Research and scholarship: perceptions of senior academic administrators

RUTH NEUMANN

Centre for Higher Education and Professional Development, Macquarie University, Sydney NSW 2109, Australia

Abstract. This paper reports selected findings from the first stage of a study on the research role within academic work in Australian universities. These findings come from the interview component of the study and discuss the perceptions that senior academic administrators hold on 'research' and 'scholarship'. The analysis of the interviews indicates that 'research' covers a wide and varied range of activities across the disciplines found in a university and therefore needs to be defined broadly. However, 'research' has three major attributes: new knowledge, enquiry and publication of results and views. 'Scholarship' was perceived to be part of the research process, providing the context for good research by adding the element of breadth to the depth of 'research'. In addition, 'scholarship' describes the manner of pursuing a serious, sustained line of enquiry as well as the dissemination process.

Introduction

It is virtually impossible to imagine present day universities without research and it is easy to forget that our notion of research and its acceptance as an appropriate activity for higher education derives from its relatively recent introduction and development in German, American and British universities during the nineteenth century. In fact, research is now such an integral part of universities that the nature and division of academic work reflect its importance and the organisation of universities provides the framework for its productive existence. The organisation of universities into departments according to the British and American models and chairs according to the European (German) model provides the structural framework for academic work to be pursued.

However, notwithstanding the universal acceptance of the research role of higher education, there is not an agreed-upon definition of research. Rather, the word 'research' is a general term used in a variety of ways by the different interest groups in higher education. These various groups each use the term 'research' in a way that reflects their particular philosophical and political perspectives. In particular, there appear to be a number of differences in usage across the discipline groups which are of considerable significance but which as yet are not entirely understood. Such differences need to be appreciated by all with a stake in higher education: academics, administrators, policy-makers, funding bodies and the wider community.

In general terms, there are two types of view expressed in the literature about a definition of 'research'. There is a broad view which takes into account disciplinary differences and highlights the wide and diverse range of research activities in

different settings, and there is a narrower view which includes only the discovery of new knowledge, often with an emphasis on quantitative techniques.

Support for the adoption of a broad view comes from the findings of research studies, both quantitative (Biglan 1973a, 1973b) and qualitative (Becher 1981, 1987a, 1987b, 1989; McGrath 1962). These studies have demonstrated that academics in different fields have different understandings of the term 'research', how it should be conducted and what its relationship should be to other areas of academic work, in particular teaching. Such studies would suggest that an understanding of 'research' is best gained by looking at the context within which the term is used. Each discipline has its own knowledge paradigm which determines the appropriate manner of approaching a research problem. Hence, in some disciplines 'research' is what is done in 'projects' whereas in others it involves field work or laboratory experimentation, while in others still, it is the study of documents in a library. Carter (1980) argues that there is a diversity of activities carried out by different fields under the umbrella of 'research' including: scholarship; theory construction; observing and chronicling; experiment; theory testing; design; development; criticising and elucidating; artistic creation; and consulting and advising. According to Bowen (1977) and Bowen and Schuster (1986), all these activities may be classified as 'research' provided they include the discovery of new knowledge or the creation of original art and provided also that they involve dissemination through publication, since "only through dissemination do they become a significant advancement of knowledge or the arts" (Bowen and Schuster 1986: 16).

However, according to other viewpoints, not all of these activities are legitimately described as 'research'; they may be labelled or termed as 'community service' or grouped along with 'scholarship' as a category distinct from 'research'. Thus, in contrast to the broad notion of research, this narrow notion of what constitutes research is based on the view that there is a dichotomy between 'research' and 'scholarship'. 'Research' involves exploring the 'new frontiers of knowledge', while 'scholarship' is seen as keeping up to date with the research literature in one's field, especially in fields which have few 'new frontiers of knowledge' left. Thus, in this view, real 'research' consists of theorising, experimenting and theory-testing, and applies for all practical purposes only to the 'hard' quantitative sciences, and most particularly to the expensive forms such as high-energy physics. This dichotomous view is also used to link 'research' with 'science' and with social or economic value, while 'scholarship' is applied to the humanities and implies private benefit to the individual rather than the community (Cyert and Knapp 1984).

During the twentieth century, particularly the latter half, this narrow interpretation has become the increasingly dominant interpretation in Western universities. The narrowing of the term 'research' has been accelerated by the stringent financial situation in universities, the increasing cost of scientific equipment, and the concern by governments for immediate economic returns from research (Lindsay and Neumann 1988). To further complicate the issue, the word 'science' can take on a restricted connotation of 'big' science or to refer

predominantly to the physical sciences (Neumann and Lindsay 1988). Indeed Schwartzman (1984) notes that the word 'science' has different meanings and believes that sociologists of science often adopt a restricted interpretation of 'science'.

The narrowing of the interpretation of the words 'science' and 'research' is also being used to differentiate between the research and teaching roles. These developments have been criticised for having a political and economic focus but not an educational one (see for example, Lindsay 1989; Neumann and Lindsay 1988; Scott 1991). The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (1981) has argued that such a differentiation is undesirable for both research and teaching, an argument supported by Elton (1986) who emphasises the importance of scholarship to both teaching and research. A separation of the two activities would mean the potential loss of scholarship "since it is never the prime purpose of an institution" and scholarship, Elton maintains, is the "tenderest plant" (p. 302).

The study

The externally imposed changes in higher education policy and research policy in Australia and in other Western countries, together with an interest in the usage of the words 'research' and 'scholarship' by different higher education interest groups, provided the impetus for the present study. The aim was to examine the research role within academic work from an "internalist" perspective (Clark 1983: 4) – that is from the point of view of those working in universities. The first stage of this study on academic work has focused on senior academic administrators – vice-chancellors, deputy and pro-vice-chancellors, chairs of the academic board or senate, deans, heads of school and heads of department – in universities which have a well-established research role. Disciplinary affiliation was also an important consideration and hence senior academic administrators were selected from the broad disciplinary groupings of the humanities, sciences, social sciences and professional areas. The selection of this group was based on an indication from the literature that intellectual authority resides in senior academics (Clark 1983) and that different disciplines espouse different values and cultures (Becher 1987a, 1987b, 1989). Since the questions asked are complex and call for an approach which permits exploration and depth, a qualitative approach was adopted to investigate the research problem. The prime data were derived from semi-structured open-ended interviews which permitted an intensive analysis of the issues.

Thus, thirty-three senior academic administrators at the university, faculty and departmental levels were interviewed. Since the focus of the study was on the views of individual academics, and to reduce the possible influence of institutional differences, the number of universities was kept to two. Attention was also given to achieving a spread of disciplines within the broad disciplinary groupings and to avoiding too great a disparity in department and faculty sizes. A complicating factor at the time of arranging and conducting the interviews was the release of the

Federal government's White Paper (Dawkins 1988) on higher education. Since this document proposed among the most radical changes in the history of Australian higher education, including the abolition of the binary system of higher education, it should be noted that the Paper had the potential to complicate responses by producing disquiet among academics. In the event however, only a small number of participants appeared to be concerned about confidentiality.

The interviews focused on four broad areas relating to the research role within academic work. These four areas were:

1. the definition of 'research';
2. the distinctive nature of research in a university setting;
3. influences, trends and pressures on the research role; and
4. research and university organisational features.

Documents were chosen to provide a second data source and were used primarily to cross-validate the interviews. Sixty-four public domain documents were analysed and the document sample was drawn from a broader base than the interview participants. The range of documents was diverse and included: refereed articles, conference presentations, speeches, media commentaries, letters, institutional research and educational profiles, responses to the White Paper, information on promotion procedures, and new policies and strategies relating to teaching and research. Further detailed methodological issues relating to the design of the study are provided in Neumann (1990a, 1990b).

This paper is concerned with the interview findings on the first of the above four areas, the definition of 'research', and related to this, the meaning of 'scholarship'. To preserve confidentiality all participants are identified by a number and the title of their position is often used to introduce quotes.

Defining 'research'

It was intended that participants give their view of what constitutes 'research' and discuss how 'research' and 'scholarship' are differentiated. All those interviewed expressed dissatisfaction at their inability to define 'research' appropriately. They felt that on the one hand a definition would be so broad as to sound trite and on the other, too restrictive to adequately convey the diversity of forms research activity could take. However, from the interview data, three major features or attributes stand out in the participants' definitions of what constitutes 'research': new knowledge, enquiry and publication of results and views.

The most frequent descriptor was the word "*new*". 'Research' was considered to be the search for, addition, creation, discovery or perception of something 'new'. This refers to contributing to what is already known and includes knowledge gained through activities such as experimentation, theorising, interpretation, observation, and correlation in order to gain a better understanding of the world. One deputy vice-chancellor explained:

. . . in the physical sciences it is probably easier because there you have a new compound or you have a new electromagnetic radiation, or you have a new astronomical phenomenon, something like that – previously unobserved, unknown completely – so that clearly is the result of research. In other areas, in literature for instance, the realisation that an author may have been influenced by some other author or some school of thought or some political development where it hadn't previously been understood, illuminates his work, or a poet or a novelist set in a new perspective and it illuminates the work and we call that research. The fact is the author's words are there and there's nothing new about them, but the understanding of them is deepened and we call that research. So it can mean all these things. (Participant 25)

The point was raised that 'research' really should be seen as *re*-search. Much of what people described as 'research' is really "search", that is the discovery, creation or pursuit of something new. However, "re-search" involves the checking and replicating of what is known. Indeed, the checking of other people's results and theories, and the ability to reproduce the work of others, was included in several explanations of what constituted 'research' or at least was seen as part of the research process.

A second frequent explanation of what constitutes research, was the word "*enquiry*". The asking and answering of questions is a fundamental academic and research activity. Importantly, 'research' is seen to be a serious, sustained activity, where knowledge and understanding are pursued. Indeed, research should not just be discussed in terms of adding to knowledge, since this could be interpreted as simply accumulating facts. Enquiry involves a continuous, sceptical reflection on knowledge. It is not a random pursuit, but incorporates a sense of purpose and mission, forming part of a systematic investigation and resulting in personal learning and education for the researcher. This means that research involves depth of enquiry and is not conducted in isolation. Research viewed as fundamental and systematic enquiry involves more than just increasing the stock of information. One deputy vice-chancellor explained:

. . . that it is through this process of question asking and answering that research is advanced. I think that all that is probably fairly, not platitudinous, but still worth repeating when the attitude is still perhaps widespread that knowledge is simply like a brick wall and you just go on adding bricks. (Participant 17)

A third important characteristic of research is *publication*. A number of participants defined and described research in terms of publishable work. The idea of publication involves two vital aspects of what constitutes research. The first of these relates once again to the notions of newness and replication. The second aspect relates to communication, where the results of research are submitted to the critical questioning of others. Thus, for the research work to establish itself in the domain of knowledge, publication needs to be in mediums where it is subject to peer view. This is not to deny the important responsibility of academics to communicate research results in other forums to students and the wider public. Publication here, however, is of a different kind.

One method of defining and explaining what constitutes 'research' is to look at what does not constitute 'research' or what is considered to be research of lesser

importance. The extent to which research was being conducted within a theoretical framework appears to be the prime consideration. The most frequently cited example of, at best, low priority research, is "fact collecting". The accumulation of previously unknown facts and data could be seen to fall into the category of 'new' information, but without interpretation and evaluation in a theoretical context it is meaningless. One head of department in the humanities stated that the study of the life of a poet for the sake of having all the facts and details about that person's life was pointless and insignificant without real interpretation and evaluation, while one humanities dean described such acquisition of facts as "trivial research" which can be compared to the "Guinness Book of Records". Further, the conduct of survey research of the market research variety is also seen to fit into this mould of less significant work. They are seen to have no theoretical basis or justification and the 'knowledge' gained makes a negligible contribution. It is like "adding a freckle" and "produces no structural change".

An interesting example arose in the discussion of artistic areas, such as architecture and music. In these fields the issue of what is 'research' can give rise to considerable debate within and beyond the discipline. For example, although a wide range of fields in the arts and sciences may contribute to 'research' in such areas, a major feature of 'research' in such disciplines involves artistic creation. One head of department in a professional area explained that:

> It's quite a topical issue as far as the department of architecture is concerned because architecture is really, in essence, a creative art. . . . for example is the creation of a work of art research or isn't it? . . . and I think my argument, which most of my colleagues agree with, is that the actual creation of works of art is not in essence research, but nevertheless it's an activity that is equally important, or no less important, and is an important part of university activity, or no less important, and is an important part of university activity. In the same way that in the department of music the creation of musical composition is an important part of the activity of some members of academic staff and is recorded in the university research report and is said to be very much a legitimate activity under the general rubric of research. But it can't be thought of in the same sort of terms as mainline scientific research. (Participant 29)

What is 'scholarship'?

Trying to distinguish 'research' and 'scholarship' from each other could be described as "walking through a semantic minefield". Nevertheless, the participants trod daringly in an attempt to disentangle the two activities and two important features of 'scholarship' can be discerned from the interviews. The first is the role of 'scholarship' in providing the context of the research process. The second is 'scholarship' as a far broader notion than 'research', spanning the entire endeavour of academic work.

While, the majority of those interviewed explained that research and scholarship go (or at least ideally should go) hand in hand, it should be recognised that the distinction between the two is only hazy, since it can be difficult to decide precisely where the one stops and the other starts. Nevertheless, scholarship forms an integral

part of the research process by providing *the context of research*. It is both preliminary to, and simultaneous with, research. Scholarship is part of the whole process of the asking and answering of questions – enquiry – in seeking to understand a particular field of study. In doing so there has to be theoretical and conceptual understanding of the area of knowledge being investigated. Scholarship involves the ability "to glean information" and to respond critically to what has already been done in the field. This encompasses digesting and appraising what is already known, as a result of which the gaps in knowledge can be clearly perceived and appropriate questions of enquiry asked. Indeed, scholarship necessitates placing one's own research within the existing knowledge of the field. The result is "research in context". Further, since scholarship incorporates the analysis and synthesis of, as well as the critical reflection on, existing knowledge, it could be seen to begin at one end of a spectrum of the research process and to overlap and merge with activities at the other end of the spectrum.

Because scholarship involves more of the contemplative or reflective activities associated with research, many participants believed that the distinction between scholarship and research is less clear cut in the humanities than in the sciences. Some also extended this view to the social sciences and professional areas. However, this is not to suggest that there is no scholarship in science, simply that the balance between the two activities varies. In science, scholarship takes the form of placing one's research within the broader context of the area and finding new avenues to research as a result of critically evaluating the field. It was pointed out by numerous participants from all academic areas that science is not simply a matter of walking into a laboratory and conducting an experiment to see, for example, what happens to a particular chemical under certain conditions. Rather there is already a whole way of thinking about the problem which determines the way the researcher poses the question and investigates it. The descriptions of what is at best poor quality research could be viewed as research without scholarship, that is, research without a broader context.

In addition to forming part of the research process, scholarship is also perceived as a good, all-encompassing description of academic enquiry and hence is a far broader activity than research itself. The word 'scholarship' was used in two different ways: first to describe an activity that extends into the many roles of academic work, and second, to describe a quality, or mode of working.

As an activity, scholarship was described, in addition to its contribution to the research process, as embracing teaching, mentoring, consulting and writing. It was explained that if research provides the depth to academic enquiry, then scholarship provides *the element of breadth*. It was perceived to encompass three areas in particular. Scholarship includes the acquisition of extensive knowledge through reading and keeping abreast with the literature in a particular field which represents the broad area of an academic's research interest. Further, it encompasses writing and dissemination of knowledge, not only in refereed mediums, but also the communication of ideas in a variety of forms to the broader community. Finally, it connects with the teaching role through the supervision of postgraduate students and the conveying of academic values.

However, scholarship is more than an activity. It can be considered as a manner of enquiring and a quality within academic work. On one level, a scholar can be viewed as a person who is widely read and who has immense, even encyclopaedic, knowledge. However, scholarly work requires more than a large amount of passive reading. It involves careful, thoughtful and critical work. It is the manner of undertaking a systematic investigation of a question within a theoretical framework. Not only are these qualities of what participants described as good research, but they are also qualities that academics believe are important to pass on to students and are central to the teaching-research nexus. Hence scholarship, as the activities of reading and writing within one's area of enquiry, and as a quality describing the manner in which enquiry is conducted, also forms the link between research and teaching. (For further discussion of this see Neumann 1990b). It is therefore an activity important to the individual academic as well as an important and valid role for universities.

Disciplinary variations in research and scholarship

Discussion also focused on the different forms research could take across the various disciplines within a university. The interview participants believed that research spanned a very broad range of activities and that although details and emphases may vary, many or all disciplines have in common the same types of activities. Amongst these is the re-interpretation, reorganisation and re-thinking of existing knowledge, as well as the integration of ideas from different sources. Furthermore, research activities include the generation and testing of views, opinions, theories, and interpretive frameworks. Research may also involve the collection, collation, classification and correlation of observations and data from experiments, documents, field work, survey and excavations. Important activities are also writing and just plain "sitting, thinking and reflecting".

In specifically examining *research in the humanities*, it could be argued, depending on the interpretation of 'new', that the humanities involve more of what is considered 'scholarship' than 'research'. However, those interviewed from the humanities explained that in recent decades, alongside the more traditional forms of research, new forms of research activity have developed which may be considered to be more closely aligned to the type of research usually perceived to be characteristic of the sciences, rather than in the realm of 'scholarship'. The area of linguistics and the acquisition, development and teaching of foreign languages was a frequently cited example of this type of research. Participants from non-humanities areas however cited the more traditional examples of humanities research, such as the history of ideas, correlation, new interpretations, working with old documents and original sources and in this way producing new insights and interpretations.

The predominant examples given of *research activities in the sciences* involved the discovery of new facts through experimentation and laboratory work, or 'working at a bench'. Other frequent examples encompassed building equipment

and computing results. However, several participants also stressed some of the less physical or concrete activities of scientific research, namely theorising, intellectual model building and the developing of analytical and interpretive frameworks. One participant in the discipline of physics discussed his work in developing a theoretical framework to test lasers and related this type of research to that conducted in other fields, such as law, history and economics, where a researcher collects "case work in order to develop a new framework for making decisions, . . . understanding new events and probably to predict how a particular scenario is going to develop." (Participant 22)

Research in professional areas was also seen to take a variety of forms. There is research of a practical kind relating to applied questions raised by the practising professionals or external interest groups, while in areas such as architecture, this could include artistic design. There is also research which relates to the discipline or subject area, which can utilise a variety of approaches. Research in professional areas, participants explained, may quite often derive research techniques and methods from related discipline in either the sciences or the humanities.

Research in the social sciences was seen to include many of the same types of activity as in the other areas. Interestingly, however, about half of the participants from the social sciences, in reflecting on research in their disciplines, focused on the lack of particular types of research activity. There appears to be agreement that in many of the social sciences there is a paucity of theoretical research. Often researchers try to emulate the sciences and hence devote too much attention to experimentation. Frequent research activities include data collection through surveys and observational work. However, although research can involve reflective analysis and the development of theoretical models, it is believed that too little time is devoted to such important and fundamental activities. One head of department in the social sciences commented:

There are people who do research who never think about the subject because they just do mechanical reiterations of the same model. It is very easy to do in economics because once you build a model you can crank out any number of papers you know just varying a parameter here or there and not really thinking much about it. And I think that's very sterile sort of research . . . (Participant 26)

While those interviewed recognised and accepted that forms of research may be discipline-specific or may span disciplines, the overall view of research was an all-embracing one. Such unanimity of perception would tend to indicate that this study did not detect differences in view based on disciplinary affiliation. Indeed, one of the interesting findings of this study to date has been the unanimous consensus among senior academics from all ranks, and across the broad range of disciplines, about the research role within academic work, including here the definition of, and distinction between, 'research' and 'scholarship'. This was an unexpected finding, since recent studies had indicated that different disciplines espouse different values and cultures, hence adopting different approaches to academic work (Becher, 1987a, 1989). There was one area, however, where disciplinary variations could be

identified, namely the issue of what constitutes 'new' knowledge.

The issue of what constitutes 'new' knowledge is central to the differentiation of research and scholarship. Nearly all of those interviewed acknowledged that different views exist on 'newness' and maintained that the greatest difference of views probably existed between the humanities and the sciences. A critical issue was whether new slants on existing knowledge constitute 'new' knowledge. The majority of those interviewed claimed that this did qualify as 'new' knowledge and hence research. A small group, however, argued that they did not regard new slants on existing knowledge as 'new' knowledge. Essentially this group contended that synthesising and refining existing knowledge and offering another interpretation could not be considered 'research'. This group comprised representatives from the sciences and one member of a professional area drawing on the sciences. The following words of one dean of sciences sums up the arguments of this group:

> I think looking at it from a scientific perspective and speaking from ignorance probably – we would tend to see a lot of the research that's done in the humanities as being more in the nature of scholarship rather than what we would see as research . . . For example, people say they carry out 'research' in classics for example, now I would refer to that more as scholarship rather than research. There are only a limited number of things that you can read and study . . . without regurgitating previous opinions and so on. (Participant 9)

Interestingly, a large number of participants from the humanities suggested that most humanities people privately admit that they think of their research as scholarship because they are working over documents from the past and in this manner are continuing knowledge and casting fresh light on it. But not all humanities participants were in agreement with this view. Some stressed that research is just as much a part of the humanities as in other areas. One dean in the humanities commented that:

> Certainly inside the humanities you cannot say that everything that is done is scholarship because it isn't. Quite a lot of what is done is just as much research as any chemist working in a laboratory or physicist or mathematician working with different forms of formulae. I mean the things which we teach in the university today to arts students, at least in the higher year levels are really rather different from the things we would have taught them 20–25 years ago. It just does not stay static and there are considerable changes both in the level of our knowledge and in the methodological underpinning of what is being done. (Participant 12)

It was suggested that one reason for preferring the term 'scholarship' is because the term 'research' has "the kind of science and experiment oriented flavour to it". On balance, it appears that the prime activity of the humanities is considered to be just as much 'research' as that of the sciences, but that some prefer the word 'scholarship' to 'research' to describe this activity.

Discussion

The difficulty in defining terms which describe complex endeavours such as 'research' and 'scholarship' is a major issue to contend with. To provide definitions

which neatly and clearly delineate these activities is to risk narrowness and hence neglect activities which form a legitimate and important function of universities. 'Research' can and should be interpreted in a multiplicity of ways. It is important to recognise the necessity for a broad definition because 'research' and 'scholarship' often overlap and there are important disciplinary variations which need to be acknowledged and accepted.

The perceptions of senior academic administrators on 'research' and 'scholarship' presented here illustrate a tolerance of diversity and ambiguity. Recognition and understanding of disciplinary variations by the interview participants lend support to previous work on disciplinary cultures, such as that of Biglan and Becher. In contrast to Becher's work, however, it is interesting that the first stage of this study has found consensus among the senior academic administrators interviewed. Their views on 'research' and 'scholarship' indicate recognition of disciplinary differences, but their definitions of these terms do not – with perhaps the interpretation of 'new' knowledge – reflect disciplinary differences. While it may be argued that this could be due to the sample size interviewed, it is worth noting that a fair degree of structure was imposed on the design of the interview group and that the participants selected represent one particular stratum of academics. Further, this group is in a position to exercise considerable authority and influence the socialisation and acculturation of values and beliefs. The ongoing stages of this study are focusing on other strata in the academic community and future work will enable comparisons between these groups to be made. Nonetheless, the senior academic administrators interviewed provided an illuminating insight into what constitutes 'research' and 'scholarship' from an "internalist" perspective.

A very strong reaction was expressed against the Australian federal government definitions of research and scholarship in the White Paper (Dawkins 1988). A large number of participants disagreed with the narrow definitions adopted by the present Australian Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training and the false, artificial distinctions made between 'research' and 'scholarship'. They objected to the economic pragmatism underlying the government definitions and the imbalance of research which will result from imposition of such definitions. Such a collective, spontaneously strong reaction against the attempted imposition of an external definition at odds with an academic definition of core university activities, would indicate that the participants hold a unified and well-thought-out perception of 'research' and 'scholarship'. It may also point to potential future conflict between universities and government policy makers.

Related to the definition of 'research' is the role research plays in the training and supervision of postgraduate students. The adoption and recognition of a broad definition of research also takes into account the different needs and requirements of postgraduate students across the various disciplines. Just as there are many different disciplinary approaches to research, so there is a range of research requirements for postgraduate students, from the apprenticeship system predominant in the science areas to the "cottage industry" approach in the humanities. In addition to an understanding of research and scholarship is the

connection between teaching and research and the significant role scholarship plays in contributing to both the research and teaching functions of academic work. The linking role scholarship has in the nexus between teaching and research warrants detailed discussion in its own right and is beyond the scope of this paper. Findings on the teaching-research nexus from the interviews are discussed at greater length in Neumann (1992). It is also worth noting Elton's (1986) argument on the relationship between research, scholarship and teaching and the important mediating role that scholarship plays for both teaching and research.

The focal point of this paper has been on the presentation and discussion of the perceptions senior academic administrators hold of 'research' and 'scholarship' as presented in the interview component of the study. As indicated earlier, an additional component of the study included the analysis of document data and a brief comparison of these two data sources may be warranted at this stage. As a general observation, the detail and depth of information available in the documents are not as great as that derived from the interviews. This is possibly because the interviews provided opportunity to probe and specifically seek further explanation and examples. Of the 64 documents, one third were primarily concerned with defining and describing 'research' and 'scholarship'. Those documents which related to defining 'research' generally used 'standard' definitions such as extending or advancing the knowledge base. However, a few documents explored the definition of research a little further. Such documents acknowledged the connection between research and scholarship and stressed the need for a broad definition which would accommodate important disciplinary differences. Only three documents were located which discussed at some length the different meanings and forms of research in various disciplines. One of these documents was a lengthy, detailed institutional policy document on how 'research', as expressed in the various disciplines, should be interpreted for promotion purposes.

Noticeable in the document data is the lack of concentration on the distinction and relationship between research and scholarship. Only three documents refer to this although several documents, either directly or indirectly, are critical of the artificial and false distinction between research and scholarship made by the Federal government's Green/White Paper on higher education. Indeed, even in the interviews, participants often commented on the difficulty of explaining scholarship and the difference between research and scholarship. Such difficulty in finding views on an important area of academic endeavour may indicate a need for more explicit articulation of a key area of academic work.

In summary, the interview analysis from this study indicates that a definition of 'research' needs to include three important elements:

1. the creation of new knowledge,
2. the pursuit of a sustained line of enquiry, and
3. the dissemination of research results through publication for the scrutiny of peers.

While research and scholarship are both interrelated, they are also separate

activities. Scholarship is the broader of the two, encompassing aspects of research as well as relating to other areas of academic investigation. Central to research and scholarship is academic enquiry, which can be described as a critical reflection on existing knowledge and a desire to ask unanswered questions. In order to conduct good quality research, both a critical stance on, and appraisal of, existing knowledge, as well as the 'discovery' of 'new' knowledge are necessary. That is, the enquiry should be undertaken in context. The former of the two activities is generally described as the scholarship part of the research process, while the latter, the finding of something 'new', be it a theory, view, perspective or fact, is 'research'.

References

Becher, T. (1981). 'Towards a definition of disciplinary cultures', *Studies in Higher Education* 6 (2), 109–122.

Becher, T. (1987a). Disciplinary discourse. *Studies in Higher Education* 12 (3), 261–274.

Becher, T. (1987b). 'The Disciplinary Shaping of the Profession', in Clark, B.R. (ed.), *The Academic Profession*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 271–308.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Biglan, A. (1973a). 'The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 57 (3), 195–203.

Biglan, A. (1973b). 'Relationships between subject matter characteristics and the structure and output of university departments', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 57 (3), 204–213.

Bowen, H.R. (1977). *Investment in Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Carter, C. (1980). *Higher Education for the Future*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Clark, B.R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cyert, R.M. and Knapp, P.A. (1984). 'Research in the humanities', *Liberal Education* 70 (2), 95–101.

Dawkins, J.S. (1988). *Higher Education: A Policy Statement* (White Paper) Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Elton, L. (1986). 'Research and teaching: symbiosis or conflict. *Higher Education* 15, 299–304.

Lindsay, A. (1989). 'The teaching and research roles of academics – conflicting pressures in the higher education system', *Herdsa News*, 11 (3), 5–6.

Lindsay, A.W. and Neumann, R.T. (1988). *The Challenge for Research in Higher Education: Harmonizing Excellence and Utility*. Washington: ASHE-ERIC.

McGrath, E.J. (1962). 'Characteristics of outstanding college teachers', *Journal of Higher Education* 33, 148–152.

Neumann, R. (1992). 'Perceptions of the teaching-research nexus: a framework for analysis', *Higher Education* 23 (2), 159–171.

Neumann, R. (1990a). Interview-Based Research Into Academic Work, in Macpherson, R.J.S. and Weeks, J. (eds), *Pathways to Knowledge In Educational Administration: Methodologies and Research in Progress in Australia*. Armidale: ACEA, pp. 95–104.

Neumann, R. (1990b). *A Study of the Research Role Within Academic Work*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, School of Education, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia.

Neumann, R. and Lindsay, A. (1988). 'Research policy and the changing nature of Australia's universities', *Higher Education* 17 (3), 307–321.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (1981). *The Future of University Research.* Paris: OECD.

Schwartzman, S. (1984). The Focus on Scientific Activity, in Clark, B.R. (ed.), *Perspectives on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views.* Berkley: University of California Press, pp. 199–232.

Scott, P. (1991). 'Beyond the dual-support system: scholarship, research and teaching in the context of academic autonomy', *Studies in Higher Education* 16 (1), 5–13.