8-16-2010

What do university teachers do all day (and often into the night)?'

Josie Arnold

Swinburne University of Technology, jarnold@swin.edu.au

What do university teachers do all day (and often into the night)?'

Abstract

Teaching and the student experience are interlocked. This paper takes a personal look at the pleasures and pressures of teaching in contemporary higher education. In doing so it adds to the definition of teachers' work in higher education, surveys some of the creative and positive sides of University teaching and shines a light upon the impact of increased commercialisation and managerial approaches upon academic work. It focuses upon the teaching and learning activities that academics undertake in the service of the university, including the research that adds to and updates their own knowledge, and hence underpins their teaching, so as to enable and enrich the learning journeys of their students. This paper has been written as a personal narrative, as what I have come to call a 'subjective academic narrative'. The 'subjective' refers to acknowledgement of the inevitability of the personal being an integral part of research; the 'academic' refers to the analytical and the intellectual ambience in which university research takes place; and the 'narrative' refers to the story, that is, the way in which we re-tell all of our research. Above all, this paper contributes to a sense of understanding some of the elements of teaching that are involved in student engagement.

Introduction

There are two distinct (yet often complementary) elements of research that academics undertake in the service of the university. The first is research that adds to and updates their own knowledge and hence underpins their teaching so as to enable and enrich the learning journeys of their students (Bain, 2004). The second is research that adds to and enlarges the body of knowledge within their discipline and/or about teaching and learning itself, which adds to the students' journeys in a different way. Yet 'many university academics hardly consider themselves "teachers" at all, instead visualising themselves more as a member of their discipline' (Kember 1997:255).

This paper acknowledges the importance of both, but concentrates on the former, that is, teaching and/as research (Kember et al., 2006). This paper explores how teaching expertise and scholarship are both able to be reframed within a critical framework provided by anecdotal theory. In doing so, it proposes a methodology of 'subjective academic narrative'.

As a teacher for over 45 years, and a writer published in many genres with over 50 major books and many articles, I bring to the academic world multiple stories of self in relationship to teaching and learning. Through this lived experience, I see life and learning as a form of textuality and discourse, as a created story, a narrative of some kind (Ulmer, 1985; Midgely, 2004; Gallop, 2002). In my academic thinking, I have attempted to bridge the gap I've found still exists between 'real' methodology and 'other' by working towards and within the articulation of a practice of academic writing that I am calling 'the subjective academic narrative'. This, then, is not a 'personal narrative' as much as one that brings together these 3 elements into the academy.

Theoretical framework

The whole question of 'voice' is one that intrudes upon our understanding of what is personal and what is academic. In this 'subjective academic narrative' I utilise multiple voices that address the subjective, the academic and the narration. I have arrived at this through a personal and academic study of personal narrativity and how it is beginning to be seen as an integral aspect of knowledge itself; that is, to be epistemologically sound. There is a growing body of researchers who claim that narrative non-fiction, even subjective autobiography, is in fact the basis for all published research, most particularly and obviously in the social sciences (Ulmer 1985; 1994; 2005), and as such should be seen as important in both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. To bring together the three aspects of my methodology, I have referred to literature around teaching for support, reference and anecdote. This adds to my personal insights about teaching my academic and narrative

reading about teaching, hence developing the 3 threads of subjective academic narrative.

Midgely alerts scholars to the seductive simplicity of Enlightenment concepts. (2004:5), arguing that cultural 'norms' celebrate the scientific knowledge model because it has led to so many demonstrable advantages (2004:9). Yet this celebration ignores what has been lost or has not occurred because of this dominance. Such cultural interstices are an important element enabling the growth of feminist poetics that act to draw together multiple ways of thought, enquiry, research, theory and practice. The academy, ways of knowing, pedagogy, theory and practice are entwined.

Gallop is a proponent of enacting an academic feminism that breaks down the barrier between the professional and the personal through what she calls 'anecdotal theory' (2002:7). Such thinking accords with the postmodernist dispersal of paradigmatic thought which urges the academy to accept alternative ways of knowing. It also coincides with Jacques Derrida's (1983) ideas of not doing again what has already been done and accords with what I call 'fictional truth' (Arnold 2007), and 'subjective academic narrative' (Arnold 2009).

This paper, then, enacts a methodological proposition that the personal is also academic and such narrative discourses add to the body of knowledge and, in this case, that personal, professional and theoretical knowledge is about teaching. It follows Midgely's proposition that 'The forms of thought needed for understanding social dilemmas are distinct from those that we need for chemistry and again from historical thinking, because they answer different kinds of questions. They are bound to have different standards of validity' (2004:6).

This seems to me to be in accordance with what Martin et al. describe as 'the broad theoretical position of non-dualism in educational research' that asserts that '…meaning is created or constituted in the relationship between the individual and the context.' (2000:388).

In this case, the question is: 'What do university teachers do all day (and into the night)?' The only validity I am seeking is that it is my own subjective academic narrative based upon many years of life-led research. This contrasts with more traditional views of knowledge arising from an analytico-referential science model in which 'knowledge exists independently of the knower and can be learned and applied separately from its context, or exists within the knower independently of the context he or she is in.' (Martin et al. 2000:388).

Teaching

Great teachers are mythical beasts with outstanding powers. They combine the speed of the man-horse centaur with its adaptability, the lion-power and the eagle-fierceness of the gryphon, and the beauty and gracefulness of the flying white unicorn with the determination, grit, adaptability and dynamism of all of the animal kingdom…enhanced by the feeling, wit and intellect of our humanity. (Dunkin, 1991). Or on a more 'academic' note, as Stephanie Sachs says: '…education researchers have consistently identified five attributes of effective urban teachers: (a) sociocultural awareness, (b) contextual interpersonal skills, (c) self-understanding, (d) risk-taking, and (e) perceived efficacy' (2004:178).

 No wonder there are relatively few of them. Indeed, Goldhaber writes about 'the mystery of good teaching' saying that students entering teaching do so from the 'lower end of the ability distribution' yet 'high-quality teachers raise student performance…8.5%.' (2002:1-2).

There is a surprisingly large number of really, really, good teachers in our schools and universities (Bain, 2004). Universities have recently begun to rate teaching effectiveness more highly than in the past, and are now keen to develop all academics as effective teachers focussing upon student outcomes, and the concept of 'teaching and learning' has been replaced by 'learning and teaching' (Kember 1997:257).

This is my story, a subjective academic narrative, about effective teaching. In my own experience, the attributes such effective teachers display include:

Energy. Teaching is a highly creative interaction, with knowledge transfer being but a minimal part of the work. Creative energy is something that is not always articulated fully or valued highly when we talk about teachers, but it is the ability that I rate as the highest. Teachers' willingness to put their creative energy into interacting with students and knowledge is extremely generous, and it's what identifies a really good teacher as well as a great one. It includes the intersection of assessment with students and teacher achievement: student achievement because they have done the necessary evaluative work relating to the subject, and teacher achievement because they find joy in seeing this in their assessing that overcomes the exhaustion of very strenuous and demanding assessment allocations. Goldhaber states that 97% of teacher influence is 'intangible'. He describes this as an elusive aspect incorporating 'enthusiasm and skill in conveying knowledge' (2002:3). This capacity to challenge and engage students is a central one.

Passion. University teachers have access to the latest knowledge discussions about their area of teaching and learning. A passion for this knowledge intersects with a passion for making it available to students. Martin et al. suggest that '…when teachers make decisions about what is to be taught and how it will be learned they do so in line with an explicit or implicit theory of what teaching and learning the subject matter involves' (2000:388). Student engagement is then really present as the other side of teachers' passion.

Willingness to learn. The information explosion is one aspect of this, but so is the capacity to believe that our students bring knowledge and insights as well as human interactions with them that we can learn from. Martin et al. suggest that 'the critical issue is not how much teachers know or what their level of teaching skill is, but what it is they intend their students to know and how they see teaching helping them to know' (2000:388).

Interest in people. Access to knowledge can sometimes mean that we cut ourselves off from interactions with people. Perhaps the best a university teacher offers of herself or himself comes about as they allow students to see how learning is problematic and how the teacher has to work something out…and to display freely how they go about it.

Martin et al.'s review of research on higher education teachers indicates that '…where teachers see teaching as having a focus on the teacher, and where they see the task as either transmitting information or getting students to adopt the concepts and ideas of the discipline, then students will learn less well. In contrast , where teachers see the focus being on student learning (as opposed to being on teaching) and where teachers work to help students develop or change their own understanding of relevant ideas and conceptions, then students will learn more effectively' (2000:389).

Charm. A difficult word to use as it's so easily debased. However, teachers must show their own engagement and their own interest in subjects and topics as well as people. This is charming and enables students to interact fruitfully with both subject knowledge and ways of thinking (Sachs 2004).

Forcefulness. Teachers need to be able to show that they are in control: of themselves, the teaching situation and the subject topics (Vanetta & Fordham. 2004).

Love of knowledge. If students see lack of interest, then why would they be interested themselves? Goldharb's study 'suggests that teachers' knowledge of their subject matter, as measured by degrees, courses, and certification in that area, is associated with high performance' (2002:4).

Willingness to go further than the prescribed. Intransigent boundaries to teaching are undesirable and are easy to maintain only when they prevent extensions beyond the minimal. Martin et al. record their phenomenological interview with Dr Sara who teaches human reproduction: 'I want them to understand things, I don't want them to have to sit down and memorise A, B, C, D fits with F, G, H. I want them to understand it, so that we can build on that foundation of understanding and apply it to a number of things' (2000:401) and Dr Leon who says: 'I try to give them the overall education and way of thinking that will allow them to be much better doctors rather than academically getting through the medical course and coming up with text book type knowledge' (2000:406).

An ability to see beyond the norm, the given, the everyday. Creativity involves seeing beyond the known, and creativity is a strong aspect of teaching. However, we also see beyond the known when we stand on the shoulders of giants. Another strong element of teaching is translating intense, arcane knowledge (sometimes the work of genius) into that which students (and ourselves) can readily understand. This is not to diminish it or make it somehow 'easy'. As Kember says: 'basing teaching upon a single fervently held ideal would normally be seen as inconsistent with the goals of universities, founded on Western models, which stress critical thinking and encourage the plurality of viewpoints (1997:259).

A real interest in the students and their personal learning journeys (Biggs 2003). The basis of my teaching philosophy is that the student's journey is paramount. Facilitating that journey has been my life's work in the classroom and lecture theatre, in planning and publishing curriculum, in developing programs for flexible deliveries and in my own research.

The most significant question underpinning such an approach is, for me, how curriculum can be developed that is clearly understood by the student and that signposts the acquisition of skills rather than the accumulation of information. In Martin et al. Dr Lucy says she has the specific intention to: 'engender in students a practice of continuing self-examination not just concerning thinking about legal matters but concerning all social and political and even personal matters' (2000:407).

Approachability. Students should always feel easy about approaching an academic. There are real issues here, for example, of a 'duty of care', of not stepping across any lines, particularly harassment or sexual harassment lines, and of respecting the students as individuals not as an extension of self. There are also issues of access and equity that relate to favouritism as against professional involved detachment. One way to see this is to understand that we teachers act as 'critical friends' to our students. For us as teachers, Martin et al. describe this as 'constituting the subject matter as they teach it' (2000:409).

Ability to be innovative. Academics should be able to present work without relying upon single textbooks or dogmatic transmission of content calling for predictable responses. This ability to be innovative applies to teaching methodologies and presentation skills as well as content analysis and the interpretation of ideas rather than the transmission of information. It is particularly apposite regarding cyberteaching and learning. Martin et al. state that 'students need to be aware of the profession's continued development and the way knowledge continues to be developed and constructed within the profession…it is also expected that students will continue to question and to reflect on key issues in all aspects of social, political and personal life, throughout their lives' (2000:407).

Collegiality
Getting academics together has sometimes quite cynically been described as 'attempting to herd cats'. In describing collegiality, however, there is no intention to make academics into some kind of mindless herd. Rather there is a readiness to develop appropriate contributions to research projects and other group activities that also contributes to the CV profile of the individual.

This is, of course, not an exhaustive list. There are endless studies on good teaching processes (for example: Ramsden, 1992; Kember et al., 2006; McBer, 2000; and Pigge & Marso, 1997) this is my own subjective academic narrative.

Devising, writing delivering and reviewing curriculum

This is the main work that we do for the Universities in which are employed (Biggs, 2003). It is our 'core business' by which we bring into the university undergraduate students and postgraduate students undertaking course work in sufficient numbers both to justify the university and to justify our own jobs. Making curriculum is intense, because it involves much more than 'knowledge transmission'. It goes from imagining, to trying out the idea against other materials, to finding backing for the idea in learned materials, discussions with peers, to writing up the summary of the idea as a pre-accreditation suggestion.

All of this is followed by the accreditation documentation and processes to build up into a good journey for the students. It's a privilege to be able to take your own interests and knowledge and to make this into something that will engage, and hopefully even enchant, students (Arnold, 2005; 2007).

The life of the curriculum extends into the lecture theatre and the tutorial room as well as into the assessment and evaluation of students' work. Live and electronic lectures are a broadcast way of getting information and ideas to students in bulk. Good lecturers are theatrical performers. They also have

impeccably prepared and up-to-date information that they make accessible to students; they are in control of any electronic 'toys' they're using; and they are cheerful and exude positive energy. Furthermore, they are prepared to let the lecture theatre students see how they work things out. In doing so, they admit their weaknesses and personal biases whilst assuring students that they do not have to accept them but can problematise any information in lectures including the lecturer's positions. Martin et al.'s study concludes that '…it is not just how we teach that is important to students learning, nor what we teach, but what we constitute in particular learning and teaching contexts. Teachers need to consider what it is they constitute for their students in their classrooms That is, they are not just presenting subject matter or teaching content, but they are constituting the subject matter as they teach it' (2002:409).

Face-to-face and virtual tutorials are another aspect of teaching that means energy and positivity must be shown about the topics under discussion and the ways in which students might interact with them. Good tutors are well-prepared and able about the subject materials, but they are also people who act as 'academic ushers': they open doors and take students further than they might ever have imagined they could go. Predictably, studies show that teachers 'who intended to transmit information adopted teacher-focused strategies, while others who believed in conceptual development or change adopted student-focused strategies.' (Kember 1997:269).

Despite many structures within Universities aimed at 'quality control' Kember shows that 'it is hard for regulatory bodies to discover, let alone have any influence upon, the underlying beliefs or conceptions of teaching' (1997:271). However, at base, especially in undergraduate teaching, assessment is a prime mover for students enabling how they interact with knowledge. When we devise curriculum, the assessment is a central and significant aspect of its content and delivery. It must be integrated into the teaching and learning materials so that the students' journeys are facilitated. Assessment should never be pejorative or a surprise: it should arise naturally and even organically from the materials themselves as well as the interactions between teachers and students and students and students. 'The students' perceptions of the learning-assessment environment, based on former learning experiences and their recent experiences, have an important influence on their learning strategies and affect the quality of their learning outcomes' (Segers and Dochy. 2001:15).

Assessment *of* students has a correlative of assessment *by* students (Biggs, 2003). This is a two-edged sword, of course, because students are not expert in the field under consideration: that is, either with the content or with the pedagogy. Nevertheless, they do have a common-sense approach to their

learning experiences, and their opinions are worthy of being taken into account by teachers and academic managers.

Of course, assessment isn't everything, but what is of central importance is that student-focussed approaches to teaching should take this into account as well the ideal of 'knowledge being constructed and/or problematic.' (Martin et al. 2000:410).

Spending time in lectures and tutorials identifying and extending students' learning styles

Teachers encourage students to build up multiple learning styles once they have been helped to understand that they have their own preferred way of learning. Teachers recognise that a combination of verbal, aural, kinaesthetic, and visual learning skills will enable deeper and richer learning that is easier for the student to undertake. At University level, students benefit greatly from becoming aware of how to learn efficiently (Entwistle & Ramsden. 1983).

Teachers usually demonstrate these various learning styles to students in multiple teaching events in tutorials, lectures and discussion groups as well as in their written class notes or subject outlines (Entwistle & Ramsden, 1983). Martin et al. note that: 'traditionally, studies of teaching in higher education have focussed on the strategies teachers employ…More recent studies have concentrated on identifying teachers' intentions and their ways of thinking and arguing a link between intentions and strategies.' (2002:411).

An intrinsic and interesting 'teacherly' aspect of this is understanding how teachers 'conceive of their teaching and their students learning, the way they approach their teaching and the object of study they intend to and do constitute for their students in their teaching/learning environment' (Martin et al. 2000:410).

Supervising work experiences, international travel, scenarios and case studies

As Universities strive to make employability one of their key offerings, the abilities that teachers have to help students to see the everyday reality through the prism of intellectual learned knowledge becomes more and more important. This may be, for example, through the creation of scenarios and case studies (Kember et al., 2006:43). Or it may be through travel and employment as Universities are no longer happy to be seen as inward-looking 'ivory towers'. Now they have opened up to the world in ways that are not always seen as appropriate to places that cherish learning for its own sake (Watson 2003).

The old boundaries between theory and practice, between employment and study, between town and gown, are continually being re-addressed, stretched and even eroded away. This is a sensitive and challenging process. All university students today are encouraged to travel and learn overseas, to undertake industry-based learning and to identify skills learnt in the learning process as skills they can take forward into employment and lifelong learning (DETYA, 2002).

A significant difficulty teachers regularly address here is that of ensuring that academic standards of knowledge are not eroded by fads.

Martin et al. find that the most important aspect of teaching and/for learning is for teachers to clarify not only 'strategy and intention' but also answer the question 'what is it that teachers want their students to learn and how do they believe their students will come to know this-the 'object of study'?' (2000:411).

Utilising the advantages offered by cyberlearning

Today, significant questions in teaching students who are 'cybernatives' must be addressed by us as we go about enabling students to learn how to learn in the Information Age when everything changes quickly as computerisation brings information to our fingertips. Teachers must consider for ourselves and our students the question of how we can turn information into knowledge and how we can keep up with rapid cultural changes (Usher& Edwards, 1998).

Teachers today also need to be able to keep up with our general cultural developments and to bring cyber capacities into their own teaching and their students' learning strategies (Willett, 2008). Being familiar with students' own electronic tools such as iphones and interactive multimedia technologies is a valuable lifelong learning skill in itself and teachers can harness. Our 21st century students' cultural backgrounds are totally different from those that formed and informed us as teachers the challenge is for us as teachers to overcome it and make the 'e' a learning delight.

Establishing lifelong learning abilities in/for students

In our fast changing society, we need to help students to become lifelong learners by identifying the ways in which they prefer to learn and helping them to make this work even more fruitfully for each of them. This means, for example, helping individual students to:

- understand themselves as a learner. The various ways people go about learning are not stand-alone: most of us use some aspects of every learning approach. If we can help students to understand their own learning approaches, we can also help them to build up skills which don't come naturally to them.

- maximise their lifelong learning skills. Good teachers help students to understand how to break down learning tasks into achievable and understandable parts. Today, most universities embed lifelong-learning in their graduate attributes policies. Yet Barries' work questioning 'the extent to which this rhetoric does reflect a shared understanding (2004:263) shows that teachers' understanding of how to achieve these is flawed as 'academics hold qualitatively different conceptions of the phenomenon of graduate attributes' and this is despite the fact that 'claims of graduate attributes sit at a vital intersection of many of the forces shaping education today.' (2004: 261). His work indicates that there is no shared understanding of this concept of graduate attributes leading to and involving lifelong learning skills. His case study indicated that a framework could be evolved that would enable this to be overcome.

- limit negative stress. When teachers show students how to be in control of their own learning they become able to apply the most appropriate ways of learning to ensure that they are focussed on the task and its successful completion rather than use up energy being stressed about what they have to do. Joels et al. explain that 'people who experience very stressful events often show unreliable memory for details." (2006:153)

- emphasise positive stress. Teachers know that the ways in which we get things done are made more productive for ourselves and our students if we use our energy positively. Joels et al. state that stress will facilitate the learning process '(i) when stress is experienced in the context and around the time of the event that needs to be remembered, and (ii) …when convergence in time and space takes place'(2006:152).

- keep up with professional and work information. The information overload applies to all aspects of teachers' work on behalf of student learning. In Eppler and Mengis's review of the literature they state that 'researchers across various disciplines have found that the performance (i.e. the quality of decisions or reasoning in general) of an individual correlates positively with the amount of information he or she receives-up to a certain point. If further information is provided beyond this point, the performance of the individual will rapidly decline The information provided beyond this point will no longer be

integrated into the decision-making process and information overload will be the result' (2004:326).

- participate in business and political developments. Increasingly, academic staff are expected to be aware of the links between town and gown for their area of specialisation as well as most particularly to enable students to see, grasp and to operate in work/employment opportunities.

- be alert to possibilities for creativity and artistic opportunities. This is a vexed issue for academics as this area receives little overt or even covert support within the key performance indicators of most universities and most university departments. Sawyer states that 'teaching is an improvisational performance. Conceiving teaching as improvisation highlights the collaborative and emergent nature of effective classroom practice, helps us to understand how curriculum materials relate to classroom practice, and shows why teaching is a creative art' (2004:12).

- make sound judgements. Teachers are making multiple judgements every day. These are not only about our own areas of learning but also about the often arcane and even reality-divorced bureaucratic decision-making into which they have increasingly rare input. The judgements that we do make include how to transmit information so that it becomes digestible knowledge, how to judge the academic materials that multiply daily, how to evaluate books and articles and, perhaps most importantly, how to make sound yet encouraging assessments of students' work whilst also making judgements about how such assessment drives the curriculum for students.

'It is the students' journeys that should be at the centre of teaching' (Biggs, 2003).

Making knowledge accessible

One of the major tasks of teachers is to take complex information and make it accessible to students without diminishing it. As I have shown, teachers in undergraduate courses need to consider a complex number of areas.

Making knowledge accessible is a task that teachers undertake from their undergraduate classes to their PhD candidate supervision (Arnold, 2007; Barron & Zeegers, 2002; Sinclair, 2004).

Theorising knowledge and teaching/applying cultural, critical and literary theories

Although teachers help students in the processes involved in identifying fundamental content and concepts and making them explicit, they also teach them how to deal with conflicting and even contradictory theories and ideas as well as information that challenges their own sincerely held beliefs.

 Theories and their relationship to the ways in that our culture works provide a first step for teachers and students to enrich their understanding of the culture in which we live locally and the one that is growing globally (Barthes, 1977; Derrida, 1978a&b, 1983, 1980, 1982; Cixous, 1988; 1984; Deleuze & Guattari, 1981,1987; Eagleton, 1989; Irigary, 1989a&b; Kristeva, 1982; Milner & Worth, 1990).

Teaching various appropriate methodologies

In higher education, methodology refers to the ways in which we go about researching a topic, idea or area of thought or culture. Much of what we think of as valid University research methodologies arises from a dominant western scientific model (Midgely, 2004; Yates, 1990). This in turn arises from a divide between 'thought' and 'feeling', between 'reason', and 'emotion' that can be traced to the work of the French algebraist and thinker Rene Descartes. He famously came to the conclusion that human existence relies upon intellect: 'I think, therefore I am' or 'cogito ergo sum'. Through this Cartesian binary, the science genie was out of the religion bottle. The thirst for knowledge became less divine and more earth-bound (Braudel,1981; 1982; 1986).

Thus, the most common methodology that we advance to our students in higher education teaching, as in research generally, is that which underpins the quantitative natural sciences model. In the late 20th and early 21st centuries, a less scientific but no less rigorous way of undertaking research gained ground as the study of society grew, and as literary theories expanded their influence from literature itself to textuality and discourse as being relevant to studies of culture itself.

There are numerous qualitative methodologies (Lincoln & Guber, 1985; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Yates, 1990). These theories provide a prism or way of viewing what is being undertaken. My own favourite is Practice Led Research, which has acted to recognise that an intrinsic aspect of lifelong learning comes about through personal narratives that lead the research (Arnold, 2007).

Undertaking research that enables and enriches the teaching and learning experience

Teachers in universities are required to be at the cutting edge of knowledge within their specialist subject area. Undergraduate courses, especially in the Arts and Social Sciences, offer a range of subjects that enable young people in particular, who have little or no 'uncredentialled' life-experience knowledge, to range across a broad offering so as to find their educational and possibly life focus.

How can they do so in confidence, with energy and in a belief that they are truly extending their own knowledge base so as to enrich their personal well-being and to prepare them for their adult lives? A major contribution to this is that their teachers are up to date and even slightly towards the front.(Arnold 2005, 2007; Barron & Zeegers, 2007).

Dealing with ubiquitous bureaucracy

There used to be a sport in elite British Public Schools called 'The Hare and The Hounds". A paper trail was laid by the fastest runner who was given a few minutes start and then the pack set off after him. There was no real point to it except the exercise it entailed and perhaps the impression on young minds that a wily individual was usually no match for the might of the British Empire (Hellawell & Hancock, 2001).

This idea of the paper chase seems pre-eminent in academic circles today where management criteria are fast overtaking and capturing academic and intellectual pursuits. University teachers do teaching and research in their field of expertise so as to keep their own and the nation's young minds alert, not to be chased down by managerialism. There is no real point to this managerial 'paper chase', either (Watson, 2003).

However, academic leadership seems irrevocably locked into the faulty model of the paper chase, of leaving a paper trail that meets performance goals of management and of external evaluating bodies, or the un-named (and perhaps un-nameable) bureaucracies behind best practices, international benchmarking and client satisfaction criteria (Anderson, 2006). The checklist and the justifying document seems to have more importance than the matters of academic substance embodied in critical thinking, researching, reading, drawing together disparate ideas, communicating to academic peers and participating in a positive intellectual way in facilitating the undergraduate and postgraduate students' journeys. That is, teaching (Austin & Baldwin, 1991).

Traditionally, universities offered courses about what they thought people should know about intellectual matters. Then people attending universities were students. Today, universities set up courses that will appeal to a target group of clients. Universities have become business corporations ruled by ubiquitous bureaucracies engaged in paper chases (Gettler, 2004; Coslovich, 2004, 2-3).

Understand the relationship of the margins to the centre of knowledge

Because they interact daily with many people, particularly young people, university teachers understand that the dynamic nature of how the culture can act exuberantly and academically actually relies not so much upon the conservative establishment which, after all, is quite fixed and intransigent in many ways, but upon the actions of those who are on the margins (Arnold, 2005; 2007; Eagleton, 1989a&b). These marginal activities act to create opportunities for the culture to grow and develop. Very often, the marginal becomes the central.

New intellectual endeavours arise in a dynamic and enabling environment. They do not grow from conforming to dominant cultural givens. They grow from challenges to such received notions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Philosopher and teacher Peter Singer, in his newspaper article 'We must nurture the humanities' (2009:13), looks closely at his question: 'what is excellence in a university?' He says 'I regret that so many young Australians do vocationally oriented degrees because they believe it will get them a job…Teaching people to think for themselves equips them for a wide range of future possibilities' He avers that an education in the humanities is valuable because '…it gives you an intellectual foundation to use throughout your life, whether you decide to go into medicine, law, business engineering or any other occupation.'

Collegiality

Collegiality involves working with other people in a way that respects their position as well as your own, and that develops the University for which you work. In other areas of business, it might be called team work: something that we insist all of our students become familiar with and even expert at as part of their courses so that they can work in groups in the workplace (Austin & Baldwin, 1991). Intellectual sharing also shows possible synchronicities where the members of the team can bring various aspects of their thinking into other projects.

This willingness to work together is a strengthening aspect of our work both as teachers and researchers. It is all too easy for eccentric habits of thought and action to develop when you work alone as a researcher, and whilst these are often a valuable aspect of the research work, they are also available to be critiqued as not always in the service of the University and also, perhaps, not always in the best interests of students and even staff themselves (Hellawell & Hancock, 2001).

Conclusion

This paper intends to open up for scrutiny and discussion some of the things that university teachers do all day. Perhaps the most important is that they value the transformative and possibly redemptive nature of education itself so that they love teaching. It's not by chance that one of the things repressive societies do first is to jail or even execute intellectuals and to burn books that they disagree with. Most Western societies simply don't publish books if they are considered too disruptive. If they can't burn or repress the books many other cultures arrest and/or silence the intellectuals because they are critical thinkers…or even of the wrong gender! (Nafasi, 2003).

Universities are at the creative heart of the nation. Whilst this is readily identifiable through research into such areas as climate change, social and cultural issues, psychological and medical knowledge, advances in engineering and economics, it's too often overlooked in regard to teaching and learning. University pedagogy goes from the tertiary undergraduate stage of year 13 to the postgraduate PhD stage. All OECD countries focus upon University education as a predictor of their economic and cultural well-being. Without teachers doing what they do all day, there would be no foundation for the research activities that are such a significant part of the universities contribution to nation-building. This involves teaching well, particularly at undergraduate level. Singer says of his experiences in every American university that it '…sees undergraduate teaching as its core mission. No matter how distinguished professors may be, or how many books they have published, they are expected to teach undergraduate courses, to participate in events open to undergraduates, and to be available for students to talk to on an individual basis' (2009:13).

References

Anderson, G. (2006). Carving out time and space in the managerial university. *Journal of Educational Change Management.* 19(5), 578-592. www.emeraldinsight.com/0953-4814.htm Accessed 17/03/08.

Arnold, J. (2007). *'Practice Led Research: A dynamic way to knowledge.'* The Rock View Press. Melbourne. Australia.

Arnold, J. (2005). The PhD in Creative Writing Accompanied by an Exegesis. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice.* 2(1), 36-50. http://jutlp.uow.edu.au/ Accessed 12/03/07.

Arnold, J. (2009). Herstory is women's history: Are popular books by and about women pro-women? *The Creativity and Uncertainty Papers: the refereed proceedings of the 13th conference of the Australian Association of Writing Programs 2008.* http://aawp.org.au/creativity-and-uncertainty-papers Accessed 12/08/09

Austin, A.E. & Baldwin, R.G. (1991). *Faculty Collaboration, enhancing the quality of scholarship and teaching.* ASHE_ERIC Higher Education Reports, No. 7.

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do.* Harvard University Press. Cambridge. U.S.A.

Barrie, S. (2004). A research-based approach to generic graduate attributes policy. *Higher Education Research & Development.* 23(3), 261-275.

Barron, D. and Zeegers, M. (2002). *'O' for Osmosis, 'P' for Pedagogy: Fixing the postgraduate wheel of fortune.*
http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap/bar02605.htm. Accessed 22/08/07

Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, Music, Text.* Fontana/Collins. London. U.K.

Biggs, J. B. (2003). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the students do.* SRE & Open University Press. Buckingham. U.K.

Braudel, F. (1981). *The Structures of everyday life.* Vol. 1 of *Civilization & Capitalism 15th-18th Century.* William Collins Sons Ltd. London. U.K.

Braudel, F. (1982). *The wheels of commerce.* Vol. 2 of *Civilization & Capitalism 15th-18th Century.* William Collins Sons Ltd. London. U.K.

Braudel, F. (1986). *The perspective of the world. The limits of the possible* Vol. 3 of *Civilization & Capitalism 15th-18th Century.* William Collins Sons & co. Ltd. London. U.K.

Bryant, J. & Lasky, B. (2007). A researcher's tale: dealing with epistemological divergence. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management.* 2(3), 181-93. Emerald Publishing. Northampton. U.K.

Cixous, H. (1988). *Writing Differences. Readings from the seminar of Helene Cixous.* Sellers, S. Open University Press. Milton Keynes. U.S.A.

Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education.* Routledge. London. UK

Coslovich, G. (2004). *Have Talent, Will Travel.* The Age. Melbourne. Australia. March 22, pp 2-3.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia.* University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis. U.S.A.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1981). *Rhizome, Power and Desire, Diagrams of the Social.* I&C Spring No.8.

Derrida, J. (1983). *The time of thesis: punctuations.* Philosophy in France Today. Ed. A. Montefiore. CUP. Cambridge. U.K.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing a Difference.* Routledge & Kegan Paul. London, U.K.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Structure Sign and play in the human sciences*. Writing and Difference. Routledge and Kegan. London. U.K.

Derrida, J. (1980). The law of genre. *Critical Enquiry*. Vol.7. No.1 Autumn

Derrida, J. (1982). *Margins of Philosophy*. Harvester and Wheatsheaf. U.K.

Derrida, J. (1984). *Signesponge*. Columbia University Press. N.Y. U.S.A.

DETYA (2002). *Employer Satisfaction with Graduate Skills Research Report*. DETYA Evaluations and Investigations Programme HED, Australia

Dunkin, M. (ed.) (1991). *Award Winning University Teachers*. Centre for Teaching and Learning. The University of Sydney. Australia.

Eagleton, T. (1989) *Literary Theory* Basil Blackwell. U.K.

Eagleton, T. (1989). *The Significance of Theory*. Blackwell. Oxford. U.K.

Entwistle, N. & Ramsden, P. (1983). *Understanding student learning*. Croom & Helm. London. U.K.

Eppler, M. & Mengis, J. (2004). The concept of information overload: a review of literature from organization science, accounting, Marketing, MIS, and related disciplines. *The Information Society*, 20, 325-344.

Gallop, J. (2002). *Anecdotal Theory*. Duke University Press. U.S.A.

Gettler, L. (2004). *Oeipus Wrecks*. The Age Review. 28/08/04 pp1. Melbourne. Australia.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Aldine. Chicago. U.S.A.

Goldhaber, D. (2002). The Mystery of Good Teaching. *Education Next*. Spring pp1-7.

Hellawell, D. & Hancock, N. (2001). A case study of the changing role of the academic middle manager in higher education: between hierarchical control and collegiality? *Research Papers in Education*. 16(2), 183-197. Accessed 18/05/08.

Irigaray, L. (1989). *Speculum of the other woman*. Cornell University Press. Ithaca. N.Y. U.S.A.

Irigaray, L. (1989). The Language of Man. In: *Cultural Critique*, 13:191-202.

Joels, M., Zhenwei P., Weigart, O., Oitz, M. & Krugers, H. (2006). Learning under stress: how does it work? *Trends in Cognitive Science*. 10(4), 152-158.

Kember, D. (1997). A reconceptualisation of the research into university academics' conceptions of teaching. In: *Learning and Instruction*. 7(3), 255-275.

Kember, D., Ma, R., McNaught, C. and 18 excellent teachers. (2006). *Excellent University Teaching*. Chinese University Press. Hong Kong.

Kristeva, J. (1982). *Powers of horror: an Essay on abjection*. Columbia University Press. N.Y.

Lincoln, Y. & Guber, E. (1985). *Naturalistic enquiry*. Sage Publication. Newbury Park. U.S.A.

Martin, E., Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., Ramsden, P. & Benjamin, J. (2000). What University Teachers Teach and How They Teach It. *Instructional Science 28*. Kluwer Academic Publishers. The Netherlands.

McBer, H. (2000). *Research into teacher effectiveness. A model for teacher effectiveness.* Department for Education and Employment. Great Britain.

Midgely, M. (2004). *The myths we live by.* Routledge Oxon and New York.

Milner, A. & Worth, C. (eds) (1990). *Discourse and difference: Post-structuralism, Feminism and the Moment in History*. Centre for General and Comparative Literature, Monash University, Clayton. Australia.

Nafasi, A. (2003). *Reading Lolita in Teheran: A memoir in books.* Hodder Aust.

Norris, C. (1985)*. The Contest of Faculties: Philosophy and Theory after Deconstruction*. Methuen, London.

Pigge, F. & Marso, R. (1997). A seven year longitudinal multi-factor assessment of teaching concerns development through preparation and early years of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 13(2), 225-235.

Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to teach in higher education.* Routledge. U.K.

Sachs, S. (2004). Evaluation of teacher attributes as predictors of success in urban schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 55(2), 177-187.

Sawyer, R.K. (2004). Creative teaching: Collaborative discussion as disciplined improvisation. *Educational Researcher*. 33(2), 12-24.

Segers, M. & Dochy, F. (2001). New assessment forms in problem-based learning: the value-added of the students' perspective. In: *Studies in Higher Education*. 26(3), 1-18.

Sinclair, M. (2004). *The pedagogy of 'good' PhD supervision: a national cross-disciplinary investigation of PhD supervision.* Dept. of Education, Science and Training, Australia.

Singer, P. (2009). We must nurture the humanities. *The Age.* Monday July 27. p13. Melbourne. Australia.

Ulmer, G. (1985). *Teletheory: Grammatology in the age of video.* Routledge. NY.

Ulmer, G. (1994). *Heuretics: the logic of invention.* John Hopkins University Press. Baltimore

Ulmer, G. (2005). in '*Seulemonde' Conversation with Gregory Ulmer.'* http://www.cas.usf.edu/journal/ulmer/ulmer.html. 2/10/07

Usher, R. & Edwards, R. (1998). Lost and found: 'cyberspace' and the (dis)location of teaching, learning and research'. In: *Papers from the 28th annual Standing Conference on University Teaching and Research in the Education of Adults. (SCUTREA) Conference.*

Vanetta, R. & Fordham, N. (2004). Teacher dispositions as predictors of classroom technology use*. Journal of Research on Technology in Education*. 36(3), 253-271.

Watson, D. (2003). *'Death Sentence: The decay of public language'* Knopf. Random House. Australia.

Willett, G. *'Global Communications: a modern myth?*
http://www.unisa.ac.za/dept/press/comca/212/willett.html Accessed 1/02/08.

Yates, L. (1990). *Theory/Practice Dilemma.* Deakin University Press. Geelong. Australia.