

Academic Staff Workloads and Job Satisfaction: Expectations and values in academe

Don Houston^{*}, Luanna H. Meyer and Shelley Paewai
Massey University, New Zealand

University academic staff do complex work in an increasingly demanding environment. Traditionally, universities have defined the role of academic staff according to the three domains of teaching, research, and service, with primary emphasis placed upon the teaching and research aspects and secondary emphasis upon service or administration. Recent dialogue regarding the place of universities in a “knowledge society” has not necessarily reflected upon the impact on the workloads of faculty given increased expectations for measurable outputs, responsiveness to societal and student needs, and overall performance accountability. University faculty motivated by core academic and disciplinary interests are said to be increasingly challenged by increased accountability and workloads. Research on academic workloads have examined the intensification of academic work as well as the balance between research and teaching, particularly as governments have adopted performance funding for research budget components for higher education. Other studies have investigated the impact of the increasing demands on staff stress and work-life balance. This study examines one university’s approach to these issues, using triangulation of three sources of data on workloads developments and outcomes. Our results are compared to international research findings, and suggestions are offered for future research and development activities based on this comparison and critique.

Introduction

University academic staff do complex work in an increasingly demanding environment. Universities are the only organizations focussed on dual core functions of knowledge creation and knowledge transmission through the processes of research and teaching (Romainville, 1996). The work life of university academic staff is predominantly framed and shaped by commitments to and performance in these functions. While the “interdependence of teaching and research” in the New Zealand university is asserted in legislation, ongoing

^{*}Corresponding author. Institute of Technology & Engineering, College of Sciences, Massey University, Private Bag 11 222, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
Email: D.J.Houston@massey.ac.nz

tensions exist between the two particularly in terms of demands on time and variable recognition and rewards. Jenkins (2004) noted existing evidence that commitments to teaching and research can be synergistic and complementary or antagonistic and competing. Thus, he argued that the relationships between research, teaching, broader work expectations, and rewards need to be defined and managed at the institutional, departmental, and individual levels to avoid potentially undesirable effects and counterproductive behaviours (Jenkins, 2004).

Harman investigated changes in academic staff roles in Australian universities across a 20-year period based on survey data gathered in 1977 and again in 1997 (Harman, 2001, 2002, 2003). Respondents in 1997 reported high satisfaction with the academic components of their jobs while, at the same time, they were highly critical of aspects of the work environment, including the level of stress on the job and salaries in comparison to those outside academe (Harman, 2001). Similarly, Leslie (2002) found that salary and job satisfaction were uncorrelated and that faculty (who spent the majority of their time teaching) reported a preference for being rewarded for teaching effectiveness, despite the fact that “institutions may actually reward them for something else” (p. 68). Academics reported an increase in workloads from 1977 to 1997 and that the time allocated to research in comparison to teaching had increased significantly. Nearly 30 years ago, Kerr (1975) noted that “Society *hopes* that [university] teachers will not neglect their teaching responsibilities but *rewards* them almost entirely for research and publications ... Consequently it is rational for university teachers to concentrate on research, even to the detriment of teaching and at the expense of their students” (Kerr, 1975, p. 773; emphasis in original).

Many academics believe this contradiction remains three decades later, yet continue to value their jobs (Bellamy, Morley, & Watty, 2003; McInnes, 1999). McInnes (1999, 2000) found that level of commitment remains high with academic staff attributing this to intrinsic motivators rather than extrinsic factors such as salary and working conditions. Motivation theory and evidence from existing research on academic role satisfaction emphasises the importance of intrinsic motivators as well as external “academic”, discipline-based recognition by peers and teacher-student relationship factors (McInnes, 1999; Meyer & Evans, 2003). Challenge, variety, and autonomy are key elements of the academic work environment that enable academic staff to engage in core activities such as critical thinking, reflection, and collegial interactions in the context of disciplinary interests and expertise (Winter, Taylor, & Sarros, 2000). Flexibility and autonomy are key factors in becoming and remaining an academic (Bellamy et al., 2003). It would appear that academic staff responses are as complex and diverse as the demands placed upon them, guided not by consistently rational responses to extrinsic motivators but by the values they bring to academic work.

The Changing Context of Academic Work

During the three decades since Kerr's observations, the international tertiary education environment has undergone significant changes (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1999). In New Zealand, tertiary reforms have sought to refine the role of higher education and define university linkages to enhance national economic development and to make universities more accountable to government, students as consumers, and the public generally (Patterson, 1996) while subjecting them to more centralized control mechanisms. Universities have responded to greater demands for monitoring and data collection by developing increasingly complex and time-consuming control, audit, and assurance mechanisms to demonstrate compliance with accountability expectations. New Zealand also recently adopted a research accountability mechanism – Performance Based Research Funding (PBRF) – placing a percentage of government funding at-risk according to various criteria ratings of research productivity for institutions and their faculty. A parallel but unrelated mechanism to consequence institutions to a lesser extent based on evidence of teaching outcomes is currently being implemented. These developments represent significant challenges for universities striving to meet external demands while protecting the qualities of academic life that define a university.

Nevertheless, teaching and research remain at the core of university functions in New Zealand as elsewhere. Indeed, the links between research and teaching are enshrined in legislation that describes universities as concerned with advanced learning, where research and teaching are closely interdependent, and where most teaching is done by people active in advancing knowledge (Education Act 1989, Section 162(4)). Academic freedom and the institutional autonomy of universities as traditional values of higher education are also explicit: Section 161(2) of the Act provides for the freedom of academic staff to pursue research driven by their disciplines and inform their teaching through advanced scholarship and without undue interference. The position profile of academic staff has traditionally comprised duties apportioned across the three areas of teaching, research, and what has been variously labelled as service, administration, or outreach. Where pursuit of the knowledge society has resulted in increased pressures and performance expectations, workloads of academic staff have been affected directly. Coaldrake and Stedman (1999) noted that as academic work expanded to meet growing expectations, universities and individual academics have responded through “accumulation and accretion” rather than adaptation (p.9). McInnes (2000) highlighted the need to investigate workloads issues such as increased stress on staff, development of creative solutions to ameliorate problems, and “sustaining the primary sources of work satisfaction that best promote quality” (2000, p. 151; see also Winefield, Gillespie, Stough, Dua, & Hapuararchchi, 2002).

Coaldrake and Stedman (1999) noted that “[u]ntil recently the effect of change in academic work has been a blindspot in policy terms for many universities ... and it remains so for most” (p.1). Managers, leaders and individual academics are expected to be responsive to diverse student needs and expectations, a competitive

research environment, community expectations for relevance, declining public funding, and increased administrative and fiscal accountability. Meeting challenges to deliver outputs and outcomes while simultaneously preserving valued process and academic discourse is a complex balancing act. This paper reports the efforts of one New Zealand university to address its previous blind spot in this complex system of inter-relationships: the challenges of workload management. Sources of data include information regarding university policy on workloads, two-year results from a staff survey of job satisfaction, the analysis of workloads allocation models developed within academic units, and qualitative review of selected case studies of the workloads management process.

The Local Research Context

This research was conducted in one of New Zealand's eight public universities. The university has several campuses plus a significant percentage of students enrolled in distance study, with a full-time equivalent number of 20,000 students. Over 1700 academic staff are organized into more than 40 academic departments with additional non-academic support staff bringing total staffing to approximately 3000. Not unlike other universities, this university has undergone significant changes in recent years. These include devolution of budgets and accountability from university to unit level; recent major restructuring involving staffing reallocation and the loss of a large number of jobs; and mergers with two other tertiary institutions which have entailed major changes in role expectations for academic staff integrated into the university.

In the 1990s, research reports commissioned by university staff unions raised concerns regarding workloads and levels of stress (Sullivan, 1997). Chalmers (1998) found that staff were reporting increased stress associated with the academic work and more work-related illnesses or injuries in comparison to previous years. Consequently, workload systems management has increasingly been a factor in recent contract negotiations and collective employment agreements. The workload policy and procedures which provide the context for this study were the first to be formally approved at a New Zealand university, following four years of deliberation about principles, explicit coverage in collective contract negotiations, and considerable debate regarding appropriate approaches to workloads management.

Method

The present study utilized three sources of data gathered over a three-year period, to analyse faculty workloads and both institutional and individual faculty responses to workloads expectations and realities: (a) findings of the Academic Work Environment Survey (WES) in 2002 and 2003; (b) analyses of academic unit workplace "snapshots" and workloads allocation models submitted by all academic units in 2002–2003; and (c) case studies comprising documents analyses and interviews with the faculty and the heads of four academic units conducted in 2003–2004.

Work Environment Survey

The university's Work Environment Survey (WES) was administered to academic staff for the first time in 2002 for the purposes of gathering valid, institution-wide data on staff perceptions of the academic work environment. A second administration was conducted in 2003, with the agreement that the WES would then be administered on a biennial rather than yearly basis. The WES builds on published work on workplace stress and job satisfaction from US, Canadian and Australian Universities and incorporates questions from an extensive Australian study (Winefield et al., 2002). The survey design and administration procedures were overseen by a university-wide policy advisory group jointly representing the administration and staff unions with additional critique from key staff with relevant expertise (e.g., professional development and human resources). The executive committee of the university approved the WES along with formal review and approval from the University's Human Ethics Committee.

The survey included demographic questions to enable disaggregated comparisons by college, campus and for variables such as gender, ethnicity, and employment status (e.g., part- *versus* full-time). Staff were also asked to provide information on the extent to which their position required travel between campuses, whether they were enrolled in degree study, the nature of their work (e.g., combinations of teaching and research *versus* management), an estimate of hours worked after hours, duration of employment, whether their unit had a Workload Allocation Model, and whether their individual review of performance and planning (PRP) had been done that year. Participants responded on a scale for agreement-disagreement with statements organized into several categories: (1) workloads and workload management; (2) teaching and research; (3) work environment; (4) academic management; (5) senior management; and (6) overall job satisfaction (see also Tables 1 and 2, which include those items for which results are reported here).

For each year, response rates of slightly more than 50% were achieved from a random sample of approximately 35% of staff asked to complete the surveys. For 2003, disaggregated results by college and campus were compared with the university-wide aggregate and with the 2002 results. Responses for each of the questions included the mean, standard deviation and number of respondents.

Workplace Snapshots and Workload Allocation Models

The University's 42 academic units are organized into five broadly disciplinary-based colleges headed by a senior academic leader with budgetary and administrative control devolved from college level. Units range in size from less than a dozen to over 100 academic staff. All academic units were required to generate "snapshots" of typical workloads and formal Workload Allocation Models derived through consultation with staff as part of a University-wide implementation of a workloads policy and procedures (Paewai, Houston, & Meyer, 2004). This development had been initiated earlier, but gained momentum from 2002 with the establishment of a

Table 1. Staff perceptions of their work and work environment

	2002 mean of responses	2003 mean of responses
<i>Workloads management</i>		
My workload has increased over the past 12 months	3.82	3.62
I often need to work after hours to meet my work requirements	3.91	4.12
The amount of administration I am expected to do is reasonable	3.32	3.15
<i>Teaching and research</i>		
The number of students I am expected to teach and/or supervise is reasonable	3.43	3.46
I have time to do good quality research	2.20	2.45
I feel pressured to attract external research funding	3.37	3.55
I believe the promotions procedures recognize the variety of work that staff do	2.50	2.48
I believe that teaching and research achievements are considered equally by promotions committees	2.27	2.31
<i>Work environment</i>		
I know what is expected of me in my role	3.90	3.84
I am willing to put in a great deal of effort in order to help this university be successful	3.87	3.97
I feel acknowledged for a job well done	2.91	2.83
I am supported when change and new initiatives are being introduced	2.90	2.87
Staff morale is high within my department, institute, school, or unit	2.49	2.56

joint workloads taskforce comprising several members each representing the University management and staff unions as a result of agreement reached in contract negotiations. Managers and staff were required to work together to achieve a workloads allocation process consistent with policy principles of equity, transparency, reasonableness, safety, and acceptability. To facilitate development of appropriate unit models, units were first required to submit individual workloads vignettes (snapshots); subsequently, all units were required to submit their Workloads Allocation Models by the end of 2003, and all did so. While the taskforce deliberately resisted providing a template for these models, required parameters included expectations for teaching requirements (e.g., teaching contact hours and/or numbers of courses taught); research time allocation and/or research output expectations; and the extent and nature of administrative duties and/or

Table 2. Staff job satisfaction

	2002 mean of responses	2003 mean of responses
Freedom to choose your own method of working	5.53	5.36
The recognition you get for good work	4.12	4.10
The amount of responsibility you are given	5.09	5.14
Your salary or rate of pay	3.61	3.95
Your chance for advancement	3.79	3.75
The amount of variety in your job	5.33	5.26
Now taking everything into consideration, how do you feel about your job as a whole?	4.64	4.66

service activities. Supervision of graduate student research and clinical/professional practice supervision were also incorporated where relevant.

The joint taskforce analysed the information from these models in 2004, producing a report with a summary of existing models, the diverse time allocation ranges reported by academic units for different activities, and making recommendations for action by the University based on implementation to date.

Case Studies of Four Academic Units

The workloads taskforce sought formal Human Ethics Committee review and approval to undertake a review of four academic department “case studies” in order to evaluate selected models *in situ* and the effectiveness of implementation. Selection of the case-study models was made on the basis of particular features so that the departments investigated included a combination of two or more of the following: multi-campus operations; clinical supervision components; Maori-related activities; distance teaching; and participation in the Summer School programme. The inclusion of Maori-related activities was important as universities have obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi to contribute to Maori development and the Maori resource base.

Managers of representative units were invited to participate in the review process; all agreed to do so. One to three members of the taskforce then met with the managers to discuss the review questions and schedule a focus group discussion meeting involving department staff.

Review questions were structured to assess whether the workload allocation model had made any difference to the process of workload allocation, and the extent to which staff had an opportunity to participate in its development. Benefits and challenges of the models were also investigated, along with suggestions for improving the use of models at a local level, and across the University. The objectives for the case-study analyses were to explore the extent to which workload allocation models had been effectively implemented in departments; to investigate how staff were addressing the challenges of implementing workloads models and whether strategies had been identified that could address workloads issues across the University; to gain an understanding of some of the issues that impacted upon workload management; and to use the outcomes of the review to further inform the development of appropriate workload “benchmarks”.

Findings

Work Environment Survey Results

Results from the Work Environment Survey (WES) indicate that staff are stretching their working time to accommodate the demands of their work. In both 2002 and 2003 a high proportion of respondents (86% and 94% respectively) indicated that

they had worked after hours in the week preceding the survey. Thirty-four and 39% indicated that they had worked more than 10 hours beyond full-time.

Table 1 contains selected data relating to staff perceptions of the work environment. For the statements contained in Table 1 respondents indicated their level of agreement on a response scale from strongly disagree (coded as 1) to strongly agree (coded as 5). The data indicates a weak level of agreement that workloads had increased over each of the past 12 month periods (means of 3.82 in 2002 and 3.62 in 2003 respectively) and somewhat stronger agreement that staff need to work after hours to meet work requirements (3.91 and 4.12). Respondents neither disagreed nor agreed that the amount of administration required of them was reasonable: the mean of responses in both years was slightly to the “agree” side of the neutral mid-point of the response scale.

Regarding teaching and research, there was weak agreement that expectations about the number of students taught and or supervised were reasonable (means: 3.43 and 3.62) and general disagreement that staff had time to do good quality research (2.20 and 2.45). There was weak disagreement that staff had adequate funding for research and an indication that staff felt increasingly pressured to attract external research funding. Responses also indicate that staff disagreed that promotions processes recognized the variety of academic work and that teaching and research achievements are considered equally in promotions processes. (Unfortunately, the measure did not seek clarification on which area staff saw as privileged or alternatively less valued.)

Respondents generally agreed that role expectations were clear and that they were willing to put in a great deal of effort to help the university to be successful (3.87; 3.97). Responses were less positive in relation to feelings of being acknowledged for a job well done and being supported in change. There was weak disagreement that staff morale was high (2.49; 2.56).

The section of the instrument seeking staff views on job satisfaction used a seven point scale from “extremely dissatisfied” (coded as 1) to “extremely satisfied” (coded as 7). Table 2 presents the means of responses for selected questions. Overall, staff were moderately to very satisfied with the freedom to choose their own method of work, their level of responsibility, and the amount of variety in their job. Respondents were neutral about the recognition they get for good work. In relation to salary and chances for advancement, the means of responses fell between the neutral and moderately dissatisfied response categories. For the global question, taking all things into consideration, the mean of responses fell between the neutral and moderately satisfied categories. The data suggest substantial differences in the indicated levels of satisfaction with particular aspects of respondents’ jobs. Respondents were relatively less satisfied with extrinsic rewards from their work such as their salary, chances for advancement, and the recognition received for good work. They were relatively more satisfied with intrinsic aspects such as flexibility, amount of responsibility, and variety in their jobs.

The Work Environment Survey provides a picture of staff with mixed attitudes to their work environment and their own jobs. Despite perceived increasing workloads and the need to work out of hours to meet expectations, unbalanced reward and recognition systems, lack of support and low staff morale, respondents indicated general agreement with the statement “I am willing to put in a great deal of effort in order to help this university be successful”. Staff appear relatively satisfied with their work overall. Yet, in both 2002 and 2003, negative comments out-numbered positive ones (2002, 204 negative, 32 positive; 2003, 92 negative, 11 positive). The two key themes to emerge from analysis of the comments were excessive workloads (particularly evident in 2003) and under-valuing of staff (accounting for more than a third of the negative comments in 2003). Finally, respondents in 2003 indicated increased awareness of the existence of workload allocation models within departments (65% compared with 40% in 2002) but also indicated concerns about the fairness and transparency of work allocation processes.

Analyses of Snapshots and Workloads Allocation Models

Examination of the information submitted in the workload “snapshots” revealed five main areas where work demands were perceived to be expanding: compliance requirements and information requests; administrative duties associated with the introduction of new systems and changes to University policies; increasing numbers of programme and paper offerings; increased workload resulting from the variety of delivery modes supported by the University; and increasing demand for a longer teaching year (i.e., summer school). The majority of models submitted by academic departments reported expectations for teaching requirements with guidelines for teaching contact hours. Typically, a workloads formula was applied to indicate the number of hours or “units” associated with various teaching activities. Time for research appeared to be that remaining after teaching and administration requirements had been met, and there were instances in which it was difficult to establish clear time commitments for staff to complete quality research. Table 3 provides information on the ranges of time commitments evident in the different models for similar activities across the units.

The taskforce report concluded that some departments were simply attempting to do too much, leaving the achievement of objectives largely dependant on the willingness of a dedicated workforce to add additional work without corresponding decreases in other duties. Concerns were also raised about the match between resource distribution and work requirements. There was a perception in some areas that units were expected to “do more with less”, and no additional resources could be secured to address identified workload inequities. The lack of time dedicated to research was also highlighted as a significant risk to the University, given the partial dependence of research funding on research productivity and quality.

Table 3. Variations in times allocated to teaching-related activities

Teaching activity	Range of time allocations presented in the models
Preparation of a new paper to be delivered internally	50–100 hrs
Preparation of a new study guide	40–360 hrs
Revision of an existing study guide (Major)	24–144 hrs
Revision of an existing study guide (Minor)	8–80 hrs
Lecture preparation	1–11 hrs per lecture
Tutorial preparation	0.5–4 hrs per tutorial
Laboratory/practical preparation	1.5–15 hrs per laboratory/practicum
Assignment marking (100–200 level)	0.4–1.5 hrs per student
Assignment marking (300 level)	0.4–4 hrs per student
Supervision (Masters)	20–67.5 hrs per student per year
Supervision (PhD)	16–92 hrs per student per year
Supervision (Research Project)	6–45 hrs per student per year
Paper coordination	20–70 hrs per paper per year
Programme coordination	50–270 hrs per programme per year

Results of the Case-study Analyses

Factors that were reported to contribute to successful implementation of the models included: department-specific procedures for workload allocation rather than using generic checklists or principles; the extent of consultation and collaboration between the manager and staff in development of the model; transparency in the workload allocation for individual staff members; and regular review of the model to ensure that it accurately represented tasks undertaken and the time required to complete those tasks. Where the model was perceived to be ineffective, this was attributed to a failure of the model to reflect accurately the work that was actually done. Staff also reported that differences existed between the times allocated for particular tasks vs. the time actually spent on those tasks; the wide variability evident in time allocations across units illustrates this (see Table 3). Staff were also concerned at the exclusion altogether of some tasks. Particularly problematic was the allocation of time for professional and clinical practice supervision requirements and for staff to meet practice requirements to maintain their own professional registration, generally not reflected in the workloads allocation models for those academic units delivering such programmes.

Overall, comments received from the department managers and feedback from academic staff was consistent. Where the department manager had not been proactive in the development and implementation of the workloads allocation model, staff were unaware of the workloads procedures and *vice versa*. Nevertheless, despite the limited success of implementation in some cases, staff were supportive of the process: references were also made by staff to specific models perceived by them to be working well in other areas. Where staff were aware of the workloads model, a number of benefits were mentioned. Staff commented that use of the model acknowledged areas where workloads were difficult to quantify or may not have been effectively distributed. Overall,

development of the models were said to have clarified staff expectations so that they could manage their own workloads more effectively. In some cases, the models drew attention to areas that were understaffed and used as justification to add permanent or temporary staffing accordingly.

The case-study analyses found variability in the extent to which workloads issues might be addressed by staff and their managers. In some cases, there appeared to be no immediate solution to problems raised, such as the feasibility of recruiting and retaining staff in specialized work areas. In others, solutions appeared to be within the grasp of managers and their staff given determination to achieve a greater understanding of the workloads problems identified.

Discussion

Today's universities are complex organizations comprising disciplinary and professional studies and research that is wide-ranging with diverse scholarship profiles. The duties and even the timing of the academic year for faculty within the same university will vary considerably, such that any attempt to standardise workload expectations is fraught by different realities. The literature investigating different approaches to work allocation is limited and does not provide a comprehensive research-base for clear guidelines with known consequences (Burgess, 1996; Burgess, Lewis, & Mobbs, 2003; Soliman, 1999). Clearly, managing the workloads of academic staff whilst respecting the academic culture is an exercise in balancing the complex and variable. Consistent with Harman (2002), our respondents also reported that they were on average working considerably in excess of full-time. Henkel (2000) emphasized that despite such changing conditions, academics in the UK have to date largely responded adaptively and succeeded in retaining valued components of their academic identity in both teaching and research. Despite reported increases in workloads across time, staff remain committed to their chosen vocation and to the success of the university. However, they do so with the contingency that workloads allocation be underpinned by principles of equity and transparency (Burgess et al., 2003; Soliman, 1999). Thus, departmental managers play a pivotal role, both through their approach to workloads allocation as well as through establishing a climate of transparency and collegial sharing of information. Given the difficulties of quantifying work done by academic staff, these negotiation and staff consultation factors will be integral to the success of workloads allocation models and staff satisfaction.

Interestingly, the interviews with staff identified a surprising lack of problem-solving or creative thinking by academics who, one would presume, would apply such skills to their disciplinary work – both teaching and research. During the review process, the taskforce interviewers had encouraged staff to suggest strategies and initiatives the unit had explored or might explore to enhance the use of the workloads model and contribute to the resolution of workloads challenges. Feedback from the

focus group meetings suggested that staff in some areas of the University had retreated to a “culture of blame” stance rather than proactive problem-solving or advocacy to address difficulties in workloads management. There was little evidence in some areas that staff had attempted to resolve workloads pressures through reprioritization of tasks or refusing additional tasks where resources were already stretched. Instead, there was a tendency to blame another unit or system for their frustrations, absorb additional tasks at the expense of overall productivity, and become increasingly insular which, in turn, would further decrease effective communication towards solving problems. This attitude was also associated with reports that research time had to be compromised in favour of teaching and administrative duties. Doring (2002) discussed the possibility that faculty succumb to seeing themselves as victims of change rather than continuing to pursue their historical valuing of the role of agents of change. It would be important to identify such perspectives on the academic role and, if possible, relate those perspectives to strategies that could be pursued or discontinued based on such functional relationships.

Meyer and Evans (2003) argued that continued interest in the academic career pathway despite increased accountability pressures, relatively low salaries, and increased criticism from government and the public can be explained only with reference to motivational theory. Academics report that they are attracted to University careers because of academic valuing of intrinsic motivators such as flexibility and autonomy (Bellamy et al., 2003). Rather than salary, the external motivators that are mentioned by staff are far more likely to be expressions of appreciation by one’s students and peer recognition from colleagues within the discipline but outside one’s university. Eventually, unless workloads are managed well and, for example, time is provided for scholarship and research as well as teaching and service – those things that are valued by academics attracted to university careers – the lifestyle of an academic will be affected and the original motivators for career choice may dissipate. Harman (2001, p. 334) notes that “Little is known how academics in different universities actually make decisions about the allocation of their time”. Both managers and individual academic staff should play an active role in managing workloads through advocacy for needed changes to institutional practice, programme delivery patterns, and reconsideration of activities that detract from the fundamental purposes of higher education. Ultimately, it is the individual managers and faculty who must assume responsibility for shaping their role and academic work profile.

Note

An earlier version of portions of this paper was presented at the OECD Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) Biennial General Conference on Choices and Responsibilities: Higher Education in the Knowledge Society, Paris, September 2004.

References

- Bellamy, S., Morley, C., & Watty, K. (2003). Why business academics remain in Australian universities despite deteriorating working conditions and reduced job satisfaction: An intellectual puzzle. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 25, 13–28.
- Burgess, T. F. (1996). Planning the academic's workload: Different approaches to allocating work to university academics. *Higher Education*, 32, 63–75.
- Burgess, T. F., Lewis, H. A., & Mobbs, T. (2003). Academic workload planning revisited. *Higher Education*, 46, 215–233.
- Chalmers, A. (1998). Workloads and Stress in New Zealand Universities Report for the New Zealand Council for Educational Research and The Association of University Staff of New Zealand. Wellington: Author.
- Coaldrake, P., & Stedman, L. (1999). *Academic work in the twenty-first century: Changing roles and policies*. Occasional Paper Series, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Australia.
- Doring, A. (2002). Challenges to the academic role of change agent. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26, 139–148.
- Harman, G. (2001). Academics and institutional differentiation in Australian higher education. *Higher Education Policy*, 14, 325–342.
- Harman, G. (2002). Academic leaders or corporate managers: Deans and heads in Australian higher education, 1977 to 1997. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 14, 53–70.
- Harman, G. (2003). Australian academics and prospective academics: Adjustment to a more commercial environment. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 15, 105–122.
- Henkel, M. (2000). *Academic identities and policy change in higher education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Jenkins, A. (2004). *A Guide to the research evidence on teaching-research relations*, *The Higher Education Academy*. Retrieved December 16, 2004, from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources.asp?process=full_record§ion=generic&id=383
- Kerr, S. (1975). On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 769–782.
- Leslie, D. W. (2002). Resolving the dispute: Teaching is academe's core value. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 49–73.
- McInnes, C. (1999). *The work roles of academics in Australian universities*. Canberra: DETYA.
- McInnes, C. (2000). Changing academic work roles: the everyday realities challenging quality teaching. *Quality in Higher Education*, 6, 143–152.
- Meyer, L. H., & Evans, I. M. (2003). Motivating the professoriate: Why sticks and carrots are only for donkeys. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 15, 151–167.
- New Zealand Government (1989). *Education amendment Act*. Wellington: New Zealand Government.
- Paewai, S. R., Houston, D., & Meyer, L. H. (2004, September). *Managing academic workloads and meeting requirements whilst respecting the academic culture*. Paper presented at the OECD Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) Biennial General Conference on Choices and Responsibilities: Higher Education in the Knowledge Society, Paris, France.
- Patterson, G. (1996). *New Zealand Universities in an era of challenge and change, occasional Paper, No. 4*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Department of Management Systems.
- Romainville, M. (1996). Teaching and research at university: A difficult pairing. *Higher Education Management*, 8, 135–144.
- Soliman, I. (1999, July). *The academic workload problematic*. Paper presented at the HERDSA Annual International Conference, Melbourne, Australia.

- Sullivan, K. (1997). *What Should Count as Work in the 'Ivory Tower'?: Determining academic workloads in tertiary institutions, a university case study*. NZARE Monograph No. 6. Wellington: New Zealand Association for Research in Education.
- Winefield, A., Gillespie, N., Stough, C., Dus, J., & Hapuararchchi, J. (2002). *Occupational stress in Australian universities: A national survey 2002*. Canberra: National Tertiary Education Union.
- Winter, R., Taylor, T., & Sarros, J. (2000). Trouble at mill: Quality of academic worklife issues within a comprehensive Australian university. *Studies in Higher Education, 25*, 279–294.

Copyright of *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management* is the property of Routledge, Ltd. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.