AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE STAFF'S PERCEPTION
OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT AT UNIVERSITAS TERBUKA

By

BOEDHI OETOYO

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to investigate the involvement of academics in staff development programs at Universitas Terbuka (UT), to investigate the factors that delayed the career advancement of academics at UT, to investigate the types of staff development programs that are needed at UT, to investigate the differences in opportunities to be involved in academic activities between academics who work in the faculties and those who work in other units, and to investigate the relationship between the opportunities of academics to be involved in academic activities and their academic position/faculty rank.

These issues were addressed by administering a questionnaire to all 233 junior academic staff both of UT Jakarta and of UT regional centers throughout Indonesia. The response rate was 67.4% (n157).

The results of this study indicated that academics' involvement in academic activities at UT was a critical problem. About 60% of the respondents had never attended, never been invited, or never been assigned to academic activities related to credit point attainment.

Work overloads and, more crucially, the rarity of academic activities were the factors which caused the academics to miss the opportunities to be involved in the programs. Similarly, more than 70% of the respondents stated that academic activities for staff development at UT were inadequate. The majority of the respondents suggested that the best staff development system for UT would be "coordinated by each faculty". Respondents also stated that "Conducting Research", "Writing Test Items", and "Writing Modules" were the activities that were considered most necessary to improve academics' knowledge, skills, and qualifications. It was felt that these activities would also help the academics to attain the credit points necessary to meet the criteria for promotion.

The results of this study also indicated that there were significant differences in the academics' involvement in academic activities between staff who work in the faculties and those who work in other units outside the faculties. The results also showed that there was a positively significant relationship between academic position and academic activities, and a moderately significant relationship between academic position and years of experience.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

The main responsibilities of academics in higher education are teaching at the post secondary level, conducting research, and carrying out community services (Armour, Caffarella, Fuhrmann, and Wergin, 1987). In addition to the main responsibilities, academics in higher education, according to Siaciwena (1989), must also involve in academic activities concerning their professional development and career advancement. With regard to career advancement, promotion criteria must be based on activities related to teaching and learning, research, and community service. This study is intended to investigate academic involvement in academic activities existing at the Universitas Terbuka (UT).

Universitas Terbuka (The Open Learning University of Indonesia), established in 1984, is the 45th state university in Indonesia. UT was founded by the government to carry out four missions. The first mission is to expand higher education opportunities for high school graduates of all ages. The second mission is to produce experts for various levels of national development. The third mission is to improve the competence of teachers. The last mission is to support national development by producing skilled manpower (Universitas Terbuka, 1989).

UT can be considered an innovation in the educational system in Indonesia. Unlike conventional universities, UT delivers its teaching-learning process through a distance learning system. In this system, teachers do not directly meet with the students, instead, the students study through printed learning materials, called modules, and other learning media, such as audio and video aids. Thus, the teaching activity focuses on facilitating learning (Beaudoin, 1990).

Given the nature both of its students and its distance learning system, UT requires an organizational setting which is different from conventional universities. However, UT was established within a very short period of preparation due to the urgency of the country's need to provide higher education opportunities for its people. Thus, UT's organizational structure and policies were based on the same regulations which were applied to other conventional higher educational institutions. To support its mission, however, UT requires a different organizational structure in which the administrative staff also play key roles as the operating core which determines the success of UT in carrying out its mission, such as students registration, distribution of course materials, or exam processing. On the other hand, according to Mintzberg (1979), the members of the operating core in conventional universities are the professionals, the academics. In this case, the members of the operating core at UT are the academics who have to carry out the academic duties and who actually do the administrative work as well.

As in other universities, UT has two kinds of professional: faculty or academic staff, and administrative staff. The main responsibilities of the academics are to provide service and expertise in instructional media, to develop course and exam materials, and to conduct research. Administrative staff, on the other hand, are responsible for general administration, student registration, course materials distribution, and exam administration. However, the actual work of the academics also involves

considerable amount of administrative work. Thus, many of academic staff at UT are not only placed at the faculty level, but also placed at the other units outside the faculty. For example, faculty staff or academics may work in the Examination Processing Centre, in the Centre for Research and Service to the Community, and in other work divisions outside the faculty (The organizational structure of UT is presented in Appendix A).

The policy of "academic placement" is based on Act Number 2, 1989 on the National Educational System and the Operational Regulations (Indonesia Ministry of Education and Culture, 1990). According to the Act, there are two kinds of academics: teachers and educational staff. Teachers are those whose main functions are to teach. The educational staff, other than teachers, conduct activities other than teaching, such as acting as researchers, educational program developers, librarians, and laboratory instructors. The promotion requirements for these two kinds of academics are different. Although UT employs a distance learning system in which the main function of all academics does not include teaching, the institution, however, has adopted the promotion regulations for teachers.

Academic activities at UT are different from those at conventional universities where academics mostly teach classes or do research. in Indonesia, faculty members have their main duties and responsibilities in three areas, teaching and learning, research, and community services. These three responsibilities are known as "Tri Dharma Perguruan Tinggi" ("The Three Basic Functions of Higher Education") (Indonesia Ministry of Education and Culture, 1990).

According to the Document of Promotion Criteria at UT (UT, 1989), activities which are considered to be 'teaching and learning, research, and community services' are as follows:

a. Teaching and learning activities
1) achieving degree from higher education institution from the highest stratum, such as gaining a masters or doctoral degree
2) giving tutorials (for UT)/lectures in other university(ies)
3) writing/revising exam items
4) writing manuals/audio video scripts/text books
5) developing laboratory instruments and computer programs (hardware and software)
6) giving guidance and advice to students in academic activities
7) supervising junior lecturers
8) participating in curriculum development

b. Research
1) conducting research studies
2) writing research papers/studies
3) presenting research studies in seminars/conferences

c. Community services
1) conducting workshops/internships
2) providing services for community development
3) writing books for high school courses

d. Other supporting factors

1) as a committee member in Faculty/University activities or as a university representative in relation with other institution

2) as a member of a professional organization

3) as a participant in National or international Internships/Workshops/ Conferences as a member of a delegation or of an organizing committee

In conventional universities, the teaching and learning activities of the academics are very clear, since they are the routine work done on a day-to-day basis. At UT, the work regarded as academic activity is sometimes very different from the main duties and responsibilities of the academics of conventional universities. Most of the routine work at UT is considered to be administrative work. At the Examination Processing Centre, for example, the workload is almost unbearable for the staff, since the Centre also represents UT as a Testing Service Centre serving other institutions (A Master Plan of Universitas Terbuka Development, 1992). As well, the Centre supplies many other additional services since these services are financially beneficial for UT. in this case, UT works in cooperation with other institutions, such as other universities, the Indonesia Telecommunication Company, the Indonesia Post Office, the Indonesia Ministry of Agriculture, the Indonesia Ministry of Religion, and public and private industrial companies. Thus, the staff must perform these duties even though they are not their main responsibilities. These duties alone constitute an overload for the staff. However, the academics of the Centre must also include additional academic activities in their workload in order for promotion to take place.

The difficulties faced by the academics in getting promotion, especially those who work outside the faculty, have two underlying causes. First, the nature of UT's distance learning system requires a great deal of administrative work. Second, academic promotion is based on the promotion procedure which is found in conventional universities where the academic duties are clear, having been established over many years: these include teaching and doing research. Therefore, in order to get promoted, the academics must carry additional workloads which are related to the promotion requirements.

The difficulties in getting promotion which are faced by academics working in a distance learning institution are acknowledged in many countries. Based on the differences in atmosphere and expectations for university academics, Paul (1990) questioned whether or not someone with tenure at a regular university should receive a tenure appointment at an open university. However, such a question would be irrelevant in the case of UT, since no academic would be working at UT without academic-based career advancement and academic-based pay schedules. In this case, academics at UT could choose to work as administrative staff so they do not have to accumulate credit point to meet the requirement for promotion as the academics do. Faculty staff, for example, can apply for promotion every two years, receive incentives based on scholarly rank position, and retire at the age of 65 (Tamat, 1991). Administrative staff, however, must retire at the age of 56, receive much smaller monetary incentives than the academics do, and compete very hard to attain and remain at a certain position due to the limited number of possible administrative positions in the university. Although the administrative staff

receive automatic promotion every four years, the majority of the staff who are university graduates prefer to be academics.

A university graduate must complete up to one year of probation and must take a formal examination afterward --conducted by the Department of Educational and Culture-- in order to become a government employee. After passing the examination, the employee is required to obtain 10 credit points in all promotion criteria ––eighty percent based on "Teaching & Learning, Research, and Community Services", and twenty percent based on "Supporting Factors"-- in order to be promoted to be an Associate Skilled Assistant (IIla). There are 9 (nine) levels of faculty rank (see Appendix B). Individual careers begin at Associate Skilled Assistant (Ill/a) and move to higher rank by accumulating credit points based on the promotion criteria. Faculty rank of Associate Skilled Assistant (Ill/a) is the lowest rank for an academic staff member. To move from Associate Skilled Assistant (Ill/a) to Skilled Assistant (hub) rank, staff requires the achievement of 100 credit points in all promotion criteria. The point scale for faculty staff promotion at UT is presented in Appendix B.

To be appointed to an academic position, an employee must have a faculty rank of, at least, Associate Lecturer (III/d). if these conditions for promotion continue to exist, there is a possibility that staff will leave UT to seek better career opportunities elsewhere. Tamat (1991) suggests that there is a tendency for government employees to move to private companies due both to the lack of career advancement opportunities and to the inadequate salaries of the government agencies. He stated further that this tendency is occurring at UT. The issue was raised by staff who felt that they were underpaid compared to employees in private agencies and who were disappointed with the career path at UT. Given, the right of the staff to seek better employment elsewhere, UT will face a great loss of skilled manpower if this happens. Thus, if UT continues to use the conventional promotion criteria, the university must provide the staff development programs necessary to help its staff to obtain the skills and opportunities necessary for career advancement.

The purposes of the study

The purposes of this study are (I) to investigate the involvement of academics in staff development programs at UT; (2) to investigate the factors that delay the career advancement of UT staff; (3) to investigate the types of staff development needed at UT; (4) to investigate the differences in opportunity between staff who work in the faculty and those who work outside the faculty to be involved in academic activities at UT; (5) to investigate the relationship between the opportunity of UT staff to be involved in academic activities and faculty rank, and (6) to provide recommendations for improvement of existing staff development programs at UT.

Significance of the study

Faculty involvement in academic activitiesis important to the attainment of promotion criteria as well as to the improvement of the academic qualification. It is, then, necessary for the university, in this case Universitas Terbuka, to investigate whether or not there were enough opportunities for staff development associated with academic activities.

This study is the first study conducted on staff development at UT. Furthermore, this study attempts both to address the perceptions of UT's staff about staff development and to identify the factors involved in academic career advancement at UT. Based upon the results of this study, recommendations will be made, which, it is hoped, will be taken into consideration in the improvement of the staff development program at UT, especially in the improvement of opportunities for promotion for UT's academic staff.

Research questions

The following questions form the basis of the study:

1. To what extent are the academic staff involved in staff development programs (academic activities) at UT?
2. What factors have delayed the career advancement of junior academic staff at UT?
3. What kinds of staff development programs are needed by the junior academic staff at UT?
4. is there any difference in opportunity to be involved in academic activities between staff who work in the faculty and those who work outside the faculty at UT?
5. is there any relationship between the opportunity of UT staff to be involved in academic activities and their faculty rank?

Definition of terms

An open learning institution is an institution dedicated to helping individuals enroll in an educational setting without facing various barriers, such as entrance requirements, time constraints, and geographical distance (Paul, 1990). An open learning institution, according to Paul, delivers its teaching learning process by means of a distance learning system or distance education in which students learn through 'didactic' or educational media, such as printed learning material and audio-video aids, without the necessity of regular class participation.

Staff development, in general, refers to programs and activities designed to help the staff of an institution obtain personal and professional development by acquiring the necessary skills, knowledge, and understanding so that, in turn, they will benefit the organization (Fullan, 1990; Stoddart, 1977; Bertcher, 1988). The term staff development, as used in this study, refers to programs and activities designed to help the academics at UT have the opportunity to acquire the skills and knowledge to carry out the academic activities which comprise the requirements for promotion.

Academic activities refer to activities that relate to academic duties, such as teaching in post secondary level, conducting research, and carrying out community services (Armour et al., 1987; Siaciwena, 1989; and Tamat 1991).

Credit point attaintment, at UT, refer to the gaining of credit points as a result of accomplishing academic

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Staff Development

Staff development is a very important factor in every institution or organization. Cummings and Huse (1989) stated that professional and skilled staff will be beneficial for any organization. If the staff feel satisfied with their career advancement, this will improve their performances, both in productivity and in quality, towards achieving the organizational goals. Thus, the organization must consider the career advancement of its staff in order to help the staff achieve higher position rank, greater responsibilities, salary increases, and more opportunities to carry out self-actualization activities in the workplace.

A number of studies have been conducted which emphasize the fact that staff development plays a crucial role in the development of any organization (Pfiffner and Sherwood, 1965; Pfiffner, 1960; Rigors and Myers, 1977; and Edington, 1990). Fullan (1990) and Beaudoin (1990) define staff development as any activity or process intended to improve skills, attitudes, understandings, or performance in present or future roles. According to Stoddart (1977), Scriven (1986), and Beaudoin (1990), staff development is a must in a university in order to respond to the developmental needs of both individuals and the institution. Staff development, they state further, is a part of an institutional obligation to prepare the individual teachers for promotion. Thus, staff development cannot be an isolated activity, but must be central to the activity of the university.

Furthermore, Billing (1977) and Beaudoin (1990) both noted that the scope of staff development activities may include in-service training in educational methods and curriculum development, increasing and up-dating subject knowledge, training in management and committee work, research, job rotation, administrative responsibilities, and preparation for retirement. Staff development activities, according to Bertcher (1988) and Black (1992), should place emphasis on improving the staffs abilities to do their jobs well so that the organization can achieve its goals while the staff members can find their work more rewarding. Staff development activities, Bertcher (1988) suggested, should include orientations to the organization, supervision, training, field trips to cooperating agencies, problemsolving staff meetings, participation in the development and implementation of acceptability systems, participation in research focused on service delivery or organizational operation, and periodic individual evaluation, in short, staff development should be provided as academic development (Lewis, 1992).

Despite the importance of staff development, however, there have been disputes about the effectiveness of staff development in facilitating the continuing professional and personal growth of school personnel (Hippos, Scalded, and Landau, 1989; Fullan, 1991). Research indicates that, among the common reasons for the ineffectiveness of staff development, are lack of sincere commitment and participation by both teachers and administrators, insensitivity of planners to the individual needs of schools and staff members, the inability to link program content to actual school situations, and lack of continuity of the staff development programs. in a study of in-service education as a method of professional development, Fullan (1991) determined that the reasons for failure in the program included:

one-shot workshops, topics of the in-service did not address the participants' needs and concerns, lack of follow-up support for ideas and practices introduced in the in-service programs, infrequent follow-up evaluation, no framework for the planning and implementation of the in-service that would ensure their effectiveness. Hence, it is obvious that planning for staff development must be taken seriously if the programs needed for personal and professional development are to be effective in benefiting the organization.

Staff Development in Distance Education

In the distance education setting, Blackburn (1983), Paul (1990), Siaciwena (1989), Beaudoin (1990), Taylor and White (1991), and Lewis (1992) suggested that academics must be involved in an orientation program, professional meetings, seminars, special sessions on instructional design, trainings on tutoring, informal sessions with colleagues, and opportunities to meet face-to-face with students. These activities should be conducted, from time to time, to facilitate adjustment to the system, which is very different from the system of conventional universities. An orientation program could include an introduction to the mission, history, and philosophy of the institution, with reference to other open and distance-learning institutions. Seminars and other interactive sessions which are supported by well documented data from institutional research focusing on the students --who they are, what they are looking for, factors in their success and failure in this mode of learning-- will help the staff to understand their roles in teaching at a distance. Discussions can be held to analyze the implications of the students' failure and success on course design and delivery.

McGuire (1988), and Caffarella, Duning, and Patrick (1992) indicated that the majority of faculty time in the traditional university setting is spent teaching. Distance education, then, necessitates a different emphasis on faculty roles. in this case, according to Lewis (1992), academic staff in distance education should be granted more autonomy in planning and designing a staff development programs that would benefit not only individuals but also the institution itself.

According to Siaciwena (1989), McGuire (1988), and Taylor and White (1991), faculty members in distance education need professional guidance and ongoing training; as well, they need to develop the skills, such as course writing, demanded by academics in a conventional university. It is also important, according to Siaciwena (1989), to have special sessions on instructional design led by professional staff trained in this area (instructional developers, editors, experienced faculty course-writers). Beaudoin (1990) noted that academics need to have feedback and strategy sessions on various ways of tutoring (by telephone, correspondence, and computer). In addition, to adjust to the unique challenges of working in a distance educational setting, staff need to be involved in peer consultations. Furthermore, opportunities to meet face-to-face with students will help the staff to understand better the challenges they face and the services and support which have enabled the students to succeed.

Wright (1988), Hinson, Caldwèll and Landrum (1989), and Edington (1990) suggest that improving tutoring competence can occur through staff development. Furthermore, Wright (1989), Wu (1988), and Holdzkom and Kuligowski (1988) stated that it is important to think of staff development as a learning process which is based on the interaction between reflection and practice. This is a significant

suggestion since most tutors adopt teaching styles and techniques that are much like those used in conventional settings either that are more tutor-centred or that are similar to those experienced by themselves as learners (Taylor and White 1991; and Black, 1992).

Siaciwena (1989) studied staff attitudes towards distance education at the University of Zambia. His findings indicated that the majority of junior academic staff in distance teaching institutions wasn't given due consideration for promotion. In addition, he stated both that academic staff felt distance teaching is a big responsibility and that it "was an extra burden which was not sufficiently rewarding" (p.47).

Due to this situation, support from the institution is an important factor for involving the academic staff in distance teaching (Steinhart, 1988). Carrafella, Duning, and Patrick (1992) recommended that a reward system for faculty member in distance education, such as increasing salary, promotion, and tenure guide-lines should be provided by its institution, in a sense, academic staff require rewards, incentives, and training regarding the distance teaching (Siaciwena, 1989). According to Siaciwena (1989), "teaching could be improved by a variety of means, including changes in the teaching environment and organizational structure, in the promotion criteria and the provision of staff development programs" (p. 60). According to Fullan (1990), staff development, therefore, should become part of an overall strategy for professional and institutional reform.

Given the complexity of the "administrative" and "academic" workloads at UT, staff should be given the opportunity to be involved in the staff development programs necessary to correspond to the promotion requirement because promotion, according to Spilperman and Lunde (1991), "is a principal means of growth and occupational status" (p.691).

Walandow (1991) states that staff development at UT can be focussed on training for program development, item development, and knowledge enrichment. In this way, UT can be more accountable in providing qualified modules,, other learning materials, and examinations. At present, only 10% of the learning materials are written by UT's staff. in addition, UT's staff have, so far, only developed and reviewed 50% of the examinations, and the rest have been provided by content experts from other universities (Walandow, 1991), if UT is to be a source university, it must provide and train the staff with an extended staff development program on program development, item development and subject matter enrichment. Only in this way will the university have its own qualified content experts in the long run. One way to do that is to involve staff in such activities as developing learning materials, tutorials, and item development.

In fact, UT has been providing staff development programs to improve the knowledge, skills and performance its staff in order to provide them with opportunities for career advancement. Yet promotion remains problematic for the majority of UT's academic staff! Thus, research is required determine the state of staff development at UT and the perceptions of the staff about the programs needed. It is expected that the findings of the study will enable UT to provide the staff development programs necessary to promote the professional development of the staff which will in turn enhance the quality of UT's programs in providing higher education opportunities.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

General approach

In general, this study used a survey approach. The main characteristic of a survey, according to Li (1981), is a systematic data collection from samples or populations by using questionnaires or structured interviews. Questionnaires, in fact, were used in this study to collect data from all UT's junior academic staff concerning staff development program at UT.

Subjects of the study

The subjects of this study were 269 UT's junior academic staff whose academic ranking are Junior Assistant (Tenaga Pengajar), Associate Skilled Assistant (Asisten Ahli Madya), Skilled Assistant (Asisten Ahli), Junior Lecturer (Lektor Muda), and Associate Lecturer (Lektor Madya); none held a structural administrative position such as Assistant Dean, or Head of Centre. Other ranking such as Lecturer (Lektor), Associate Senior Lecturer (Lektor Kepala Madya), Senior Lecturer (Lektor Kepala), Associate Professor (Guru Besar Madya), and Professor (Guru Besar) were excluded from this study. The subjects of this study, therefore, were junior academic staff of UT Jakarta and at of UT regional centres throughout Indonesia.

Of the 269 academic staff, only 233 received the questionnaires. The remaining staff (36 out of 269 academic staff) were engaging in off-campus duties such as attending workshops/seminars, attending training programs, and studying in and out of Indonesia.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was developed based on the UT's promotion criteria to elicit information on academic activities concerning staff development programs at UT. The questionnaire consisted of three sections. The first section gathered personal data. Respondents were asked to give information about their latest education, faculty ranks/academic positions, years of experience in UT, and work division. The second section of the questionnaire elicited information on' staff involvement in staff development programs. The last section addressed what staff development programs are needed at UT. The items in the questionnaire employed multiple choice and 5-point scale questions.

The questionnaires of the Indonesia version, firstly, were distributed to UT's academic staff who study at University of Victoria, Canada, asking for some comments --both written and verbally-- on the readability of the questionnaires. Afterwards, the questionnaire of the Indonesia version was translated into English. A copy of the questionnaire can be seen in Appendix C for the English version and in Appendix D for the Indonesia (Bahasa Indonesia) version.

Before distributing the questionnaires, however, a two day pilot project was conducted in the beginning of April, 1994 at UT to review the questionnaires. Twenty-nine questionnaires were distributed --as take-home assignment-- to 29 academic staff who attended in the first day of the pilot project. The

29 academic staff were asked to fill the questionnaires and give some comments based on their experiences in their involvement in academic activities and on UT's promotion criteria as well. Of 29 academic staff, 21 academic staff attended in the second day to review and to evaluate the "take-home assignment" questionnaires. The purpose of reviewing and evaluating the questionnaire was to ensure that the questionnaire would be readable, could be completed within 20 minutes, and most importantly would better suit in measuring the opportunity of academic activities at UT.

Procedure

Data were collected through the use of the questionnaires. The major reason for using the questionnaire approach in this study was the anonymity offered to the respondents. As Nhundu (1992) suggested that "this approach allows the respondents to express their views anonymously, views that may otherwise be opposed or influenced by others or by researcher bias" (p. 339).

At the end of April, 1994, the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents. They were handed out personally by the researcher to 228 academic staff at UT and were mailed to 41 academic staff at the regional centres with stamped-return envelopes provided for return of the completed questionnaire. The return rate was 72.10% (n1 68))

Data analysis

Most of the data were analyzed by using descriptive statistical analysis, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviation. The analysis was done by using the SPSS for windows release 6.0

This study used t_{test} to determine whether or not there were differences in the frequency of opportunity to be involved in academic activities between staff who work in the faculty and staff who work outside the faculty . Correlation analysis between the opportunity of UT staff to be involved in academic activities and faculty rank. In the case, $p < 0.005$, $p < 0.01$, or $p < 0.001$ were used as the significant level for the statistical analyses. Finally, respondents' comments on open-ended question were categories based on the main concern expressed.

CHAPTER IV
RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

The Respondents

Of the 233 questionnaires that were sent to the respondents, 168 (72.10%) were returned. Due to missing data, 11 (4.72°h) questionnaires were eliminated. Thus, 157 (67.38%) questionnaires were used in this study. The summary of the demographic data of the respondents is presented in Table 1 to Table 5.

Table 1

Education level

Item	n	%
Bachelor	126	80.3
Master	27	17.2
Doctor	4	2.5

(n=157)

Table 2

Faculty of

Item	n	%
Education	43	27.4
Math. & Natural Sciences	51	32.5
Social & Political Sciences	41	26.1
Economics	22	14.0

(n=157)

Table 3

Years of experience

Item	n	%
less than 2 years	11	7.0
2 years	13	8.3
3 years	17	10.8
4 years	8	5.1
5 years	22	14.0
6 years	15	9.6
7 years	12	7.6
8 years	28	17.8
9 years	31	19.7

(n=157)

Table 4

Academic position

Item	n	%
Junior Assistant	25	15.9
Assoc. Skilled Assistant (III/a)	59	37.6
Skilled Assistant (III/b)	51	35.5
Assistant Lecturer (III/c)	22	14.0
Associate Lecturer (III/d)	0	0

(n=57)

Table 5

Work division

Item	n	%
Faculty	75	47.8
Other Units	82	52.2

(n=57)

Staff Involvement in Academic Activities

Academic activities at UT are activities associated with promotion criteria for academics that is published by the Ministry of State for Administrative Reform Regulation Number 59/Menpan I87. Included in the academic activities at UT are subject matter enrichment, writing modules, revising modules, writing test items, revising test items, conducting tutorials, writing audio and video scripts, conducting research, and presenting seminars, in addition, there are also some training conducted to improve academic qualification, such as training on test and measurement, developing computer programs, writing paper/ articles, and developing laboratory instruments.

Attending meetings on tasks related to credit point attainment. Respondents were asked whether or not they had been invited to meetings on tasks related to credit point attainment in the last two years. The summary of their responses is provided in Table 6.

Table 6

Attending the meetings on tasks

related to credit point attainment

Option	n	%
Never	84	53.5
Almost Never (once)	46	29.3
Sometimes (2-3 times)	24	15.3
Often (4-5 times)	3	1.9
Very often (more than 5 times)	0	0
Mean		1.7

Attending meetings on tasks related to credit point attainment is important to the academics since day-to-day duties include mostly administrative work. The academics need to know what daily tasks could be used for fulfilling promotion criteria. In this case, they should know both their rights and their obligations as UT's academic staff.

Eighty-four (53.5%) of the respondents indicated that they have never been invited to attend the meetings on tasks related to credit point attainment. Forty-six (29.3%) respondents attended once, and 24 (15.3%) respondents attended two to three times. Only three (1.9%) respondents attended 4 to 5 times. The mean of respondents' attendance was 1.7 on the 5-point scale. It can be assumed that the majority of academic staff only attended the meetings once in the last two years.

From the results illustrated in Table 2, it seems that UT/SDU (Staff Development Unit) "neglected" the academics. Faculty members, according to Siaciwena (1989), need professional guidance. Therefore, the institution, as Bertcher (1988) suggested, should arrange orientations, staff meetings, supervision, and individual evaluation regarding staff development programs.

Staff involvement in academic activities that are provided by UT/Staff Development Unit. The respondents who work in the faculties or at the other units were asked about their involvement in the academic activities that are provided by UT (i.e. Staff Development Division). They were asked how often they had been involved in such activities in the last two years. A summary of the academics' responses is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Staff involvement in the training session that were provide by UT/Staff Development Unit

Items	N	AN	S	O	VO	Mean	SD
Conducting Tutorial	113 (72.0%)	39 (24.0%)	3 (1.9%)	1 (0.6 %)	1 (0.6%)	1.331	.614
Test and Measurement	113 (72.0%)	137 (23.6%)	7 (4.5%)	-	-	1.325	.557
Writing Modules	145 (92.4%)	10 (6.4%)	2 (1.3%)	-	-	1.089	.329
Writing A/V Script	125 (79.6%)	20 (12.7%)	9 (5.7%)	3 (1.9%)	-	1.229	.665
Developing Lab. Insts.	153 (97.5%)	4 (2.5%)	-	-	-	1.025	.158
Developing Comp. Progs.	148 (94.3%)	9 (5.7%)	-	-	-	1.057	.223
Conducting Research	131 (83.3%)	21 (13.4%)	3 (1.9%)	2 (1.3 %)	-	1.210	.531
Writing Articles/Paper	146 (93.0%)	8 (5.1%)	2 (1.3%)	1 (0.6 %)	-	1.096	.389
					Grand Mean		1.2

Symbols: N : Never   AN: Almost Never (once)   S: Sometimes (2 3 times)
O: Often (4 5 times)   VO: Very Often (more than 5 times)

It can be seen in Table 7 that 72.0% to 97.5% of the respondents never attended such academic activities; 2.5% to 23.6% attended once; 1.3% to 5.7% attended 2 -3 times; 0.6% to 1.9% attended 4-5 times; and only 0.6% attended more than 5 times in the last two years. The grand mean of respondents' attendance in the academic activities was 1.2 on the 5-point scale, It can be assumed that the academics seldom attended academic activities in the last two years. The UT/Staff Development Unit must arrange training sessions periodically to increase the opportunity of the academics to be involved in academic activities.

Staff involvement in academic activities that are provided by the faculties. The respondents who work both in the faculties and in other units were also asked about their involvement in academic activities which had been provided by the faculties in the last two years. A summary of the responses is presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Staff involvement in academic activities provided by the faculties

Items	N	AN	S	O	VO	Mean	SD
Subj. Matter Enrichment	84	42	23	6	2	1.726	.963
	(53.5%)	(26.8%)	(14.6%)	(3.8%)	(1.3%)		
Writing Module(s)	92	46	14	4	1	1.573	.810
	(58.6%)	(29.3%)	(8.9%)	(2.5%)	(0.6%)		
Revising Module(s)	84	48	19	4	2	1.675	.879
	(53.5%)	(30.6%)	(12.1%)	(2.5%)	(1.3%)		
Writing Test Items	78	29	30	13	7	1.994	1.196
	(49.7%)	(18.5%)	(19.1%)	(8.3%)	(4.5%)		
Revising Test Items	93	22	28	8	6	1.803	1.135
	(59.2%)	(14.0%)	(17.8%)	(5.1%)	(3.8%)		
Giving Face to Face Tutorials	96	34	14	8	5	1.675	1.045
	(61.1%)	(21.7%)	(8.9%)	(5.1%)	(3.2%)		
Giving writing Tutorials	93	20	30	7	7	1.882	1.157
	(59.2%)	(12.7%)	(19.1)	(4.5%)	(4.5%)		
Writing A/V Script	86	37	15	11	8	1.841	1.169
	(54.8%)	(23.6%)	(9.6%)	(7.0 %)	(5.1%)		
Conducting Research	96	39	16	6	-	1.567	.826
	(61.1%)	(24.8%)	(10.2%)	(3.8%)			
Presenting Seminars	58	33	30	23	13	2.363	1.331
	(36.9%)	(21.0%)	(19.1)	(14.6%)	(8.3%)		
					Grand Mean		1.8

Symbols: N : Never   AN: Almost Never (once)   S: Sometimes (2 3 times)
O: Often (4 5 times)   VO: Very Often (more than 5 times)

As indicated in Table 8, 12.7% to 30.6% of the respondents attended once; 8.9% to 19.1% attended 2 -3 times; 2.5% to 14.6% attended 4 -5 times; and 0.6% to 8.3% attended more than 5 times in the last two years. In fact, 36.9% to 61.1% of the respondents had never been involved in any training session. Thus, the majority of the academics had never been involved in any related academic activities.

The grand mean of staff involvement in academic activities that were provided by the faculties was 1.8. It can be assumed, therefore, that the academics had rarely, if ever, been involved in the staff development programs that were carried out by the faculties. In other words, they had attended only one activity in the last two years.

In relation to involving academics in staff development programs, Henderson and Kane (1991) suggested that faculty members should be involved in academic activities such as teaching or research as parts of their mission statements. The faculties, thus, must arrange such activities more frequently in order to increase the academics' involvement in the staff development programs.

Staff involvement in academic activities outside UT. Respondents were also asked about their involvement in academic activities outside UT -inside and outside Indonesia related to-the credit point attainment. These responses are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9

Staff involvement in academic activities institution

Items	N	AN	S	O	VO	Mean	SD
Conducted in Indonesia	90 (57.3%)	34 (21.7%)	23 (14.6%)	6 (3.8%)	4 (2.5%)	1.726	1.017
Conducted out Indonesia	140 (89.2%)	14 (8.9%)	3 (1.9%)	-	-	1.127	.338
						Grand Mean	1.5

Symbols: N : Never   AN: Almost Never (once)   S: Sometimes (2 3 times)

O: Often (4 5 times)   VO: Very Often (more than 5 times)

In Table 9, it is shown that over fifty-seven percent (57.3%) of the academics have never been involved in the activities conducted by other institutions that were conducted outside UT/inside Indonesia; 21.7% of the respondents attended once; 14.6% attended 2 -3 times; 3.8% attended 4-5 times, and only 2.5% attended more than 5 times. In addition, almost ninety percent (89.2%) of the academics had never been involved in the activities conducted by other institutions outside Indonesia. Of the remainder, 8.9% attended once, and only I .9% attended 2- 3 times within the two last years.

The grand mean of 1.5 indicated that the academics have almost never been involved in such activities. Therefore, UT must increase the frequency of the academics in the academic activities conducted by other institutions.

Involving the academics in academic activities not only locally but also internationally (such as overseas training, or attending international seminars) is important for UT's academics to improve their knowledge, academic skills, and qualifications (expertise).

Involving academics in the academic activities by means of invitation by UT or faculties, appointment by superiors, or voluntary registration. Respondents were asked about their involvement in the staff development programs by means of invitation by UT or by faculty, appointment by superior, and voluntary registration. Their responses are reported in Table 10.

Table 10

Staff involvement in academic activities by means of

Items	N	AN	S	O	VO	Mean	SD
Subj. Matter Enrichment	95	42	16	1	1	1.529	.756
	(60.5%)	(26.8%)	(10.2%)	(0.6%)	(0.6%)		
Writing Module(s)	70	52	25	8	2	1.854	.953
	(44.6%)	(33.1%)	(15.9%)	(5.1%)	(1.3%)		
Revising Module(s)	52	51	38	9	7	2.159	1.089
	(33.1%)	(32.5%)	(24.2%)	(5.7%)	(4.5%)		
Writing Test Items	83	34	29	8	3	1.815	1.030
	(52.9%)	(21.7%)	(18.5%)	(5.1%)	(1.9%)		
						Grand Mean	1.9

Symbols: N : Never   AN: Almost Never (once)   S: Sometimes (2 3 times)
                  O: Often (4 5 times)   VO: Very Often (more than 5 times)

The results showed that 33.1% to 60.5% of the academics have never been involved in the staff development programs by means of invitation by UT/Staff Development Unit/the faculties, appointment by the superior, or voluntary registration. Between 2 1.7% and 33.1% were invited, were appointed, or registered voluntarily once. Between 10%) and 24% of academics were invited, or were appointed, or registered voluntary 2-3 times. Up to 5.7% of the respondents were involved in the activities 4-5 times. Finally, only a few staff (0.6% to 4.5%) had attended the programs more than 5 times in the last two years.

The grand mean of 1.9 indicated that staff involvement in the academic activities by means of invitation by UT/faculties, appointment by the superior, and voluntary registration was low. They had only attended about once in the last two years.

Assigning academics to academic activities based on their qualifications. There are some criteria for assigning staff to be involved in certain academic activities, such as seniority, education, expertise on the job, performance/ability to learn new skills, and equity/fair opportunity). Assigning staff to participate in academic activities/staff development programs based on the staffs qualifications was also investigated. The summary of their responses is presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Assigning staff to participate in academic activities based on the qualifications

Item	N	AN	S	0	VO	Mean	SD
Seniority	70 (44.6%)	32 (20.4%)	38 (24.2%)	13 (8.3%)	4 (2.4%)	2.038	1.120
Education	62 (39.5%)	35 (22.3%)	44 (28.0%)	13 (8.3%)	3 (1.9%)	2.108	1.084
Expertise on the job	44 (28.0%)	41 (26.1%)	54 (34.4%)	14 (8.9%)	4 (2.5%)	2.3 18	1.056
Performance	37 (23.6%)	35 (22.3%)	53 (33.8%)	25 (15.9%)	7 (4.5%)	2.554	1.146
Equity/fair opportunity	57 (36.3%)	42 (26.8%)	32 (20.4%)	19 (12.1%)	7 (4.5%)	2.2 17	1.189
					Grand mean =		2.3

(n=157)

Symbols: N : Never AN: Almost Never (once) S: Sometimes (2 3 times)
O: Often (4 5 times) VO: Very Often (more than 5 times)

In Table 11, it can be seen that 23.6% to 44.6% of the respondents were not assigned to participate in academic activities. About twenty to twenty-six percent of the respondents were only assigned once. About twenty to thirty-four percent of the respondents were assigned 23 times. About eight to fifteen percent of respondents were assigned 4 - 5 times. Finally, about one to four percent of the respondents were assigned more than five times in the last two years.

The grand mean of respondents' assignment to participate in the staff development programs was 2.3 on the 5-point scale. It can be assumed that academics at UT were assigned only two to three times within the last two years.

The adequacy of activities provided by UT for staff development. Respondents were asked whether or not they felt or thought that staff development provided by UT/Staff Development Unit was adequate in terms of the opportunity for academic activities. The summary of their responses is presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Adequacy of academic activities for

staff development provided by UT

Options	N	%
In adequate	116	73.9
Adequate	37	23.6
More than adequate	4	2.5
Mean = 1.3		

As indicated in Table 12, 73.9% of the respondents stated that the academic activities for staff development provided by UT were inadequate; 23.6% of the respondents stated that it was adequate; and 2.5% of the respondents said that it was more than adequate. The mean of 1.3 on the 5-point scale obviously indicated that the majority of the academics felt or thought that the academic activities for staff development provided by UT were inadequate.

As Walandoüw (1991) mentioned, only 10% of UT's learning materials are written by UT's academic staff, and only 50% of the examinations are developed and reviewed by UT's academic staff, while the remainder are developed by professors from popular state universities in Indonesia, such as the University of Indonesia, Gadjah Math University, Bandung Institute of Technology, and Airlangga University). It seems clear that the academic activities at UT do not meet the needs of the academics. UTstaff Development Unit, the faculties, and the other units should work together to anticipate and to solve these problems in order to meet the needs of the academics.

Open-ended comments on the adequacy of academic activities provided by UT. Respondents were asked to give their comments or reasons concerning the adequacy of academic activities for staff development provided by UT, and a total of 122 out of 157 replied. Their remarks were categorized according to the main concern expressed.

There were four (3.27%) respondents who said that academic activities for staff development provided by UT are "more than adequate". They stated that UT has a large number of potential staff to manage and to organize staff development programs; thus, they concluded that there will not be a problem for academics' career advancement. This probably means that improving academic qualification not only depends on the provision of academic activities but also should come from within the academic themselves. In a sense, the academics must have the motivation for self development concerning their academic career. For example, they might conduct a research study, or publish an article by themselves.

There were 29(23.7%) respondents who stated that academic activities for staff development provided by UT are "adequate". Their reasons are illustrated below:

- A large number of staff receive scholarships for postgraduate studies inside and outside Indonesia.
- The programs support the academics to develop their careers and to attain higher faculty ranks.
- The programs which are provided have enough activities so that respondents can choose to be involved in certain activities based on their academic expertise and interest.
- The Staff Development Unit has provided a periodic activities for staff academics even though not all of the staff have had a chance to be involved in the programs.

There were 89(72.95%) respondents, however, who complained about the adequacy of programs of staff development at UT. They stated that the academic activities for staff development provided by UT were "inadequate". Academics' comments on the existing staff development programs are illustrated below:

- The existing programs did not meet the needs of the academics such as activities that match the academics' educational backgrounds and the academics' duties.

- There was a lack of quality of the programs (the programs and the objectives were not clear). In a sense, UT/Staff Development Unit does not have a standard program.
- There was a lack of coordination among Staff Development Unit, the faculties, and the units, so that the academics were rarely involved in the programs.
- There was a lack of information. In a sense, the academics often received information too late.
- There was a restriction on the number of participants, so that not all of the academics have the same opportunity to be involved in the staff development programs.

Summary. More than fifty percent of the respondents never attended meetings which discussed tasks related to credit point attainment, in the last two years, furthermore, the majority of the academics have never been involved in the staff development activities that were conducted by UT/ Staff Development Unit, by the faculties, or by the units. At least half of the respondents have never been assigned, invited, or appointed by their superiors to participate in the academic activities. In addition, the academic activities for staff development programs that were provided by UT were inadequate for involving all academic staff.

Factors that delayed career advancement of the academics at UT

Concerning career advancement, respondents were asked whether or not they ever missed the opportunity to be involved in the academic activities based on the provided reasons --which are "not allowed by superior, not appointed by superior, not informed, and not interested"-- in the last two years and, if so, how often they had missed them. "Not allowed by superior", in a sense, means that the academics are interested in the programs offered but they are not allowed to be involved. On the other hand, "not appointed by superior" means that somebody else has been appointed (even though they may or may not be interested), since almost in every academic activities at UT only a small number (usually one or two) of participants from each unit were invited. Their responses are summarized in Table 13.

Table 13

Missing opportunity to be involved in academic activities

Item	N	AN	S	O	VO	Mean	SD
Seniority	70	12	8	4	-	1.225	.669
	(44.6%)	(7.6%)	(5.1%)	(2.4%)			
Education	97	26	24	5	5	1.694	1.048
	(61.8%)	(16.6%)	(15.3%)	(3.2%)	(3.2%)		
Expertise on the job	68	38	28	17	5	2.051	1.159
	(43.9%)	(24.2%)	(17.8%)	(10.8%)	(3.2%)		
Performance	37	32	28	7	4	1.796	1.048
	(23.6%)	(20.4%)	(17.8%)	(4.5%)	(2.4%)		
Grand mean =							1.7

In response to the question, "In the last two years, have you missed the opportunity to be involved in the activities for following reasons?" (The reasons are "Not allowed by superior", "Not appointed by superior", "Not informed", and "Not interested"), 43.9% to 84.7% stated that they never missed them. This may mean that they either always attended or were involved in the academic activities provided. About 7% to 24% of the respondents, however, missed once in the last two years. About 5% to 17% missed 2-3 times. Approximately 2% to 10% missed 4-5 times, and 2.5% to 3.2% missed the opportunity more than five times.

The grand mean of 1.7 indicated either that the academics never missed the opportunity to be involved in the programs or, at least, that they missed only once in the last two years. If they did miss the opportunity, however, they probably missed for reasons other than those provided in the answer choices. It may be the case that there were not enough academic activities to attend. Thus, most academics missed the opportunity to attend academic activities simply either because there is not enough opportunity or because they were not available when the activities were conducted. Furthermore, it can be seen that the academics more frequently missed the opportunity because they are not interested in the programs offered than those who were interested but not allowed by their superiors.

Respondents who work in the faculties and those who work outside the faculties were also asked about academic activities conducted in their own units. Firstly, they were asked about whether or not their own units ever conducted academic activities. Secondly, they were asked about their involvement in such activities. Their responses are presented in Table 14 and Table15.

Table 14

Academic activities and academic involvement in the activities in the units

Items /The Units	N	AN	S	O	VO	Mean	SD
Conducting activities by units	26 (16.6%)	14 (8.9%)	18 (11.5%)	12 (7.6%)	12 (7.6%)	2.63	1.44
Involving the academics in the activities by the units	30 (19.1%)	15 (9.6%)	17 (10.8%)	9 (5.7%)	11 (7.0%)	2.46	1.43
					Grand Mean		1.5

(n=82)

Table 15

Academic activities and academics involvement in the activities in the faculties

Items/The Faculty	N	AN	S	O	VO	Mean	SD
Conducting activities by units	10 (6.4%)	22 (14.0%)	30 (19.1%)	8 (5.1%)	5 (2.5%)	1.726	1.06
Involving the academics in the activities by the units	14 (8.9%)	28 (17.8%)	20 (12.7%)	8 (5.1%)	5 (2.5%)	1.127	1.12
					Grand Mean		1.5

(n=75)

It is shown in Table 14 and Table 15 that both the units and the faculties appear to have conducted academics activities only once or twice in the last two years. This would seem to imply that the academics missed opportunities to be involved in academic activities for reasons other than those provided in the answer given. It is most likely that the academics missed opportunities either because not enough activities were provided or because the academics were not free to attend at the time that the activities were conducted.

Pearson-product moment correlation were conducted to investigate the relationship between academic position and missed opportunity to be involved in academic activities. The results are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

Correlation between academic position and missed opportunity to be involved in academic activities due to

Items	Academic position
Not allowed by supervisor	-.0918
Not appointed by supervisor	-.0769
Not informed	.0985
Not interested	-.0049

As indicated in Table 16, there was an insignificant correlation (,$p > 0.05$) between academic position and missing opportunity to be involved in academic activities due to the reasons mentioned above. Chi-square analysis also indicated that there were no significant differences between academic position and missing opportunity to be involved in academic activities. In a sense, academic position was negatively related to missed opportunity to be involved in academic activities.

In summary, it can be assumed that the factor that delayed academic career advancement/academic promotion was missed opportunity to be involved in academic activities. However, the academics had not missed opportunities because they were not allowed or appointed by their superiors, not informed, and not interested. They had missed opportunities to be involved in academic activities because UT and the faculties rarely conduct the academic activities needed to help the academics attain credit points for promotion.

Open-ended comments on missed opportunities to be involved in the academic activities, Respondents were asked to give their comments or reasons for missing their opportunities to be involved in academic activities. Their comments were categorized according to the main concern expressed.

Twenty-four out of 157 respondents commented that they were not allowed by their superior. Out of those 24 respondents, seven (29.16%) commented that they were not allowed because their superior thought that the programs were not suited with the respondents' expertise. Four (16.66%) of the

respondents felt that their superior did not like them. The remaining thirteen (54.16%) respondents said that their superior did not allow them to participate due to work overload.

There were 60 respondents out of 157 who commented on missed opportunity to be involved in academic activities because they were not appointed by their superior. Of those 60 respondents, 5 (8.33%) respondents stated that they missed the opportunity due to limitations on the numbers of possible participants. Eight (13.33%) respondents felt that their superior did not like them, so that they were not appointed to participate in academic activities. Seventeen (28.33%) respondents said that their superior thought that they were not capable of participating in the programs. Eleven (18.33%) respondents stated that their superior did not appoint them to participate because the appointment was based on seniority; they said, in fact, that senior staff have a greater chance of being appointed by the superior. Nineteen (31.66%) respondents commented that, due to work overload, their superior did not appoint them to be involved in academic activities.

Eighty-eight respondents out of 157 stated that they missed the opportunity because they felt that they were not informed. Of those 88 respondents, twenty-four (27.27%) respondents, however, did not give their comments. Thirty-six (40.90%) respondents stated that they did not know the reason why their superior did not inform them concerning academic activities. Eleven (12.5%) respondents said that they missed the opportunity to participate because they received late information, and 17 (19.31%) respondents stated that they were not informed because they missed the information due to work overload,

There also were 71 out of 157 respondents who made the comment that they were not interested in academic activities. Of those 71 respondents, 21 (29.57%) respondents revealed that the activities provided had taken place more than once, even more than twice. Twenty-seven (38.02%) respondents stated that they were not interested in the programs due to work overload. Twelve (16.90%) respondents said that the information rarely came in time. Eleven (15.49%) respondents commented that they were not interested in the programs because they felt that they did not have a chance to compete with the senior staff.

It is obvious from the data above that academics frequently stated "work overload" as the reason for missing the opportunity to be involved in such academic activities. As Tamat (1991) mentioned, the day-to-day duties are primarily administrative, so that it is not impossible that the majority of academics missed the opportunity to be involved in the staff development programs due to work overload. This situation, of course, seriously limits career advancement for the majority of academics. As Blackburn and Baldwin (1993) indicated, postponed career advancement will discourage the academics and will decrease the academics' performance.

Staff Development Program are needed by the Academics at UT

The best staff development system for UT. Respondents were asked about what would be the best staff development system for UT. Their responses are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

The best staff development system for UT

Options (#)	Frequency	Percent
Centrally coordinated by Staff Development Division	43	27.4
Coordinated by each faculty	52	33.1
Coordinated by each unit	44	28.0
Combination #1 2 3	5	3.2
Combination #1 2	6	3.8
Combination #1 3	3	1.9
Combination #2 3	4	2.5
Mean=		2.4

As indicated in Table 17, 52 (33.1%) of the respondents stated that the best staff development system for UT is one "coordinated by each faculty". Forty-three (27.4%) of the respondents said that the best way is "centrally coordinated by Staff Development Division", and 44 (28%) of them said that the best way is "Coordinated by each division". The remaining 18 (11.4%) respondents stated that the best staff development system for UT would be one of the suggested combinations (see Table 17).

Open-ended comments on staff development system for UT. Respondents were asked to give their comments regarding the best staff development system for UT. There were 101 (64.33%) out of 157 respondents who provided comments or suggestions.

Forty-three (42.57%) out of 101 respondents suggested that the best staff development system for UT would be centrally coordinated by Staff Development Unit (SDU). Of those 43 respondents, 29(67.44%) respondents said that this system would be more effective and more efficient financially. In addition, they felt that it would be easier to coordinate and organize the programs. According to respondents' comments, it would also be easier to supervise and to control the frequency and the quality of the programs, so that the programs could be managed professionally. More importantly to the respondents, it would provide equal opportunities to all academics at UT to be involved in staff development programs.

Fifty-two (51.48%) out of 101 respondents stated that the best staff development system for academic staff at UT would be coordinated by each faculty. Of those 52 respondents, forty-one (80.76%) respondents chose this system because they felt that the faculties know more about the qualifications that staff need. The respondents felt, therefore, that the faculties have to be responsible both for improving academics' qualifications and for academics' career advancement. This system, they stated further, would also provide equal opportunities to academics to be involved in the programs.

There were 44 (43 .56%) out of 101 respondents who suggested that the best staff development system for UT would be coordinated by each division. Of those 44 respondents, 23 (52.27%) respondents stated that career advancement for academics who work in the units is the responsibility of

the head of units. The head of units know the ability, the performance, the needs, and the best interests of their academic staff. Thus, they could develop and schedule a program which consists of certain activities that would improve the academics, qualification according to day-to-day duties of academics in the units. They stated further that it would be more flexible and beneficial for time management and would provide better coordination and more open communication between the superior and the staff. In addition, this would make it easier to supervise, to control, and to evaluate the on going programs for quality improvement.

There were some respondents who combined the options in determining the best way concerning staff development system for UT (see Table 10). Of those 101 respondents, 2(1.98%) of the respondents chose the options 1,2, and 3 in combination; 2 (1.98%) respondents chose the options 1 and 2 in combination; 3 (2.97%) respondents choose options 1 and 3 in combination; and I (0.99%) respondent chose options 2 and 3 in combination.

The comments of this group of respondents were similar. Even though this would be expensive, they stated that these combination ways must be more effective and efficient in coordinating, in managing and in organizing the programs. According to the respondents, this combined system would involve all levels of authority within the organization. In addition, the program activities that are arranged by UT/Staff Development Unit, both by the faculties and by the units, would not overlap each other. These respondents felt that this would create an equitable work climate and equal opportunity for the academics to be involved in the programs. Undoubtedly, as Strain (1987) suggested, the academics should be involved in staff development programs so that they will be more engaged and more committed to a course in which they are involved.

The academic activities that are most needed for UTs staff development. Respondents were asked about the kinds of academic activities that are needed at UT. They were asked to choose the activities (listed) which were best suited to their needs. The response is provided in Table 18.

Table 18

The activities that are most needed

for UT's staff development

Item	n	%
Conducting Research Studies	43	27.4
Writing Test Items	29	18.5
Writing Module(s)	19	12.1
Revising Test Items	14	8.9
Writing A/V Script	14	8.9
Giving Face to Face Tutorials	12	7.6
Giving writing Tutorials	12	7.6
Revising Module(s)	10	6.4
Presenting Seminars	3	1.9
Others*	1	0.6
Subj. Matter Enrichment	0	0

As indicated in Table 18,43 (27.4%) of the respondents chose Conducting Research Studies as the "first" activity most needed for staff development programs. "Writing Test Items", then, was chosen by 29(18.5%) respondents. Nineteen (12.1%) of the respondents chose "Writing Module(s)". Fourteen (8.9%) respondents each chose "Revising Test Items" and "Writing Audio/video scripts". Twelve ((7.6%) respondents each chose "Giving face-to-face tutorials" and "Giving written tutorials". Ten (6.4%) respondents chose "Revising module(s)". "Presenting seminars" was chosen by 3 (1.9%) of the respondents. Finally, 1 (0.6%) respondent preferred "Other activities", which included the English Course and Training on Computer Programs.

As can be seen from Table 18, conducting research studies, writing test items, and writing module(s) were chosen as the three activities most needed by the academics. Conducting research, for instance, was the "favourite" academic activity since the academic had difficulties conducting research simply due to the fact that the daily routine work was mainly administrative and that they rarely had the opportunity to do academic activities. Based on experience, furthermore, the bureaucracy at UT was too complicated to facilitate obtaining funding for conducting research studies. Therefore, the academics rarely conducted research, so that they had difficulties in attaining the credit points in research activity to meet the requirements for promotion.

As Walandouw (1991) mentioned, only 50% of the examinations are developed and reviewed by UT's academic staff. Writing test items, then, was the second activity that the academics needed to do. It is not surprising that the results indicated that the academics did not choose "Subject Matter enrichment/Learning more about certain course(s)" simply because in writing test items, the academics must also learn more about certain course(s) so that they are able to write test items properly and accurately. Thus, the respondents felt that, in writing test items, they must learn more deeply about certain course(s) as well.

The "third" activity that the academics chose was Writing Module(s). Again, as Walandouw (1991) mentioned, only 10% of UT's learning materials, such as modules and other learning media, are written by UT's academic staff. Indeed, writing module(s) is considered to be one of the academics' duties, so it is mandatory that academics at UT learn more about how to write module(s) properly.

Summary. With regard to academic activities, Conducting Research Studies, Writing Test Items, and Writing Module(s) were the activities that were considered to be most needed by UT's academic staff. These activities are considered to be the activities that must be undertaken to gain knowledge, skills, and qualifications. If the academics have the knowledge and ability, promotion for the academics would not be as difficult to attain as it is presently.

Open-ended Comments on Staff Development Programs. At the end of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to give their comments or suggestions concerning staff development programs at UT. There were 73 out of 157 respondents who gave their comments or suggestions.

Twenty-one (28.76%) respondents indicated that staff development programs are not well-organized, and they suggested that UT or Staff Development Unit must improve the quality of the programs and also offer more of a variety of programs, such as training on management in distance education, an intensive English course (TOEFL), and training on computer programs.

Fourteen (19.17%) of the respondents indicated that UT/Staff Development Unit should be more organized in its scheduling of programs and should conduct the programs periodically. Eleven (15.06%) respondents suggested that either the UT/Staff Development Unit, or the faculties must inform the academics in time, so that the academics can participate in the programs. Nine (12.32%) of the respondents commented that the Staff Development Unit should be led by an openminded, dedicated and creative leader.

Nine (12.32%) respondents also suggested that Staff Development Unit should arrange programs that are related to the academics' needs or interests. Six (8.22%) respondents stated that it is necessary for UT to apply job rotation periodically, so that academics both within and outside faculties have equal opportunity to be involved in the programs. Five (4.11%) respondents suggested that UT should involve the academics who work at the regional centres in academic activities, especially in conducting research studies.

THE COMPARISON OF ACADEMICS' INVOLVEMENT IN ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES BETWEEN STAFF WHO WORK IN THE FACULTIES AND THOSE WHO WORK OUTSIDE THE FACULTIES.

One of the purposes of this study was to determine whether or not there are differences in opportunities to be involved in academic activities between staff who work in the faculties and those who work outside the faculties. Overall academic involvement with each academic activities is defined as the mean of all items such as writing modules, writing test items, writing audio/video scripts, or conducting tutorials--- evaluating academic activities.

The comparison of academic's involvement in the training sessions that were conducted by UT/Staff Development Units between staff who work in the faculties and those who work outside the faculties is presented in Table 19.

Table 19

Mean of academic's involvement in the training session that were conducted by UT/Staff

Development Unit.

ITEMS	The Faculties (n=75)		Other Units (n=75)		t	p
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD		
Conducting Tutorial	1.48	0.76	1.20	0.40	2.98	0.003*
Test and Measurement	1.44	0.60	0.22	0.50	2.52	0.013*
Writing Modules	1.87	0.46	1.00	0.00	--	--
Writing A/V Script	1.44	0.78	1.17	0.52	2.58	0.011*
Developing Lab. Insts.	1.05	0.23	1.00	0.00	--	--
Developing Comp. Progs.	1.07	0.25	1.05	0.22	0.48	0.633
Conducting Research	1.28	0.56	1.15	0.50	1.58	0.116
Writing Articles/Paper	1.11	0.39	1.09	0.39	0.34	0.733

As indicated in Table 19, there were significant differences in academic involvement in the training sessions that were conducted by UT/Staff Development Unit between the academics who work in the faculties and those who work in the other units.

Significant differences were found on Conducting Tutorials (t = 2.98, p < 0.003), Test and Measurement (t = 2.52, p <0.013), and Writing Audio/Video Scripts (t = 2.58, p <0.011). The three activities were regarded as teaching activities. Naturally, academics who work in the faculties have more opportunities to do these activities. On the other hand, there was an insignificant difference in Conducting Research. While carrying out daily tasks, all academics have to find the opportunity to do research themselves, except for the academics who work in the Research Centre whose main tasks are conducting research. The insignificant difference may be due, however, to the smaller number of academics who work in the Research Centre in the faculties.

Table 20 indicated significant differences in all academic involvement in academic activities that were conducted by the faculties.

Table 20

Mean of Academics' involvement in the academic activities that were inducted by the faculties

ITEMS	The Faculties (n=75)		Other Units (n=75)		t	p
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD		
Subj. Matter Enrichment2.07	1.05	1.41	0.70	4.63	.000**	
Writing Module(s)	1.93	0.89	1.24	0.56	5.87	.000**
Revising Module(s)	2.07	0.95	1.32	0.63	5.89	.000**
Writing Test Items	2.80	1.20	1.26	0.54	10.57	.000**
Revising Test Items	2.28	1.27	1.37	0.78	5.49	.000**
Giving Face to Face Tutorials	2.07	1.19	1.32	0.74	4.79	.000**
Giving writing Tutorials	2.36	1.30	1.33	0.72	6.21	.000**
Writing A/V Script	2.43	1.34	1.30	0.62	6.83	.000**
Conducting Research	1.95	0.90	1.22	0.57	6.12	.000**
Presenting Seminars	2.85	1.19	1.19	1.30	4.70	.000**

As suggested, significant differences were found in academic involvement in all activities conducted by the faculties. it seemed that the faculties involved the academics who work in the faculties more often than the academics who work in other units outside the faculties; this, of course, makes sense, but it may occur in a way that disadvantages the other units!

The t_{tests} comparing the mean values of the academic involvement in academic activities that were conducted by another institution inside and outside Indonesia indicated that there were insignificant differences between academic staff who work in the faculties and those who work in the other units.

Table 21

Mean of academic's involvement in the academic activities that were conducted by

another institution

ITEMS	The Faculties (n=75)		Other Units (n=75)		t	p
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD		
Conducted in Indonesia	1.64	0.91	1.80	1.11	-1.02	0.312
Conducted out Indonesia	1.09	0.34	1.16	0.43	-1.05	0.294

(n=157, p=0.05)

Unlike the assignment of academic staff to post graduate programs both in Indonesia and abroad which is based on a rigorous selection process, assignment of academic staff to academic activities that were conducted by other institutions outside UT (such as attending seminars, or overseas trainings) was not based on selection. In this case, UT does not have a particular or standard procedure for assigning staff to attend seminars or overseas training. Instead, it seems that the assignment of staff to such activities is simply based on the Rector's independent decision. The chances for all academic staff to participate in those activities, therefore, may not the same.

Table 22 below presents the t-tests comparing the mean values of academics' involvement in academic activities by means of invitation by UT and faculties, appointment by superior, or voluntary registration.

Table 22

Means of involving academics in academic activities by means of

ITEMS	The Faculties (n=75)		Other Units (n=75)		t	p
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD		
Invitation by UT/SDU	1.59	0.82	1.46	0.69	0.92	0.359
Invitation by Faculty	2.01	1.01	1.71	0.88	2.03	0.044*
Appointment by supervisor	2.08	0.98	2.23	1.18	-.87	0.358
Voluntary registration	1.76	0.94	1.87	1.11	-0.64	0.522

(n=157, p=0.05)

As indicated in Table 22, there were insignificant differences in academic involvement in academic activities by means of "invitation by UT, appointment by superior, and voluntary registration" between academics who work in the faculties and those who work in the other units. Yet, a significant difference

was found on academics' involvement by means of "invitation by faculties" (t = 2.03, p <0.044) between staff who work in the faculties and who work in the other units.

This is not surprising since the results presented in Tables 13 and 14 indicated that academics who work in the faculties have more opportunities to be involved in academic activities than do academics who work in other units. The more involved the academics are in the activities, the greater their opportunity to attain credit point for academic promotion.

Table 23 indicates insignificant differences in assigning the academics to participate in academic activities based on certain qualifications. However, there was a significant difference in assigning the academics based on seniority (t = 2.04, p <0.043) between the academics who work in the faculties and those who work in the other units. It is plausible that faculty administration assigned senior staff more often than junior staff; this may be because they consider that senior staff to be more experienced and "more senior" than junior staff.

Table 23

Means of assigning the academic to participate in academic activities based on a certain qualification

ITEMS	The Faculties (n=75)		Other Units (n=75)		t	p
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD		
Seniority	2.23	1.15	1.87	1.08	2.04	0.043*
Education	2.13	1.08	2.09	1.09	0.28	0.783
Expertise on the job	2.37	1.04	2.27	1.08	0.62	0.535
Performance	2.53	1.10	2.57	1.20	-.22	0.829
Equity/Fair opportunity	2.28	1.12	2.16	1.25	0.64	0.524

(n=157, p=0.05)

The t-tests comparing missing opportunities to be involved in academic activities between staff who work in the faculties and those who work in the other units (Table 24) shows insignificant differences, except for missing opportunities to be involved in academic activities due to not being informed (t = 3.55, p <0.001).

Table 24

Means of missing opportunity to be involved in academic activities due to

ITEMS	The Faculties (n=75)		Other Units (n=75)		t	p
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD		
Not allowed by supervisor	1.36	0.78	1.16	0.53	1.90	0.059
Not appointed by supervisor	1.63	0.91	1.76	1.16	-.77	0.441
Not informed	1.72	0.94	2.35	1.26	-3.55	0.001*
Not interested	1.83	1.03	1.77	1.07	0.35	0.729

(n=157, p=0.05)

This finding might be attributed to the fact that, in conducting academic activities, the faculties rarely informed the academics who work in the other units. In a sense, the faculties only involved the academics who work in its faculties. It might also be the case that the faculties informed the academics who work in the other units outside the faculties, but, for other reasons, the academics could not participate in the activities.

Above all, the academics probably missed the opportunity to participate in academic activities because ofwork overload. Work overload is, indeed, one of the factors suggested by the respondents to have caused missed opportunities to participate in academic activities (see respondents' open-ended comments concerning missed opportunities to be involved in academic activities in (p. 43). Certainly work overload is not the only reason for missed opportunities to participate in academic activities for staff who work in the other units. However, about 1 7% to 54% of the respondents commented that they missed the chance to participate in academic activities due to work overloads.

Although both the academics who work in the faculties and those who work in the other units have their own routine jobs, it can be suggested that the majority of routine jobs of academics who work in the faculties are academic jobs. Thus, it can be assumed that staff who work in the faculties have more opportunity than staff who work the other unit's to participate, are the academic activities. This might explain why there was significant difference between staff who work in the faculties and those who work in the other units in missed opportunities to participate in academic activities due to "not being informed".

THE CORRELATION BETWEEN ACADEMIC POSITION AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES; AND BETWEEN ACADEMIC POSITION AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE.

The results of the analysis (Table 25) indicated that there are significant correlations ($p < 0.01$) between academic position and academic activities in Subject Matter Enrichment, Writing Modules, Revising Modules, Revising Test Items, and attending activities outside Indonesia.
(n157, ** 0.001 <p < * 0.01)

Table 25

The correlation between academic position and academic
activities; and between academic position and years of
experience.

Items	Academic Position
Academic activities:	**Correlation**
A. Training session on	
- Conducting Tutorial	-.0360
- Test and Measurement	-.1963
- Writing Module(s)	.0797
- Writing A/V Scripts	-.1041

- Developing Lab. Instruments   -.0784
- Developing Computer Programs   -.0320
- Conducting Research Studies   .0037
- Writing Articles/Papers   .0056

B. Participating in

- Subject Matter Enrichment   .2087*
- Writing Module(s)   .2905**
- Revising Module(s)   .2905**
- Writing Test Items   .1304
- Revising Test Items   .2255
- Giving face-to-face Tutorials   .1844
- Giving Written Tutorials   .0569
- Writing Audio/Video Scripts   .0586
- Conducting Research Studies   .1624
- Presenting Seminars   .1492

C. Participating in

- Academic activities that were conducted
  by another institution in Indonesia   .0900
- Academic activities that were conducted
  by another institution outside Indonesia   .3061**

Years of Experience: **.5205**

(n=157, **0.001 < p < *0.01)

These findings are not surprising, since those activities represent the large part of the criteria for the attainment of promotion. Thus, the more frequently the academic engage in academic activities, the more likely it is that they will have the opportunity for promotion.

Finally, years of experience was significantly, but moderately related to academic position (r = 0.5205, p < 0.001). this means that the longer the staff have been working at UT, the more likely it is that they will have the opportunity for promotion. Thus, seniority plays an important role in promotion.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The main responsibilities of academics in higher education involve teaching and learning, research, and community services. Yet, at UT the work regarded as academic activity is sometimes very different from the main duties and responsibilities of the academics in conventional universities. Most of the routine work at UT is considered to be administrative work. Due to the nature of the routine work at UT, it was assumed that the academic faced difficulties in meeting promotion criteria which are based on activities related to teaching and learning, research, and community services. Thus, this study is intended to investigate academic involvement in such activities.

The results of this study indicate a very low level of academics' involvement in staff development and academic activities related to their career advancement at Universitas Terbuka. This is a critical problem. More than 50% of the respondents had never attended meetings on tasks related to credit point attainment. In this case, it is important for UT to arrange meetings periodically so that all of the academics can get proper, complete, and accurate information regarding how they can attain the required promotion criteria in relation to their daily duties. Furthermore, about 86% of the respondents had never been involved in training sessions conducted by UT. The results of this study also indicate that there were significant differences in involvement in the training sessions that had been conducted by UT/Staff Development Programs between staff who work in the faculties and those who work in other units. UT, then, should give the same opportunity for the academics who work in the faculties and those who work outside the faculties to be involved in the training session concerning academic qualification. Siaciwena (1989) suggested that involving academics in academic activities by a variety of means could improve academic qualifications.

It was found that almost 50% of the respondents had never been involved in the academic activities conducted by the faculties. Thus, UT, through the faculties and the administrative superiors, must provide the academics with more opportunities to be involved in staff development programs in order to meet the needs of the academics. The results also indicated that there were significant differences in the academics' involvement all academic activities conducted by the faculties between staff who work in the faculties and those who work outside the faculties. In this case, the faculties should give the same opportunities to the academics who work outside the faculties as the academics who work in the faculties to be involved in academic activities. Furthermore, More than 70% of the respondents had never been involved in academic activities conducted by other institutions either inside or outside Indonesia. However, the results of paired t-tests showed insignificant differences in the activities between staff who work in the faculties and those who work in other units.

The results also indicated that about 50% of the respondents had never been invited by UT or the faculties, appointed by superior, or voluntary registered to be involved in academic activities, in addition, about 35% of the respondents had never been assigned to participate in academic activities based on

their qualifications. The superiors, therefore, should realize that they rarely assign the academic to the staffdevelopment programs. The academics, in this case, should be encouraged and should be assigned to participate in the staff development programs more often. involving the academics in staff development programs, according to Black (1992), means improving the staffs abilities so that the staff can find their work more rewarding and the institution can achieve its goals as well.

Concerning the adequacy of academic activities for staff development programs at UT, about 74% of the respondents stated that the academic activities at UT were inadequate, whereas 23.6% of the respondents stated that they were adequate. Only 2.5% of the respondents stated that academic activities at UT were more than adequate. Respondents who stated that academic activities at UT were "adequate" or "more than adequate" said that the provided programs offered a large number activities that could help the academics attain credit points for promotion. Even though not all of the academics had a chance to be involved in the programs, they stated that UT had developed and carried out academic activities periodically for the academics. Thus, this was not considered to be a problem for the academics' career advancement.

In contrast, the majority of the respondents stated that academic activities at UT were "inadequate". They complained that the existing programs lacked quality. Some said that the programs did not meet the needs of the academics because the activities offered did not match the academics' educational background. Moreover, not all of the academic staff had the same opportunity to be involved in the programs. Therefore, a large number of academic staff encountered difficulties in attaining credit points related to the promotion criteria. UT, therefore, must address those problems concerning academics' involvement in the staff development programs. Opportunities to be involved in those activities, in this case, may help the staff develop their qualification and career advancement. As Blackburn and Baldwin (1993) suggested, it is a must for the institutions to monitor needs and productivity of the academics so that the institutions derive maximum benefit from their academics.

Factors that have delayed academics' career advancement were also investigated. The results indicated that work overloads is one of the factors that postponed academics' career advancement. Due to work overloads, academics at UT have missed opportunities to be involved in staff development programs to attain credit points for promotion. As well, in the last two years, the UT/Staff Development Unit and the faculties rarely conducted academic activities, so that the academics have had difficulties in attaining sufficient credit points to meet the requirements for promotion.

Comments of the respondents, furthermore, indicated that the academics generally missed opportunities because of work overloads. This situation, of course, seriously limits the career advancement of academics at UT. This should be seriously considered since, as Blackburn and Baldwin (1993) suggest, postponed career advancement will discourage academics and will decrease the academics' performance.

The best staff development system for UT, as suggested by the respondents, was one "coordinated by each faculty". Respondents stated that the faculties have to be responsible for coordinating, organizing, and conducting academic activities concerning academics' career advancement. Therefore, respondents felt that the faculties have to be responsible for improving

academic qualifications and academics' career advancement. More importantly, this system would ensure equal opportunities for all academics at UT to be involved in staff development programs.

It was also found that the activities most needed by the academics at UT were "Conducting Research Studies", "Writing Test Items", and "Writing Modules". These activities were considered to be the activities that must be undertaken to enhance the academics' knowledge, skills, and qualifications. Above all, these activities would help the academics in attaining credit points to meet the requirements for promotion.

The t-tests indicated that there were significant differences in opportunity to be involved in all academic activities between academic staff who work in the faculty and those who work in the other units outside the faculty.

Correlation analyses indicated that there was a significant correlation between academic position and academic activities, in a sense, the more frequently the academics engaged in academic activities, the more likely it is that they will have the opportunity for promotion. Moreover, years experience showed a moderately significant correlation with academic position. This means that the longer the staff have been working at UT, the more likely it is that they will have the opportunity for promotion.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. UT/Staff Development Unit and the faculties should increase the frequency of academic activities; for instance, they can accomplish this by arranging and carrying out the activities periodically on a continual basis. In this way, all academic staff could be involved in academic activities in a more frequent and predictable fashion.

2. UT/Staff Development Unit and the faculties should improve the quality of the programs, so that the programs not only help the academics to attain credit points for promotion but also help to improve the academic skills and qualifications ofthe academics.

3. The faculties should give the same opportunity to all academics to be involved in academic activities, so that all of the academics have the same opportunities in attaining credit points for promotion.

4. UT and the faculties should consider providing more opportunities for the staff to conduct the activities that are considered to be those most needed, which are conducting research, writing test items, and writing modules.

5. A "staff development system coordinated by each faculty", such as respondents suggested as the best staff development system for UT, also should be considered for application at UT.

6. Job rotation probably should be considered by UT's management as a strategy to help the academics get the same opportunity to be involved in academic activities, since the majority of the academics mentioned that work overloads was one the factors that postponed their career advancement.

7. information system at UT need improved since many academics complained about missing opportunities to be involved in academic activities due to not being informed.

REFERENCES

Anwyland, J. and Bowden, J. Attitudes of Australian university and college academics to some access and equity issues, including distance education. (1986). Distance Education, 2(1), 106-128.

Armour, R.A., Caffarella, R.S., Fuhrmann, B.S., Wergin, J.F. (1987). Academic Burnout: Faculty Responsibility and Institutional Climate. New Directional for Teaching and Learning, 29, 3-11.

Beaudom, M. The instructor's Changing Role in Distance Education. (1990). The American Journal of Distance Education, 4(2), 21-29.

Beeby, C.E. (1979). Assessment of Indonesia Education: A Guide in Planning. New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington: Oxford University Press.

Black, J.E. Faculty Support for University Distance Education (1992). Journal of Distance Education, 2(2), 5-29.

Blackburn, R. T. and Baldwin, R. G.: Faculty as Human Resources: Reality and Potensial. (1983). New Directions for Institutional Research, 10(4), 5-14.

Carrafella, R.S., Duning, B., and Patrick, S. Delivering off-campus instruction: Changing roles and responsibilities of professors in higher education (1992). Continuing Higher Education Review, 56(3), 155-167.

Costello, N. Organisational cultures and distance learning. (1993). Open Learning, 8. (2), 3-11.

Cummings, T. G. and Huse, E. F. (1989) Organization Development and Change (4th edition). West Publishing Company, St. Paul, Minessota.

Djalil, A. (1988). The Indonesia Open Learning University: A Case Study. Jakarta, Indonesia: Research and Community Service Centre of Universitas Terbuka

Fullan, M. (1991). The New Meaning of Educational Change,(2nd edition). Teachers College Columbia University: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. G. (1990). Staff Development, Innovation, and Institutional Development. In Bruce Joice (Ed.), Changing School Culture Through Staff Development. Alexandria, VA.: ASCD (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development).

Halloran, J. and Benton, D. (1987). Applied Human Resources: an organizational approach, (3rd edition). Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Henderson, B. B. and Kane, W. D. (1991). Caught in the middle: faculty and institutional status and quality in state comprehensive universities. Higher Education, 22, 339-350.

Hinson, S., Caidwell, M.S., and Landrum, M. (1989). Characteristics of effective staff development programs. Journal of Staff Development, 10(2), 48-52.

Holdzkon, D. and Kaligowski, B. (1989) Measuring the effects of staff development. The Journal ofStaffDevelopment, 1(9), 10-12.

La.mond, D. A. (1994) Human Resource Development at Universitas Terbuka. Jakarta, Indonesia: OLA-UT.

Lewis, R. and Hibbert, C. Meeting individual and organizational needs (1980).HRD-Human Resource Development: An International Journal, 4(4), MCB Publications.

Lewis, R. Approahes to staffdevelopment in open learning: the role of acompetence framework. (1992). Open Learning: The Journal of Open and Distance Education, 2(3), 20-33.

Li, P. S. (198 1). Social Research Methods: An introduction. Toronto, Ontario: Butterworth.

McGuire, S. M. (1988). Learning the Ropes: Academics in a Distance Education University. Journal of Distance Education, 1(1), 57-72.

Ministry of Education and Culture ofthe Republic of Indonesia. (1990). Sistem Pendidikan Nasional U1J RI, Nomor 2/1989 beserta Peraturan Pelaksanannya1990. (The National Education System Act Number 2/1989 and the Operational Regulation 1990). Jakarta, Indonesia: Ministiy Education and Culture.

Ministry of Education and Culture ofthe Republic ofIndonesia. (1991). Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun ke V 1989/1990-1993/1994. (Five Year Development Plan V 1989/1990-1993/1994). Jakarta, Indonesia: Ministry of Education and Culture.

Ministry Education and Culture ofthe Republic ofIndonesia. (1991). Pendidikan di Indonesia 1991. (Education in Indonesia 1991). Jakarta, Indonesia: Ministryof Education and Culture.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). The Structuring ofOrganization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Nhundu, T. J. (1992). Job performance, Role Clarity, and Satisfaction Among Teacher Interns in the Edmonton Public School System. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 3.8. (4), 335-354.

Pfiffner, M. J. (1960). Administrative Organization, (6th Edition). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Pfiffner, M. J. and Sherwood, J. (1965). The Supervision ofPersonneL Human Relation in the Management ofMen, (2nd Edition). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Rigors, P and Myers, C. A. (1977). Personnel Administration: Apoint of view and a method, (8th Edition). MCGraw Hill Book Company.

Scriven, B. Open Learning/Training: Staff attitudes to external studies. (1986). Media in Educational and Development, 19(4), 178-193.

Setijadi. (1989). Indonesia: Universitas Terbuka. Prospect, 2(18), 189-197.

Siaciwena, R.M.C. Staff Attitudes Towards Distance Education at the University of Zambia. (1989). Journal of Distance Education, 4(2), 47-62.

Spark, D. The keys to effective staffdevelopment. (1992). Principal, fl(3), 43-44.

Spilperman, S. and Lunde, T. (1991). Educational attainment and job promotion. American Journal of Sociology, 91(3), 689-720.

Steinhart, K. (1988). Increasing faculty involvement in distance teaching. In D. Sewart & J.S. Daniel (Eds.). Developing Distance Education. Oslo: International Council for Distance Education, 412-415.

Stevens, M. P. (1990). School climate of staff development: Keys to school reform. NASSP Bulletin, 11(529), 8.

Stoddart, J. (1977). Staff development and course development in the public sector of higher education. in L. Elton and K. Sirnmmonds (eds.). Staff Development in Higher Education. Guilford, Surrey: Society for Research into Higher Education Ltd. at the University of Surrey.

Strain, J. (1983). The Role ofthe Faculty Member in Distance Education. The American Journal of Distance Education: Media and Adult Learning, 1(2), 61- 65

Tamat, T. (1991). Pola pengembangan karier bagi staffUniversitas Terbuka. (Path for career development ofUniversitas Terbuka's staff). Unpublished paper.

Taylor, J.C. and White, V.J. (1991). Faculty Attitudes Towards Teachingin the Distance Education. Research in Distance Education, 3.(3), 7-1 1.

Universitas Terbuka (1988). Keputusan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 095/U/1989 tentang Angka Kredit Jabatan Pengajar. (Ministiy of Education and Culture Regulation Number 095/U/1988 about Academic Point Scale Rating). Jakarta, Indonesia: Universitas Terbuka.

Universitas Terbuka. (1989). Lima tahun Universitas Terbuka (1984-1989). (Five years Universitas Terbuka). Jakarta, Indonesia: Universitas Terbuka.

Universitas Terbuka. (1992). Kebijaksanaan-kebjjaksanaan Universitas Terbuka. (Policies ofUniversitas Terbuka). (Special edition of "Suara Terbuka"). No. 1. Jakarta, Indonesia, Universitas Terbuka.

Universitas Terbuka. (1992). Garis Besar Rencana Induk Pengembangan Universitas Terbuka 1992-2000. (A Master Plan of Universitas Terbuka Development 1992-2000).(Special edition of ~Suara Terbuka"). No.2. Jakarta, Indonesia, Universitas Terbuka.