strong elements within governmental circles within the Conservative Administrations in the UK, and even within the Labor Administration in Australia, which seek to reduce government expenditure and which believe in the superiority of the dynamics of the market. At the same time there are demonstrable needs for research and development which the private sector seems incapable of, or unwilling to, fund or manage.

A pervasive part of the culture of Higher Education is an increasing and acknowledged orientation to "the market". This is expressed in the tailoring of courses and research to the expressed needs of industry, commerce or professional groups, but also it became embedded in the language, discourse and attitudes within the institution. Just two examples - one from a University Administrator and one from a Union activist - are representative of wider opinion amongst academic staff:

The University is strongly market oriented both in relation to the development of courses and research thrusts. This is built into the organizations of the institution issuing in various market strategies. They are pervasive and subscribed to at all levels in the institution from Deans to Heads of Department, Directors of Research Centres, Senior Course Tutors. Relatively few academics take another view and express it privately rather than publicly". (Administrator.)

It's the ethos of the market - the language being used the management style - completely market led - almost a profit driven type of enterprise and we thought we were academics. The talk is of clients

or consumers rather than students. But the management style is discredited it uses techniques which are pretty naff in terms of modern business practice - the breaking up of the academic community into a rigid hierarchical structure. We used to elect Deans". (Union representative.)

Harris argues that there is a relatively new emphasis on 'management' in higher education. In all the cultures of old and new universities, ex-polytechnics and ex-colleges of advanced education there are varying existing traditions of collegiality and of administration. Thus, there are questions of how new managerialism relates to these older styles of governance, how much does managerialism incorporate, redefine or replace previous styles and structures and how far this affects the profession and its representative unions and associations.

With the establishment of a unified system, discussions within the Association of University Teachers (AUT) and National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE) at both national and local level about various forms of merger or affiliation are sharpening. There are also institutional, organisational and cultural complexities which make an easy move to one union difficult. NATFHE organises in Further Education as well as Higher Education, it does not organise academic related, administrative, computer and library staff (some of these are in NALGO) while in the universities these staff are mainly organised by the AUT, nor does it represent staff in Scotland, whereas the AUT has a Scottish Section. Difficult negotiations will have to take place before anything like a unified organisation is established. Meanwhile, national negotiations around pay and conditions of work will take place, probably with one organisation representing Vice-Chancellors of old and new universities.

One strand within both the university and polytechnic sector have been attempts to promote local bargaining and to enhance institutional managerial discretion around contracts, incremental points, appraisal systems etc. As in Australia, there is a dual movement, more is being negotiated nationally but there are also attempts at devolution of management and negotiation to the local level, sometimes with an attempt to by-pass already established local procedures, at other times establishing new areas of consultation and negotiation. The effect in both countries looked at from the union official or activist point of view is that there is more to do⁹.

Conclusion

In conclusion, is there any simple way to sum up the state of the academic profession in the United Kingdom and how does it compare with that in Australia? The sense of disappointment - for some despair - amongst many academics in both universities and polytechnics consequent on the fourth Conservative victory in April is deep. This is partly because of the predominant support by most academics for either Labour or the Liberal Democrats¹⁰ and the, as it turned out, misleading lead for Labour in the opinion polls prior to the election. There is a distinction between the majority political allegiance of academics with their political masters and as Halsey¹¹ succinctly puts it: "They are unloved by their political masters."

On the other hand the plans for structural change, the abolition of the binary divide and most policy funding measures, involving research selectivity and expansion of student numbers with limitation of resources, thus involving a dealing unit of resource per student were shared by all three major political parties. Neither are Labour politicians, as Australians know only too well, immune from the temptation to denigrate academics as being divorced from the world of business and in need of strong managerial control at state and institutional level.

What of the academic profession itself? Is it meaningful any longer to call ourselves a unified profession? The increasing number of staff on short-term, temporary or part-time contracts not supported by Funding Council monies has increased and their remuneration and conditions of work are significantly worse than that of most tenured academic staff, let alone the established medical professor. The conditions of work, remuneration, attitudes and aspirations as be-

tween polytechnic and university staff Halsey shows have been converging since the mid-1970s (Halsey 1992, p. 120), and the abolition of the binary divide is likely to increase that tendency. The implications of the policy of funding research selectivity is bound to produce a differentiation of staff, departments and universities. This will probably mean that maybe 10 or 15 universities will emerge with a dominant-research mission and that the rest, including the present polytechnics, will be ranked in an uneasily shifting league where some institutions and staff will combine to aspire to a significant research component in their activities while others may more wholeheartedly embrace a teaching mission. This process is likely to be similar in both Australia and the United Kingdom. Despite the affirmation by governments, learned bodies, vice-chancellors and union executives of the need to reward excellence in teaching to a comparable level to that in research, the dynamics of the international knowledge community and the established prestige of the research function makes that ideal of "separate but equal" difficult to realise whether in race-relations or educational practice.

One of the important features of the current state of the profession is the disadvantaged situation of women. Amongst full-time academic staff in universities in 1989-1992 women constituted 22% of the lecturer grade, 6% of the senior lecturer grade and only 3% of the professors. Overall, women in universities were paid on average 83.9% of the salaries of men. The gap is greatest in the lecturer and professorial grade, only 1.5% of the 8% pay gap in the lecturer grade can be accounted for by slightly lower age and length of service, 6.5% must be due to other factors. There is a danger that the introduction of greater management control through the use of discretion points may further reduce women's prospects of academic career progression (AUT 1992; Halsey 1992).

As far as proletarianisation is concerned, while within the careful, limited Weberian formulation that Halsey uses focussing on the degree of autonomy, from the institution, the state and industry, the security of employment, tenure and casualisation and the chances of promotion and relative pay levels, there is a case that for the 'profession' as a whole there has been a diminishing of power and position although the term proletarianisation seems somewhat overdrawn. If we take the labour process Marxist perspective, apart from the difficulties of applying an analysis essentially developed for productive work within the private sector, there remains the substantial difficulty that for many academics their work also contains elements of managerial work with secretaries, technicians, other academics, e.g. members of research teams and indeed in some sense with students (Miller 1992). In order to test that analysis it would be necessary to further elaborate the role of academics in universities in terms of their social and economic role within the broader society in formulation of cultural and material capital, legitimating the state and realising profit.

Nevertheless, in the past decade there has, in general, been an intensification of labour in the three major areas of teaching, research and administration. In terms of the numbers taught, staff/student ratios have increased from 9.3:1 in 1979/1980 to 12.3:1 in 1990/1991. The polytechnic and college average was 15.2:1 in 1990/1991, having increased from 13.5:1 in five years¹². In the 1991/1992 academic year there are 30,000 more students in the old universities which is equivalent to three fair sized UK universities of the 1980s.

As far as publications produced are concerned Halsey (1992, p. 184) reports that the mean numbers of papers, articles or books published in the previous two years increased from 3.5 in 1976 to 6.6 in 1989 in universities and from 0.9 to 2.0 in polytechnics, and the percentage of staff who had not published declined from 23% in universities and 68% in polytechnics in 1976 to 9% and 46% respectively in 1989. A process of differentiation between researchers and teachers is at this stage a largely incipient one but what may be more significant is the gap between the managers and the managed. As collegiality has declined in many institutions, academics who in a previous era saw themselves as temporary academic leaders or even administrative heads of departments servicing the needs of the profession, have been

designated executives, managers and in large measure have taken on that appellation and made it part of their identity, in many cases submerging their previous persona as teacher, scholar or researcher.

The distinction between them is often not a simple one, people do move in out of the roles and those who are managed in turn manage, power slips inexorably skywards so that when a Cabinet Minister is challenged on a policy decision, he can reply 'but I'm only a member of the Cabinet, I have little control.' Vice-Chancellors, Deans and Heads of Departments often use a similar logic. Critical as one may be of that position, most academics will at some time or other be drawn into a managerial decision-making arena, administering research funds, coping with increased student numbers, devising forms of accountability where they are essential, responding to outside pressures not of their own making, where uncomfortable compromises are struck and where the issues of principle, standards, autonomy or even scholarship, can get buried. The density of work is increasing, if one stays in the institution or profession as an active member and doesn't retreat into ritual, isolation or eccentricity -and those strategies are increasingly difficult- then the demands on time and temperament, steadily increase and difficult decisions have to be made at the individual, departmental and institutional level as well, of course, for the union as to what are the real priorities, what compromises are unavoidable and where a stand has to be made.

Notes

1. A. H. Halsey in his book with the evocative title *Decline of Donnish Dominion: The British Academic Professions in the Twentieth Century*, provides something of a benchmark and focus for a discussion of changes acting on and amongst academics and includes surveys in 1964, 1976 and 1989 on university and polytechnic staff. Like H. Perkins' book *The Rise of Professional Society* (London: Routledge, 1989), it raises crucial questions about the professionalism and proletarianisation of academics.

2. Some source material is derived from a study I have been doing of academic managers in Australia, the United Kingdom and Canada. A comparative study based on interviews with a 100 academic managers and union representatives in 20 universities and polytechnics conducted in Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom between February and September 1992 of changes in university management and the perceived pressures from state and economy. (Book forthcoming 1993). There is more personal experience as an academic working in a university, Aston, which has experienced more change and restructuring than most in the United Kingdom. I was President of the local Association of University Teachers Branch and was involved with a major legal case over academic tenure and for a number of periods member of Senate and Council. For an account of the situation from the point of view of two main activists during the 1989-1990 period see H. Miller and S. Wheeler. See also H. Miller, 'Academics and their Labour Process' in C. Smith, D. Knights and H. Willmott (Eds) *White-Collar Work: the Non-Manual Labour Process*, London: Macmillan, pp. 109-137.

3. M. S. Hickox. 'Has there been a British Intelligentsia?' *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol XXVII, No. 2, 1986. P. Anderson. 'Components of the National Culture'. London *New Left Review* No. 49 (1968). 'Culture in Control Flow', Part 1. *New Left Review* No. 180 (1989) and Part 2 *New Left Review* No. 182 (1990). A.H. Halsey op. cit. p.127 quoting Scott *The Crisis of the Universities?* (1983), "The pragmatism of the British intellectual tradition inhibited the development of an oppositional intelligentsia which might make its natural home in higher education and so provoke the suspicion of established society." (Scott, 1983: 249). J. Habermas. *Towards a Rational Society*, London: Heineman (1971), discusses not only the characteristics and problems of the German student movement, but also science and technology as ideology and the case for the democratisation of the university.

4. The admittedly contested conferment of an honorary doctorate on the French deconstructivist philosopher Derrida at Cambridge in May 1992, could also be seen as a symbolic act signifying a degree of academic independence from establishment discourse.

5. See Michael Pusey (1991) in his *Economic Rationalism in Canberra*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1991). The subtitle "A Nation Building State Changes its Mind" and the rigorous analysis of the changes in personnel and dominant ideas in central commonwealth administrative structures shows the impact of an emerging dominant free market economic discourse. In the United Kingdom the work of the education group 2 at the Centre, the Department of Contemporary Cultural Studies, *Education Limited*, London: Unwin Hyman (1991), pays due attention to changes in languages and discourse and charts the

hegemony of the ideas of the new right in education.

6. In 1964 Harold Wilson's Labour government established 29 polytechnics based on existing technical colleges, with which over time, many colleges of education merged to form the second half of the binary system. The hope was that this section of higher education would not only be cheaper to run than the universities, but also more amenable directly to public control and responsive to the needs of the people, industry, science and commerce. Eric Robinson's book *The New Polytechnics*, Harmondsworth, Penguin (1968), with its subtitle "The People's Universities", gives a good account of the radical and progressive project for the polytechnics. Thus, although the scale of the overall expansion of student numbers in higher education had, by 1981, come close to the 1963 Robbins Report projection of 560,000 full time students, their distribution in institutions was not what he had planned. Just over half of this figure were in universities, well short of Robbins' projection of 80%.

7. While the promotion prospects in universities have probably decreased, the proportion of university teachers between 1976 and 1989 who are professors, declined from 10.2% to 9.5%, in polytechnics the proportion of heads of department increased from 4.0% to 7.3% in the same period (Halsey op. cit. p. 117) and over 500 people in polytechnics have received the title of professor in the last three years. D. Walker 'Our Polyprofs are just as good as your Professors', *Independent*, 3 January 1991, p.15.

8. "The proportion of all academic staff who enjoy the protection of finance wholly from university funds fell from 84% in 1970 to 77% in 1980 and further to 63% in 1989." Halsey op. cit. p.135.

9. See H. Miller and S. Wheeler 'Changing Patterns of Power in Higher Education: A Case Study'. Paper to Ethnography and Educational Reform Conference, Warwick University, Sept 1990, which gives an account of local and national negotiations from two union activists perspective.

10. *The Times Higher Education Supplement* of March 27th 1992, just before the election, reported on I.C.M. telephone representative sample poll of 518 university, polytechnic and college lecturers. Amongst those intending to vote university lecturers split 14% Conservative, 54% Labour, 31% Liberal-Democrat and amongst polytechnic lecturers 19% Conservative, 57% Labour and 19% Liberal-Democrat.

11. Halsey, op. cit. p.269. 42% of the university teachers and 16% of polytechnic staff, 69% of university staff compared with 32% of polytechnic staff have Doctorates. Halsey *ibid.* p.117.

12. Figures supplied in answer to Parliamentary Questions reported in the *T.H.E.S.* June 19th 1992, p.5. The rise in University S.S.R. has been exponential being nearly 11% in first half of the 80s and 19% in the second. The higher rate in polytechnics and colleges is partly due to different subject rises between the sectoring with differing ratio, for example, universities had 30 medical schools with low S.S.Rs which dragged down the sector wide average.

References

- Anderson, P. (1968) 'Components of a National Culture', *New Left Review*, No. 49.
- Anderson, P. (1989) 'Culture in Control Flow', Part 1, *New Left Review*, No. 180.
- Anderson, P. (1990) 'Culture in Control Flow', Part 2, *New Left Review*, No. 182.
- AUT (Association of University Teachers) (1990) *Good Will Under Stress: Morale in UK Universities*, London, Association of University Teachers.
- AUT (1992) *Sex Discrimination in Universities: Report of an academic pay audit*, Research Department Report, London.
- Centre for Contemporary Labour Studies (1991) *Education Unlimited*, London, Unwin Hyman.
- Habermas, J. (1971) *Towards a Rational Society*, London, Heineman.
- Halsey, AH (1992) *The Decline of Donnish Dominion: The British Academic Professions in the Twentieth Century*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Harrison, M. B. (1991) 'Crisis Deepens on Britain's Campuses', *The Observer*, 10 November.
- Hickox, M. S. (1986) 'Has there been a British Intelligentsia', *British Journal of Sociology*, XXVII, 2.
- Higher Education: Meeting the Challenge* (1987), London, HMSO.
- Kogan M. and D. (1983) *The Attack on Higher Education*, London, Kogan Page.
- Miller, H. and Wheeler S (1990) 'Changing Patterns of Power in Higher Education: A Case Study', Paper given to the Ethnography and Educational Reform Conference, Norwich University, September.

Miller, H. (1992) 'The Academic Labour Process' in C. Smith et al (eds), *White Collar Work: The Non Manual Labour Process*, London, MacMillan.

PA Personnel Services (1986) *Report on Factors Affecting Recruitment and Retention of Non-clinical Academic Staff*, London, Universities Academic Salaries Committee A.

Perkins, H. (1989) *The Rise of the Professional Society*, London, Routledge.

Pusey, M. (1991) *Economic Rationalism in Canberra: A Nation Building State Changes its Mind*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Robinson, E. (1968) *The New Polytechnics*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Scott, P. (1983) *The Crisis of the Universities*, Beckenham, Croom Helm.

Times Higher Education Supplement (THES) 27 March, 19 June.

Walker, D. (1991) 'Our Polyprofs are just as good as your Professors', *The Independent*, 3 January.