

2005

# Scientists, career choices and organisational change: managing human resources in cross-sector R&D organisations

T. Turpin

*University of Western Sydney*

Samuel Garrett-Jones

*University of Wollongong, sgarrett@uow.edu.au*

K. Diment

*University of Wollongong, kdiment@uow.edu.au*

---

## Publication Details

Turpin, T., Garrett-Jones, S. & Diment, K. (2005). Scientists, career choices and organisational change: managing human resources in cross-sector R&D organisations. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management*, 11 (2), 13-26. Copyright eContent Management Pty Ltd, 2005. The journal has had a title change in 2006 and is now called *The Journal of Management & Organization*.

---

# Scientists, career choices and organisational change: managing human resources in cross-sector R&D organisations

## **Abstract**

The resource-based view of the firm has drawn attention to the role of human resources in building innovative capacity within firms. In 'high technology' firms, scientific capability is a critical factor in achieving international competitiveness. Science, however, is a costly business and many firms are entering into cross-sector R&D partnerships in order to gain access to leading edge scientific capability. The Australian Cooperative Research Centres (CRC) program is typical of the ways many governments are seeking to promote such cross-sector R&D collaboration. Scientists are key resources in these organisational arrangements available about why and when scientists choose to work in these cross-sector organisations rather than others, or the impact of changing funding regimes on their career choices. Similarly, there has been little research into the impact of such partnerships and career choices on the organisations in which scientists work. This paper presents some findings from two new ARC funded studies in Australia designed to investigate the careers of scientists and the organisational and career implications of participation in cross-sector R&D collaboration. One of our findings is that CRCs may not endure as long term 'hybrid' organisational arrangements as some observers have suggested, but rather remain as transitional structure influencing the partners involved and the careers of scientists. This has important implications for the managers of CRCs as well as those responsible for partner organisations.

## **Disciplines**

Business | Social and Behavioral Sciences

## **Publication Details**

Turpin, T., Garrett-Jones, S. & Diment, K. (2005). Scientists, career choices and organisational change: managing human resources in cross-sector R&D organisations. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management*, 11 (2), 13-26. Copyright eContent Management Pty Ltd, 2005. The journal has had a title change in 2006 and is now called *The Journal of Management & Organization*.

|

**Scientists, Career Choices and Organisational Change:  
Managing Human Resources in Cross-sector  
R&D Organisations**

**Revised Paper Submitted for Potential Publication in JANZAM**

AUTHORS

Tim Turpin,

Australian Expert Group in Industry Studies (AEGIS)

University of Western Sydney

[t.turpin@uws.edu.au](mailto:t.turpin@uws.edu.au)

Sam Garrett-Jones and Kieren Diment

School of Management and Marketing

University of Wollongong

[sgarrett@uow.edu.au](mailto:sgarrett@uow.edu.au)

[kdiment@uow.edu.au](mailto:kdiment@uow.edu.au)

|

# **SCIENTISTS AND CAREER CHOICES: MANAGING HUMAN RESOURCES IN COOPERATIVE RESEARCH CENTRES**

## **ABSTRACT**

*The resource-based view of the firm has drawn attention to the role of human resources in building innovative capacity within firms. In 'high technology' firms, scientific capability is a critical factor in achieving international competitiveness. Science, however, is a costly business and many firms are entering into cross-sector R&D partnerships in order to gain access to leading edge scientific capability. The Australian Cooperative Research Centres (CRC) program is typical of the ways many governments are seeking to promote such cross-sector R&D collaboration. Scientists are key resources in these organisational arrangements. However, there is only fragmentary information available about why and when scientists choose to work in these cross-sector organisations rather than others, or the impact of changing funding regimes on their career choices. Similarly, there has been little research into the impact of such partnerships and career choices on the organisations in which scientists work. This paper presents some findings from two new ARC funded studies in Australia designed to investigate the careers of scientists and the organisational and career implications of participation in cross-sector R&D collaboration. One of our findings is that CRCs may not endure as long term 'hybrid' organisational arrangements as some observers have suggested, but rather remain as transitional structure influencing the partners involved and the careers of scientists. This has important implications for the managers of CRCs as well as those responsible for partner organisations.*

# **SCIENTISTS AND CAREER CHOICES: MANAGING HUMAN RESOURCES IN COOPERATIVE RESEARCH CENTRES**

## **INTRODUCTION**

One of the more pervasive features of national research policies in recent years has been the considerable amount of public funds directed toward national cross-sector research programs. Collaborative research programs have been one of the most stable and widely supported components of US research policy for at least three decades (Behrens and Gray, 2001, 179). In Australia, South Africa and Germany collaborative grants and block institutional grants have come to dominate research funding mechanisms (Van der Walt and Blankley 1999; Garrett-Jones and Turpin 2002). In some countries, such as Australia, collaborative research programs have become not only major components of the research system but also a major driving force in research policy debates.<sup>1</sup>

Research scientists in this context work in quite complex and often novel organisational arrangements that depend on cooperation between interdependent parties. The interests, objectives and strategies among the parties, however, may conflict or converge (see for example Jacob, 1997; Hellstrom and Jacob, 2000; Jacob et al, 2000; and Bun and Chung, 2003). Ambiguities or ambivalence associated with such cooperation can emerge between individuals as well as between organisations within the cross-sector cooperative arrangement. Managing such ambiguities can become a difficult but pressing task.

This article is concerned with the human resource aspects of this task. In particular, our focus is on the tensions and ambiguities that drive career expectations and choices of research scientists and the organisational tensions created by the different institutional objectives and expectations of the partner organisations. The analysis presented in this article draws primarily on data collected through a three year study in Australia concerned with organisational experiences in managing cross-sector R&D through the Cooperative Research Centres (CRC) program (Managing the Risks of Cross-Sector R&D Collaboration, Turpin, Garrett-Jones, Fulop and Couchman, 2002-04). Through this project data were

collected from university and public sector research centre managers and scientists about their experiences in managing science and careers in collaborative environments. The last stage of this project comprised a final survey of an additional sample of 370 practising scientists and research managers. This article presents an analysis of the qualitative data collected through the first two years of the project and the conceptual framework developed for the final component of the study. The analysis also draws on new data emerging from a second and parallel study focused more broadly on the careers experiences of a sample of 520 'research active' scientists working across public and private sectors in Australia. (Innovation Agents and Innovation Tracks, Marceau and Turpin, 2002-3).

One of the conclusions of this article is that the Cooperative Research Centres in Australia seem to have reached a critical stage in development. Structural tensions between institutional partners combined with the expectations and career choices of scientists are raising questions about long term management and sustainable cooperative arrangements. These can perhaps be resolved in the short-term, but in the longer term CRCs and institutional partners may need to implement quite different human resource management strategies.

## **A RESOURCE BASED VIEW OF CROSS-SECTOR RESEARCH COLLABORATION AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

The focus of strategic management literature has shifted recently from environmental (industry/market) determinants in the search for superior performance, to resource-based factors that reside *within* the firm (see Zhang 2004). The core claim of this 'resource based view' is that idiosyncratic internal resources/capabilities rather than industry structure are the determinant of superior firm performance. In particular, this view perceives the firm as a unique bundle of resources and capabilities heterogeneously distributed across firms (Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000; and Zhang 2004). Resources can be created within the firm and they may refer to tangible assets (such as technology and intellectual property) or intangible

assets (such as creative technical or scientific skills and knowledge). In a recent study by Zhang of over 3000 firms in China her findings clearly revealed that it is the way these resources are internally packaged (mixed and matched) rather than the strength of a particular resource that is significant (Zhang, 2004).

Although the resource-based view of the firm emphasises firm-specific capabilities, a specific capability depends on industry characteristics and expectations that determine the 'value' of the resource. For example, manufacturing capability is valuable in industrial sectors but it may not be so valuable for firms in service industries. Cross-sector R&D partnerships introduce a variety of characteristics and expectations. A common feature is the sharing of scientific expertise embedded in individuals and teams of researchers. However, as the data presented in this article reveals, the organisational context and the ways the scientists are *expected* to work creates ambiguities and tensions not just for the scientists themselves, but also for the partner organisations they work with. To the extent that scientists' outputs are considered as a shared resource their career choices carry some resource implications for all CRC partners, albeit some more than others. Managing these tensions within organisations requires an understanding of the career experiences and employment choices of scientists.

Through the 1980s a considerable body of literature emerged focusing on the management of professionals and highly specialised technical staff (see for example Badawy, 1982; Payne, 1987; and Allen and Katz, 1992). An enduring theme in this literature was the notion of the 'dual career path' which assumed major difference in career expectations and reward structures between scientific personnel and engineers. Building on the sociology of science literature the dual career path concept associated the engineers' occupational perspective with local and applied views of work and the scientists' perspective with a cosmopolitan peer oriented view of work. The assumption that followed was that these differing occupational perspectives would generate differing motivational responses in the workplace. The

implication is that managers in R&D organisations should differentiate between these two groups in their personnel practices (Keller 1997, 944). As the structural nature of research organisations, including universities and public research institutes became more complex through the 1990s the notion of the dual career perspective was expanded to take into account a more complex and diverse set of career options. Studies that followed took into account, for example, the different roles of research managers and corporate managers (Turpin and Deville, 1995) the perspectives of the project engineer (Allen and Katz, 1995) and the technical transfer specialist (Kim and Cha, 2000)

Scientists in this more complex context are also faced with a wide range of expectations, imperatives and choices. They are no longer driven simply by the creative demands of science (if indeed they ever were) but face a range of contemporary pressures from well outside the traditional realm of science (Bun and Chung, 2003). In cross-sector collaboration the question of divided loyalties has presented dilemmas for academic scientists wishing to communicate with peers elsewhere. In a 1997 survey of over 2000 life scientists 34 per cent reported being denied access to the research output of their academic peers (Washburn, 2005). In this context, private sector scientists seeking to build trust with their academic counterparts can be placed in a difficult position in managing conflicting interests and their expanding range of work place loyalties. From the resource based view of the firm it is important to know the underpinnings of these imperatives in order to match (or 'internally package', as Zhang has put it) this critical 'shared' scientific resource with other internal firm capabilities held by partner organisations. Cooperative research centres in Australia provide a unique opportunity to explore the way different organisational objectives and individual career expectations are being managed. While the study is concerned with a broader range of cross-sector R&D issues than is reported here, the findings carry some important issues for human resource management in university/industry cooperative research centres.

## THE AUSTRALIAN CRC PROGRAM: THE ORGANISATIONAL INTERFACE

The Cooperative Research Centres Program (CRC Program) represents the Australian Government's largest single investment in cross-sector (industry-university-government) R&D collaboration. The program was first established in 1990 and has the objective of building closer relationships between Australian science and industry. The program is primarily oriented toward industrial research and development across a range of sectors including agriculture, fisheries, forestry, information and communications, manufacturing, mining, energy, medicine, water services, transport and construction. However, the program also includes centres focused on public good outcomes including public and environmental health, sustainability and maintenance of biodiversity (Howard Partners, 2003).

A feature of the CRC program is that it requires the formation of *structured* and *managed* relationships between organisational partners, including universities, government agencies, research institutes and private firms. Management plans must be clearly developed and articulated in submissions for joint funding between the Commonwealth Government and the participating research partners.

Over its 14 year existence, the CRC Program has been exposed to several major reviews. The latest, carried out in 2003, argued that as the program has evolved three distinct types of CRC have emerged: those focused primarily on building national resource sustainability; those focused primarily on improving industry performance; and those leading to new business development and the commercialisation of intellectual property. The review team argued that with this evolution there is a need to position the program as a 'vehicle in which research is seen as a means to an end, not an end in itself.' (Howard Partners, 2003, iii). Their argument was based on their analysis that CRCs are, in practice, now limited in the extent to which they can improve the match between technology push and demand. Their recommendation was that CRCs must more effectively respond and adapt to the wider structural changes in the science and innovation system and the pathways between industries and technologies. This implies a greater emphasis on and consideration of the centres' management objectives and strategies.

Our analysis supports this view to some extent. We certainly agree that the program has reached a critical stage in development. However, we are cautious about making recommendations for change that carry implications for management approaches without a much clearer understanding of what currently motivates and drives the key component in Australian science - the researchers themselves. Our analysis of the experiences and opinions of Australian scientists and research managers, including those currently working in CRCs and their partner organisations, raises some important structural observations. One of the more significant of these is that CRCs are perhaps not evolving as long term organisational arrangements, but rather transitional structures serving the short-term interests of organisations as well as the careers of scientists.

Our finding is that scientists currently working in Australia face a complex set of imperatives and ambiguities concerning career choice. On the one hand, they seek to be at the leading edge of science. Many, but not all, are also seeking to be involved in the process of applying leading edge science to contemporary industrial and environmental problems. The CRC program has provided a 'front-end' focus for both of these activities. However, the nature of CRCs provides a considerable level of uncertainty in terms of research funding and consequently employment. There is thus a certain level of ambivalence with which scientists make career choices. The options appear to be: either taking on a risky but research intensive and exciting option; or retaining a safe but research limiting and more 'pedestrian' option. This ambiguity and its implications for human resource management need to be fully understood in considering the future of the program. The long-term strategic objectives of centres and the career aspirations of scientists need to be in some reasonable state of symmetry. This raises challenges for the managers of the program as a whole as well as managers at the CRCs interface between universities, industry and public research institutes.

### **ORGANISATIONAL TENSIONS: A COLLABORATIVE RISK**

There is growing evidence that CRC host institutions are quite deeply affected by their involvement in the CRC Program. It is widely credited with 'changing research cultures' and promoting increased and more effective cross-sector, multidisciplinary and multi-organisational research, technology

development and commercialisation (Roberts, 2004). The intrusion of commercial markets has placed different pressures on university research networks as their institutions adopt commercial business practices (Marginson, 1994). Some researchers have proposed that industry/university research collaboration in commercially oriented activities has the potential to confuse the university's central commitment to the pursuit of knowledge and learning generally (Coady, 2000). Others have suggested that a decline in basic research and associated secrecy commitments in industry collaboration may undermine the innovation process (Feller, 1997). Slaughter and Leslie (1997) in describing university change adopt the term 'academic capitalism', because it captures the inherent clash in cultures and value systems. They note that since the 1980s, globalisation has accelerated movement toward the market. These are deep-seated changes, they argue, '...where professional work began to be patterned differently, *in kind* rather than in degree' (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997, 5). Ziman (1994) has proposed that the structural nature of these changes are such that it now makes sense to refer to 'post-academic science'. Others have argued that the changes are so profound that they represent a new mode of knowledge production (Gibbons *et al*, 1994). Alternatively, Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (1997) have theorised that negotiated alliances between universities, governments and industry have led to what they describe as a 'triple helix' of knowledge production. Underlying all these perspectives is the recognition that relationships between academic disciplines, universities and industry are undergoing radical transformation. What does this mean for the scientists and postgraduate research students who work at this interface? In all this theorising little attention has been paid to what such changes mean for the careers of scientists or to the ways that scientists themselves might be contributing to the 'reorganisation' of science.

Behrens and Gray have considered the organisational *cost* of cooperative arrangements (Behrens and Gray 1999, 180). They have been concerned to document *unintended* consequences of collaboration through changes in social process. They have collected empirical data to assess the impact of university – industry collaboration on graduate training. One of the more difficult concepts they seek to bring to the fore is *organisational climate*. In particular, they are concerned with questions such as *how* and *under what circumstances* the organisational climate has changed and

whether or not this has led to intended or unintended outcomes.

Recent work by Bozeman and colleagues suggest that a wide range of factors determine satisfactory outcomes for partners. They point out that it is not the act of technical partnership that should be considered effective or otherwise, but rather the technical strategy that underlies the partnership. This turns the focus onto business and organisational strategies and the effective management of human resources (Bozeman and Wittmer, 2001). Yet how, to what extent, and in what areas scientists have contributed to organisational change, or how organisational change has influenced scientists' career opportunities has been very much under-researched (Bozeman and Wittmer, 2001; Garrett-Jones and Turpin, 2002). Bozeman's team has tracked the careers of scientists in American academic research centres by collecting and analysing scientists' curriculum vitae (CV). Their work has served to draw attention to the role of research grants and the evolution of scientific and technical fields (Bozeman, Dietz and Gaughan, 2001) and the role of gender in scientific research (Corley, Bozeman and Gaughan, 2003) in generating 'S&T human capital' and influencing career mobility. Their CV methodology, although useful for tracking mobility, does not answer the question of *why* people choose to move nor how they experience the changing environment in which they work. Similarly, Laudel's use of bibliometrics (Laudel, 2003) to explore patterns of international mobility in highly specialised fields of science is valuable for documenting patterns of career movement but the questions of *why* they move or stay and the impact of prevailing national science policies on such decisions remain unanswered.

A recent study of European women scientists, drawing on qualitative interviews, has revealed some interesting insights into the role of partners' international career choices in disrupting the formation and development of scientific networks and thus adversely impacting on their career options (Ackers, 2004). According to Ackers, this is effectively placing them in a '...trailing secondary labour-market' (Ackers, 204, 199). With the institutional growth of various forms of cross-sector R&D collaboration all of the above issues become all the more complex. Our concern in this article is to investigate these issues and explore the structural tensions between organisational and human resource management in the context of the Australian CRC Program. Later in the article, drawing on our study of CRCs, we

sketch out a typology of ‘risk factors’ likely to steer career choices of scientists engaged with cross-sector collaboration.

## METHODOLOGY

The analysis that follows was based on two studies. The prime source of data was an Australian Research Council funded project, ‘Managing the Risks of Cross-sector R&D Collaboration.’ The project had two field-work phases. The first phase comprised a series of 65 in-depth interviews with senior managers and researchers working across a sample of CRCs as well as senior managers in host institutions. A separate interview instrument was used for university managers, CRC managers and researchers built around a common set of questions concerning cross-sector collaboration. Interviews were recorded (unless requested otherwise by respondent), transcribed and entered into an ethnographic data base. The data base provided the basis for a classification of cross-sector management issues, and associated ‘risks’ encountered by CRC research and management personnel. A second field-work phase, involving a written survey, was based on the analysis of phase one and a complementary study described below.

The second and complementary study on which this paper draws is the Australian Scientists Survey (2004) carried out in 2003. In this project a sample of 2,400 publishing scientists from Australian institutions was drawn from the ISI Web of Science data base. An on-line survey instrument was constructed drawing on previous work of Sommer in New Zealand and the US (2000) and Bozeman *et al.* at the Georgia Institute of Technology in the US (2001). The survey yielded 520 fully completed questionnaires. The major objective of the survey was to track the career paths of scientists and identify the nature, extent and mechanisms of contributions to innovation in Australia. In the latter section of this article we report on two aspects of the data collected from scientists through that survey: their reasons for changing jobs; and their perceptions about contemporary science issues and the role of science, government and society in their on-going research activities.<sup>2</sup> The purpose of drawing on this separate data set was to gain some further insights into scientists’ career trajectories and to establish some preliminary hypotheses for the final stage of the first study.

## A TYPOLOGY OF RISK AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES FOR CRCs

Decisions about career change generally require some trade-offs between potential costs and benefits. Some level of risk is encountered in making such choices. The management and organisational studies literature has generally tended to focus on four types of risk: 'strategic risk'; 'financial risk'; 'managerial decision making risk'; and 'project management risk' (Baird and Thomas, 1985; McNamara and Bromley, 1999). Our recent interviews with research managers in CRCs and senior managers in institutional partner organisations suggest that within CRCs scientists encounter three distinct types of career risk. We have categorised these as academic risk, scientific risk and organisational risk.

### **Academic Risk**

Academic risk concerns the risk experienced by researchers in their role as academic employees. Opportunities for career advance and mobility are subject to what we define here as 'academic risk'.<sup>3</sup> As Ziman pointed out quite some time ago, in academic markets only a small proportion of the competent researchers in a particular field will contribute to real progress in the field (Ziman, 1994). The risk that academics take in joining different research groups or networks is whether they will be in a collective position to be part of that small proportion. However, there are clearly perceived career advantages for new or young researchers.

As one Head of School put it to us:

The CRCs are a mechanism to draw people and success together and win funding, especially for younger researchers allowing them to get up and running (Interview, 2003).

Other respondents noted longer term career benefits: ... 'out of the CRC it can be a somewhat lonely place. The CRC offers a collaborative culture between student and other partners – an encounter with the real world' (Interview, 2003). Another respondent drew attention to the opportunities within CRCs for researchers to share in the commercialisation of IPR.

The rub for the researcher in a university was that the institution controlled the share of IP and a relatively smaller portion would go to the researcher as an academic and still less to a student. In the CRC the Board makes these decisions (Interview CRC CEO, 2003).

Consistently, CRC respondents drew attention to the value of teams and networks of partners that offer opportunities for researchers to extend their careers. But while there are clearly career benefits in the CRC structure there are also disadvantages associated with the short-term nature of funding. There is always the potential for contracts to draw to a close leaving some researchers to take up alternative positions offering little in terms of future career advancement. Others drew attention to the risk that long-term involvement with CRCs can leave scientists with a narrower focus: 'A focus on specific products can lead to narrowing down in the framing of objectives. It is a progressive exercise – with risk' (Interview Head of School, 2003).

### **Scientific Risk**

We use the term scientific risk to refer to the risk of change in the disciplinary structure of research and the organisational domains within which the disciplines are variably located. The issue of interdisciplinarity and implications for disciplinary boundaries has been widely discussed elsewhere (Weingart and Stehr, 2000). Our use of the term here is to draw attention to the struggles within university structures around disciplinary boundaries and the way these are managed within the university (Turpin, 1999). The risk of supporting a new and different set of research values and norms is that they may come to dominate existing academic values and expectations. As a consequence the objectives and focus of research and the ways it is judged may change in intended or unintended ways.

In the CRC context a number of respondents from Departments and Schools complained that many of their best researchers had little time left to contribute to Faculty directions. 'The result is an erosion of a department' (Interview, 2003). This was described by another respondent as a 'hollowing-out' of research expertise, especially with an exodus of doctoral students to other CRC locations. On the other hand one CRC CEO drew attention to what she described as a loss of intellectual edge among some new researchers, '...once they enter CRCs some post doctoral researchers become somewhat

lethargic'. As another respondent put it, '... there is a danger of their narrowing down in focus'. Thus while some respondents described CRCs as exciting and stimulating team based environments, others were concerned about researchers' potential loss of impetus and research breadth. In the concluding sections of this paper we return to these sorts of ambiguities. In career terms, just as there are costs and benefits there are also potential winners and losers.

### **Organisational Risk**

Organisational risk refers to the potential shift in organisational boundaries occurring through the collaborative research process. There is an organisational risk that certain strategic actions might introduce unintended and adverse consequences and that these disturb the organisation's internal environment, performance and goals. These boundary movements can be positive or negative depending on one's point of reference. If the risk is obvious then organisations can adopt risk management policies. Indeed most organisation, including universities, do this. However, our concern is more with risk from collaborative arrangements that are unknown or at least poorly understood.

From an organisational studies perspective Nooteboom (2000) has identified three important risks that universities confront. There is the possibility that research networks can become so tight and exclusionary that they might create inertia. Second, they need to build trust in two areas: competence and intention. Failure in one or the other will severely undermine future collaboration. There are also external conditions at work such as the over-arching regulatory framework as well as partners' management capacity. Thus organisational risk concerns the tension at the interface between the structure of networks and the structure of organisations in which they are embedded. While organisations clearly condition the formation of networks, once formed, there is the potential for reciprocal influence.

In the Australian CRC context there is growing evidence of a struggle over maximising 'value' among organisational participants.

Who goes into the CRCs is important – key individuals *jump ship*. In the middle is the Department head who is pushed and pulled by the university management and by the researcher. It's probably better to have the research 100 per cent in the centre rather than a

50-50 arrangement (Interview with CRC CEO, 2003).

And from another point of view, this time a deputy Vice Chancellor, the tension is to be able to maximise the institution's derived value while minimising the cost.

The problem for universities is how to best win value from such combinations of industry and universities. ...Our Dean is now looking closely at the value of participating in any CRC for the dollar returns. So too are the heads of five departments. It is about control to win value - value in terms of the impact of outcomes on the faculties as against the university's overall points for successful participation (Interview, 2003).

These tensions and risks have been documented in various ways elsewhere (see Illing, 2004). Our analysis over the past three years suggests that in many cases the tensions are increasing to the point where participants are making serious assessments about whether to remain in the partnerships. Australia's largest research institution, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), one of the major CRC participants, has already made strategic decisions to reduce their level of involvement in many CRCs. University Pro-Vice Chancellors are becoming increasingly vocal and proactive in terms of strategic action to win value. Some universities have already showed signs of withdrawing from CRCs unless they can identify greater value returns for *their institution* overall. A number of PVCs responsible for research have recently been quoted as indicating their possible withdrawal or at least 'reconsidering' their involvement in CRCs (Illing, 2004). This seems to suggest that the potential of CRCs to emerge as an enduring 'hybrid' form of organisation may already have reached its limit.

It is in this context that we are concerned to know how these tensions impact on the careers of scientists. How do scientists respond to these ambiguities and tensions? When they make choices to leave a university department to join a CRC, whether on secondment or on a contract appointment, what are their expectations? What are their views about the science policy that is steering the availability of options? What are the constraints they experience? These are all important questions for managers and policy makers concerned with cross-sector organisational arrangements.

In the following section we draw on data collected through the second study reported in this article,

‘Innovation Agents and Innovation Tracks’. The data emerging from this study offers some insights into why scientists are making some of their career choices and suggest some human resource management issues within CRCs.

## **SCIENTISTS’ CAREERS: RESEARCH OR JOB SECURITY – A DILEMMA.**

### **Changes in Research Activity**

Data drawn from the survey of scientists show a very clear erosion of time allocated directly to research activity as they progress through successive jobs. As Figure 1 shows, respondents’ average time spent on research in their first job was just under 70 per cent. However, with each successive job this proportion reduces progressively to barely 30 per cent by the sixth job. Significantly, in all current jobs the proportion of time spent on research is still only 46 per cent (including those still in their first job). Obvious explanations for this erosion of research activity includes increased teaching commitments for academic staff and increased management or administrative responsibilities as scientists progress to more senior positions. To some extent this is also, but not entirely, a factor of age.

For respondents currently working in CRCs there is clearly more time available to devote to research. This group of respondents report contributing an average of 61 per cent of their time to research. In the light of comments from CRC managers this is largely a factor of the greater distinction placed on research and management activities and responsibilities in CRCs. In universities, by contrast, administrative, reporting and management tasks are increasingly being pushed down the line to individual academics. The sharper distinction between management and research responsibilities in CRCs presents a more clearly defined ‘dual ladder’ career path for researchers (see Chaterji, 1993) or variations on that trajectory (Turpin and Deville, 1995). On this basis scientists in CRCs are better placed to identify clearer options toward alternative career pathways. As we discuss below, the perspectives and opinions of CRC respondents concerning science and its management suggest a more positive approach to career options.

---

---

Figure 1 About Here

---

### **Reasons for Changing Jobs**

Respondents were all asked to nominate their reason for changing jobs. They selected from within one or more major categories: 'science reasons'; 'employment reasons'; or 'other reasons'. The most frequently nominated category was opportunities for improving general employment conditions (90.0 per cent), particularly improved salary and promotional opportunities. Almost all CRC respondents identified an employment reason as their prime reason for changing jobs. The second most common reason for job change concerned scientific related reasons (80.7 per cent), particularly greater research autonomy, and access to better research infrastructure. Other reasons were nominated by 63.2 per cent of respondents, mainly family reasons and geographic location (37 per cent and 22 per cent respectively). The range of responses to 'other reasons' supports the view of Bun and Chung (2003) and Ackers (2004) that external factors are important for scientists just as they are with other employees.

### **Perceptions of Science and Society**

All respondents were asked to indicate what they considered to be the most pressing issues facing scientist today. The major issue that emerged was an overwhelming concern about funding. Eighty four per cent nominated access to longer term research funding as the most pressing issue. Thirty seven per cent identified an emphasis on applied funding over basic research as the major issue. The third strongest issue concerned a lack of public understanding of S&T (34 per cent).

For the present paper we are interested to contrast the responses of Australian scientists overall with a smaller sub-group of scientists working in CRCs. Because the CRC group was very small compared to the overall group it is not appropriate to look for meaningful statistical differences between the two groups. Rather, we have used the two contrasting samples to reveal potential differences that we can

explore further with a larger sample of CRC scientists. In contrast to the overall sample the CRC respondents were less concerned with access to infrastructure and equipment' but more concerned with 'research ownership' issues and the 'controversial nature of cutting edge science'. The authors have completed a follow-up survey of 370 CRC scientists and managers that examines in more detail CRC scientists' perceptions around some of these issues. This allows for further investigation into how the provision of additional research facilities, administrative and project management support, influence scientists' career choices. It also allows for further elaboration on the extent to which cross-institutional tensions result from participation in the CRC Program and how the different aims of the participant organisations, and the changes in bureaucratic regime brought on by formal cross-sector collaboration mediate career choices. The data presented in this paper has served to provide a conceptual framework sufficient to guide that subsequent data collection and analysis.

Respondents to the research scientists survey were asked to indicate their agreement, or otherwise, along a five point scale, with a set of 25 statements concerning science, government and society. These items have been replicated and adapted from earlier work carried out by Sommer in New Zealand and provide a useful point for international comparison.

The results shown in Table 1 show the proportions agreeing or agreeing strongly to each statement as well as the mean scores for 'all respondents' and the 'CRC respondents'. The scoring for each item is based on a score of 1 for strongly agree through to a score of 5 for strongly disagree. This is an ordinal scale with the lowest score indicating strongest agreement and the highest indicating strongest disagreement.

Although a comparatively small number of CRC respondents was included in the analysis they are nevertheless indicative and reflect some consistent differences in opinion from the broader sample. These distinctions, although based on small numbers, are entirely consistent with many of the observations noted by research managers and reported in the previous sections, drawn from a separate study. Overall the CRC respondents present a more positive attitude to contemporary science policy and directions (items 5, 9, 21, 25), and a more integrated perspective of science and society (items 1,

3, 4, 8) a more positive response to their current research position and environment (items 13, 18, 19) *but* also a considerably higher level of concern about job security over the next five years (item 17). In the concluding section of the paper we discuss this apparent ambiguity and some of the policy and management implications that follow.

---

Table 1 About Here

---

### **COOPERATIVE RESEARCH CENTRES - A STAGING POST OR CORRAL?**

Our analysis of scientists' and research managers' responses to contemporary science and science policy issues leads us to propose that CRCs provide an opportunity for scientists to escape the management and administrative burden in their traditional organisational arrangements to spend more time on research (especially collaborative research) in CRC types of organisation. The CRCs offer well funded but more short-term employment opportunities compared to tenured existence at universities or research institutions). Scientists seeking to leave a departmental structure to accept a CRC position or 'jump', as one university manager put it, appear to be making a trade-off: accepting limited term employment security for a more research intensive option with closer links to 'research-users'. It is not surprising that there is congruence between the concerns of some department heads that their research is being 'hollowed-out by the CRCs' recruitment of many of their top research staff and students' and the level of satisfaction expressed by scientists who have made the 'jump'.

The distinction between concerns about the capacity of tertiary education to provide an environment conducive to scientific research (low on all accounts but particularly for those not at CRCs) and the endorsement of CRCs (particularly for those at CRCs) as being beneficial for respondents' research, suggest the sharp edge of organisational change.

To some extent CRCs are viewed, from a policy perspective, as agents of change to facilitate 'appropriate' responses among universities. There has been much debate in this context about whether new of 'hybrid' organisational structures are emerging and if so what this means for science. We are

more concerned to know what this means for scientists and research managers responsible for the organisations in which they work.

From our analysis, at this stage, we suggest that CRCs are serving as ‘stepping-off’ points for many new (and older) research staff seeking a more research-intensive career than they enjoyed in previous organisational environments. Their opportunities for long-term employment in the new context, however, are limited.<sup>4</sup> So long as the centres serve as a staging post for further career choices, the longer term prospects for the organisation are perhaps not so important. On the other hand if research careers in CRCs continue in the long-term there is always the potential to become *corralled* by the short-term objectives driven by short term funding.

From a policy point of view it will remain important to monitor the impact of CRCs on the careers and mobility of research staff, including doctoral students and post doctoral research fellows. So far, there is little evidence that this is seen as a serious item to monitor in evaluation mechanisms. Scientists are clearly a key resource for CRCs, influencing their capacity to deliver social and economic returns from public and private investments. A resource based view of CRCs brings this factor to the fore in evaluation and management processes.

A further point worth noting is that lifestyle choices were clearly important factors in the career decisions made by scientists, but so too were scientific and general employment conditions. It would appear that when these coincide there is a very strong imperative for scientists to choose to ‘jump’ ship’. This has important implications for managers across all participant organisations because they are in a position to set in place creative mechanisms to reduce the sorts of tensions described earlier in this paper.

One way to resolve some of the tensions between CRCs’ constituent partners would be to introduce greater flexibility into the career options for scientists as they choose between working in different sectors or in cross-sector arrangements such as CRCs. Employment in CRCs appears to offer limited long term opportunities but considerable short-term attractions. Flexible and creative recruitment policies such as increased opportunities for secondments across sectors and institutions or joint appointments offer a range of options for resolving some of the tensions.

|

Two options seem to appear for policy makers. The first is to seek to develop more flexibility in the system to enable scientists to move more freely across private, university and public sectors, while the second is to further strengthen the CRC program as a longer-term hybrid organisation. Given the growing concerns expressed by university and research institution managers and their caution toward extending investments in CRCs this latter approach will carry significant challenges for current funding arrangements. The greater national and scientific benefit is likely to accrue when CRCs can ebb and flow in their objectives and strategies as demand and funding opportunities permit but at the same time serve as a staging post for scientists through a variety of stages in their scientific careers.

DRAFT

## REFERENCES

- Ackers, Louise (2004) Managing relationships in peripatetic careers: Scientific mobility in the European Union', *Women's Studies International Forum*, **27**: 189-201.
- Allen, J.T. and R. Katz (1992) 'Age, Education and the Technical Ladder', *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, **39**(3) 237-245.
- Badawy, M (1982) Developing managerial Skills in engineers and scientists, New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Baird, I. and Thomas, H. (1985) 'Towards a contingency model of strategic risk taking,' *Academy of Management Review*, 10:230-243.
- Behrens, Teresa R. and Denis O. Gray, (1999) 'Unintended consequences of cooperative research: impact of industry sponsorship on climate for academic freedom and other graduate student outcome', *Research Policy*, 30, pp. 179-199.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1988) *Homo Academicus*, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Bozeman, Barry and Dennis Wittmer (2001) 'Technical roles and success of US federal laboratory-industry partnerships, *Science and Public Policy*, Vol. 28, No. 4, June 2001, pp 169-178.
- Bozeman, Barry, James Dietz and Monica Gaughan (2001) 'Scientific and technical human capital: an alternative model for evaluation,' *International Journal of Technology management*, **22**: (7/8) 716-740.
- Bun, Chan Kwok and Ko Yiu Chung, (2003) 'Science's Workings and Scientists' Work', *Asian Journal of Social Science*, **31**(2): 271-285.
- Chaterji, D. (1993) 'Emerging Challenges for R&D executives – an American perspective' *R&D Management*, Vol. 23, No. 3, 239-47.
- Coady, Tony, (2000). *Why Universities Matter*, Tony Coady, (ed.) Allen and Unwin, Melbourne.
- Coombs, J. G. and Ketchen, JR. D. J. (1999). 'Explaining inter-firm cooperation and performance: Toward a reconciliation of predictions from the resource-based view and organizational economics', *Strategic Management Journal*, **20**: 867-888.

- Corley, E., Bozeman, B. and M. Gaughan (2003) 'Evaluating the impacts of grants on women scientists' careers: the curriculum vitae as a tool for research assessment', Philip Shapira and Stefan Kuhlmann (eds), *Learning from Science and Technology Policy Evaluation: Experiences from the United States and Europe*, Edward Elgar, Massachusetts.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. and Martin, J. A. (2000). 'Dynamic capabilities: what are they?', *Strategic Management Journal*, **21**: 1105-1121.
- Etzkowitz, Henry and Loet Leydesdorff (eds.), (1997), *Universities in the Global Knowledge Economy: A Triple Helix of Academic-Industry-Government Relations*. London: Cassell.
- Feller, I (1997) 'Technology Transfer from Universities' in J.C. Smart (Ed.) *Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research*, Agathon Press, New York.
- Garrett-Jones, Sam and Tim Turpin.(2002) *Measuring the Outcomes of the CRC Program: A Framework - Final Report*. Dept. of Education, Science and Training, May 2002. [http://www.crc.gov.au/Docs/pdf/Outcomes\\_Study\\_text.pdf](http://www.crc.gov.au/Docs/pdf/Outcomes_Study_text.pdf)
- Gibbons, Michael, Camille Limoges, Helga Nowotny, Simon Schwartzman, Peter Scott and Martin Trow, (1994). *The New production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*, London: Sage.
- Hellstrom, Tomas and Merle Jacob (2000), 'Emerging Issues in R&D Evaluation: The Case of University-Industry Partnership Networks, in Merle Jacob and Tomas Hellstrom (Eds.) *The Future of Knowledge Production in the Academy*, The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, pp. 95-105.
- Hill, Stephen and Tim Turpin, (1995) 'Cultures in Collision: The Changing Face of Academic Research Cultures, in Marilyn Strathern (ed.), *The Uses of Knowledge: Global and Local Relations. The Reshaping of Anthropology, Volume 1 - Shifting Contexts*, London, Routledge.
- Howard Partners, (2003) *Evaluation of the Cooperative Research Centres Programme*, Department of Education, Science and Training, Canberra.
- Illing, Dorothy, (2004) 'Unis buck at rising project dollars', *The Australian*, Higher Education Supplement, 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004.

- Jacob, Merle (1997) 'Life in the Triple Helix: The Contract Researcher, The Contract Researcher, the University and the Knowledge Society', *Science Studies*, **10**(2): 35-49.
- Jacob, Merle, Thomas Hellstrom, Niclas Adler and Flemming Norrgren, (2000) 'From sponsorship to partnership in academy-industry relations' *R&D Management* **30** (3): 255 – 262.
- Kim Youngbae and Jongseok Cha (2000) 'Career orientations of R&D Professionals in Korea' *R&D Management*, 30 (2): 121-137.
- Laudel, Grit (2003) 'Studying the brain drain: Can bibliometric methods help?', *Scientometrics*, **57**: (2) 215-237.
- Marceau Jane, Tim Turpin and Richard Woolley, 'Innovation Agents and Innovation Tracks: The Place of Research Scientists in The Australian National System of Innovation', paper presented at the DRUID Summer Conference 2004 on Industrial Dynamics, Innovation and Development, Elsinore, Denmark, June 14-16, 2004 available at [www.druid.dk](http://www.druid.dk).
- Marginson, Simon (1994) 'Markets in Higher Education: Australia', in J. Smyth (ed.), *Academic Work*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- McNamara, G. and Bromley, P. (1999) 'Risk and return in organisational decision making,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 42:330-339
- Nooteboom, Bart (2000) 'Institutions and Forms of Co-ordination in Innovation Systems,' *Organizational Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 5, pp. 915-939.
- Nowotny, H. Scott, P. and Gibbons, M. (2001) *Re-thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an age of Uncertainty*, Polity, London.
- Payne, R. (1987) 'Individual difference and performance amongst R&D professionals : Some implications for management development,' *R&D Management* **17** (3) 153-161.
- Roberts, Peter (2004) 'It's the end of an era for CRC influence', *Australian Financial Review*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Feb 2004.
- Rogers Juan D., (2001) 'Software's "Functional Coding" and Personnel Mobility in Technology Transfer: Linkage Fields between Industry and Publicly Funded Research', Research Paper, School of Public Policy, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta.

- Slaughter, Shiela and Larry L. Leslie, (1997), *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sommer, Jack (2000) 'Year 2000 Survey of Scientists: report of Results, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, NC, Project Report, 2000.
- Turpin, Tim, and Adrian Deville, (1995) 'Occupational Roles and Expectations of research scientists and research managers in scientific research institutions', *R&D Management*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 141-157.
- Turpin Tim (1999) 'Managing the Boundaries of Collaborative Research: a contribution from cultural theory', *International Journal of Technology management*, 18 (3) pp. 232-245.
- Van der Walt, Tjaart and William Blankley (1999) 'South African strategies for the promotion of research and technology innovation: Towards effective collaboration and new business development', *Industry and Higher Education*, February 1999.
- Washburn, Jennifer (2005) 'Selling out: shouldn't we be pleased that universities are increasingly business minded? Far from it. *New Scientist*, **185** (2486) 19-20.
- Weingart, Peter, and Nico Stehr (eds.) (2000) *Practising Interdisciplinarity* University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Zhang, Jing (2004) *The Impact Of Innovation Capabilities On Firm Performance: An Empirical Study On Industrial Firms In China's Transitional Economy*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Wollongong.
- Ziman, John (1994) *Prometheus Bound: Science in a dynamic steady state*, Cambridge University Press.
- Ziman, John (1996) "'Postacademic Science'": Constructing Knowledge with Networks and Norms' *Science Studies*, 1.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We wish to acknowledge the Australia Research Council for providing two Discovery grants to support the research on which this paper is based and our colleagues Professor Jane Marceau and Dr Richard Woolley from

|


the University of Western Sydney, Professor Liz Fulop from Griffith University and Associate Professor Paul Couchman from the University of Wollongong. We also wish to acknowledge the helpful comments received from two anonymous reviewers.

DRAFT

|

FIGURE 1:

The Decline of Research Compared to Other Activities Through Career Progression



Source: Scientists Survey 2004

TABLE 1:

## Science, Values, Government and Society

Science issue	ALL n=515	CRC n=18
	% agree or agree strongly	
1. Prior to conducting scientific or engineering R&D or developing new products, I always consider the potential uses of such work.	64	88
2. I think that the development of potentially dangerous technology should be decided primarily within the scientific and engineering community	16	24
3. I think the implementation of potentially dangerous technology should depend primarily on citizen input through voting processes and public debate.	36	53
4. I believe the pursuit of scientific knowledge transcends national concerns	51	47
5. The proper role of government with regard to the funding of science is to define broadly what should be investigated, thereby providing scientists with a research agenda	20	53
6. When government sets research agendas, it is responding more to political priorities than it is to potential for scientific advance	86	88
7. When taxpayers fund basic/fundamental research, their government representatives cannot require a specific payoff because no scientist can guarantee a result in advance of doing research	84	75
8. The public can be trusted to make good decisions on science-related issues	8	12
9. All things considered, government science policy is headed in the right direction	11	6
10. From what I know of scientific discovery, it is more a result of insight and circumstance than it is of application of a standard methodological treatment of a subject area	60	53
11. Most of the really interesting research questions today require expensive state-of-the-art scientific equipment to answer them	26	18
12. In my professional capacity, I feel responsible first to science and the creation of new knowledge or products and then to the concerns of citizens	31	18
13. My access to equipment, facilities and other scientific research supplies has improved over the past two years	42	41
14. During the past two years, I have participated in or directly witnessed an effective collaboration between social scientists and physical scientists	27	41
15. During the past two years, I have participated in or directly witnessed an effective collaboration between industry-based and university-based research scientists	67	65
16. The way things are going with scientific and engineering careers in Australia today, I would recommend such careers to Australian youth	67	65
17. I feel that my job is reasonably secure for the next five years	47	6
18. During the past two years, my job satisfaction has risen	34	47
19. The introduction of the CRC program has been beneficial for research in my field	33	82
20. I am able freely to submit my research results for publication	84	77
21. The management systems now in place are appropriate for the effective advancement of collaborative research	26	59
22. My freedom to collaborate with scientists outside my own institution has remained satisfactory or increased over the past two years.	71	77
23. Changes in the organisation of tertiary education over the years have created or are creating a better environment for scientific research	6	12
24. Block funding for public sector research institutions is essential for the long-term relevance of their work in Australia	63	50
25. All things considered, science in Australia is headed in the right direction.	16	35

Source: Scientists Survey 2004

|

---

<sup>1</sup> The CRC Association now holds annual meetings that are widely attended by senior policy advisors, among others, and focus on key national and international research policy debates.

<sup>2</sup> Following Sommer (2000), perceptions about science, society and government are important in understanding scientists' career expectations because they help capture the nuances about the potential divided loyalties discussed in much of the literature concerning scientists' role in society.

<sup>3</sup> Our use of the term draws on Ziman (1994) and Bourdieu (1989) although we use the term somewhat differently here.

<sup>4</sup> We use the term 'employment' here to cover both scientists who are either formally employed by the CRC itself or working with the CRC under some form of secondment from their employer organisation.

DRAFT