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Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to illuminate the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism. It aims to examine how managerial discourses affect academic professionalism and the role played by manager-academics.

The research surveyed full-time academic staff at chartered and statutory universities. Employing a mixed methodology and stratified random sampling, a focus group and interviews at various institutions were followed by a quantitative survey in which 7,000 full-time staff were invited to participate; 708 responded. The methodology enabled a comparative analysis of variables such as institutional type, rank, gender and number of years employed as an academic across various structuring contexts including workload, managerialism and professionalism.

Mirroring earlier literature, the current research indicates worsening conditions across the sector in terms of workload, bureaucracy, prescription and finding time for research. The contribution of this research is the discovery that despite greater demands, academics appear resilient, demonstrating a high level of normative professionalism and surprisingly little instrumentality. They appear generally ambivalent towards managerialism in universities, tending to blame broader societal and political changes for the worsening conditions. Manager-academics were not rated well however, and were not generally seen as supportive.

The implications of these findings for public policy and institutional middle management are discussed. It is concluded that academics are perhaps more resilient than earlier studies suggest; that they can be expected to resist managerial activities that threaten their values and autonomy and that hitherto they have been relatively successful in defending their professionalism. It is suggested that efforts now should be directed towards ensuring that the cadre of professional administrators appointed by universities over the last decade or so actually deal with the administration, allowing academics to concentrate on pedagogy. It is also further suggested that manager-academics abandon bureaucracy as a mode of indirect control and develop more ‘hands on’ social skills to enable them to manage in a consultative, inclusive and motivating manner. For their part, academics need to be cognizant of the political discourses challenging their professionalism and how new forms of accountability might be built upon to enhance trust, motivation, reflexivity and democratic dialogue in an era driven by economic rationality.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.0 Background

This thesis is concerned with the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism in English universities. It explores the response of academics to managerial axioms in universities that promote accountability, quality, efficiency and value for money. Additionally, it seeks to provide useful pointers for manager-academics on how to improve departmental management by adopting appropriate techniques to support and motivate academic staff. It should be stated at the outset that the use of the term 'managerialism' is not intended pejoratively (as may be suggested by some of the extant literature). On the contrary, the researcher approaches the subject with an open mind. There will be no attempt force the data to 'prove' or 'disprove' any hypotheses – rather to explore, tentatively, the way in which incumbent role-holders define their everyday reality as academics working in modern universities. To some extent the thesis presents an ideal model of professionalism and it may be that universities never supported this. But one assumes that in the past there was an understanding (implicit, or otherwise) of what it meant to be an academic. The current research seeks to explore whether academics perceive their role to be changing. Are they in the process of re-defining their professionalism, and if so in what way? Are they content in their work or stressed and, if the latter, are they consciously employing coping strategies?

There is little doubt that higher education in England has changed significantly since the 1980s when neoliberal discourses were introduced to the public sector. Since then higher education has expanded rapidly and extensively and evolved new ways of operating in response to funding constraints, quasi-market conditions and managerialism. England is not unique in this respect. According to Willmott (2003: 129), in advanced societies higher education is caught up in extensive ideological and organisational shifts precipitated by pressures to demonstrate its contribution to processes of capital accumulation normally articulated as national wealth generation. In the UK, regardless of their political hue, governments have steadily exposed universities to neoliberal, market-oriented, managerial discourses in a quest to improve efficiency and accountability. Simultaneously universities have been granted greater self-direction, yet in becoming more self-managed have found themselves almost universally embracing principles, structures and systems more traditionally associated with private sector organisations. It is
claimed by Wilson (1991), Willmott (1995) Simkins (1999), Halsey (1992), Hartley (1995), Parker and Jary (1995) and Chandler et al (2002), that formal systems of hierarchical line management challenge the established order of the academy, creating tensions, threatening autonomy and reducing the professional status of academic staff. No such position is assumed in this research. It is not assumed that managerialism necessarily erodes the autonomy or professionalism of academics. The starting point is to assume that academics find some way of rationalising and adjusting to changing conditions. Further, that they continue to pursue their personal and professional objectives and, unless these conflict directly with the objectives of their institutions that employ them, in the main they are allowed to ‘get on with it’. That stated, this research does not presuppose any particular outcome. Whilst one begins with a series of propositions generated from the relevant literature, one must be open to all suggested outcomes, however unexpected. As much as one may expect to find that the senses of professionalism have altered, it may also be that academics are developing new understanding of their role and negotiating new conditions in which to work. It may well be that the research exposes that mangerialism does indeed constrain professionalism, perhaps in ways that have not been exposed in the literature. If so, there will be no attempt to disguise such outcomes – they will be given credence, within the context of this as an exploratory study seeking to add to the existing body of knowledge.

1.1 The Significance of the Research

At the outset, this study accepts the premise that the academic profession exists in its own right (although academics may be affiliated simultaneously to other professional bodies). In Henkel’s (2000) analysis, the concept of academic professionalism is relatively new, having developed in response to political and institutional transformations of the last quarter of the 20th century. Prior to that, concepts of academic identity were much more concerned with distinctiveness and individual reputation. Structuring imperatives throughout society have imposed professionalism upon the academic community. For the purposes of this thesis it is accepted that there exists a community of scholars who engage with their environment and each other in such a way that they may be deemed to be part of a common ‘profession’. The academic profession comprises individuals who share the specialised knowledge and expertise of educators in addition to knowledge and expertise in their chosen discipline. It shares a number of key characteristics with other professions, for example, admittance requires a significant period of training, apprenticeship and
socialisation into behavioural and ethical norms. Once admitted, individuals can expect a relatively high level of autonomy and self-direction, however in return they are expected to adhere to standards and codes of practice established by professional associations where these exist (Middlehurst 1993:50, drawing upon Johnson, 1972; Jarvis, 1983; Downie, 1990). Culturally, universities exhibit the features of organisations employing professionals, namely reliance upon expertise as a key source of influence, authority gained through seniority and expertise, a sense of shared norms and common interests, and relative autonomy (Middlehurst, 1993). Whilst arguments about the precise nature of academic professionalism may well continue, what is in focus here is the outcome of moving from elitist to mass higher education and of being subjected to increasingly stringent financial constraints and market-oriented, means-end discourses.

This study seeks to add new knowledge to the field by challenging assumptions in the existing literature. In aggregate, much of the literature professes that academics are becoming demoralised and struggling to maintain their professional status in the face of ever-greater prescription (Halsey, 1992; Hartley, 1995; Barry et al, 2001; Chandler et al, 2002). Loss of autonomy and an atmosphere of performativity are said to stifle creativity and cause stress. Some studies suggest that academics view management as a direct threat to academic autonomy and professionalism (Zipin and Brennan, 2003; Parker and Jary, 1995). Whilst the bulk of the literature promotes this proposition, in fact it is supported by few empirical studies. Studies by Bryson (2004) and Clegg and McAuley (2005) suggest that collegiate/managerialist dualism is overstated, that managers have been instrumental in alleviating some potentially damaging executive action and external policy and that academics are not as demotivated as suggested. Pragmatically, as professionals, and in line with other professions, academics have little choice but to adapt to changing conditions. Essentially, they can either construct a new professional identity in relation to managerialist discourses (Du Gay, 1994; Nixon, 2001a) or, maintaining their existing identity, simply develop strategies which allow them to make sense of the changing context and carry on as before (Hargreaves, 1994; Trowler, 1998; Weick, 2001).

Exworthy and Halford (1999) argue that professionals have always been subject to political and organisational constraints. As such, any current change in view and behaviour may simply be symptomatic of an ongoing fragmentation of collectives, with individuals increasingly pursuing their own agenda in response to changing organisational conditions. This view is consistent with late-modern thought (see work by Giddens, 1979;
1990; 1991 and Beck, 2000; 2001; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2002) which observes the ascendancy of individualism, self-reliance and pluralism. As reactions to change are essentially intensely individualistic and subjective, one would anticipate highly variable responses (Hargreaves 1994; Halford and Savage, 1995; Woods, 1981). It is due to this variability and the lack of detailed, empirical studies that, despite the bleak picture painted in much of the literature, academics' responses to managerial discourses remain opaque overall.

The starting point of this research, following Hargreaves (1994) and Trowler (1998), is to question whether, as opposed to simply becoming increasingly stressed, academics are making sense of and adapting to the changing environment. Thus, the primary research proposition of this thesis is that politically-driven changes – specifically the expansion of higher education, requirement for greater productivity, competition for funds, and line management modes of organising universities - have impacted only marginally upon the professionalism of academic staff. It is proposed that as relatively intelligent, rational beings, academics instrumentally develop strategies to make sense of the changing conditions and protect their professional identity. If this proposition is supported, the research will also seek to explore what strategies they employ to achieve this.

As an initial working hypothesis it is anticipated that individual responses will be influenced to a large degree by local management practices and styles. As Bottery (1992:2) observes:

a fair proportion of the literature treats the management of schools (or of any institution, for that matter) as neutral and unproblematical, as nothing more than the means of implementation for purposes decided elsewhere ...

... when in fact intensely subjective judgements and values play a large part in the design and implementation of management practices.

In Willmott’s (1987) analysis, prominent and influential studies of managerial work have generally disregarded or trivialized institutional realities and significance. The management literature in the main acknowledges political influence, yet studies tend to detach organisations from their social and political context. A more rounded, realistic perspective is sought by Giddens’s (1979) structuration theory which analyses the relationship between structure and social practices. According to Giddens, structure is
conceptualised as a duality – a medium as well as an outcome of (managerial) action understood to reside within social practices. As such, the approach is more constructivist, complex and realistic than much of the management literature. Echoing this approach, Willmott (1987:260) states:

From a strategic standpoint managers are, through their deployment of resources and rules, actively engaged in accomplishing and restructuring regularized relations of interdependence between themselves and with other groups.

This is an important concept within the context of the current research since the relationship between managerialism and professionalism is not conceived as linear, but web-like and interdependent. As such, variation is anticipated within and between universities in terms of practices of accountability and control, scope for autonomy and self-direction, and relations between manager-academics and academic staff. Further, it is anticipated that such variations are not down to management practices alone, but to a greater or lesser degree to the informal, social relations and, crucially, the extent to which academics feel supported by manager-academics. Recognising a number of influential variables, Trowler (2001) goes as far as to hypothesise bilingual responses to managerialism which may be employed or dropped according to context. Thus, at this point a wide variety of responses is anticipated, within as well as between institutions. Against this background, this study therefore sets out to investigate the reaction of academics to changing conditions and to explore the extent to which they consider their professionalism threatened.

1.2 Research Aims and Objectives

This thesis therefore aims to investigate senses of professionalism amongst the current cohort of academics in England today. It aims to further the existing body of knowledge about the management of higher education. It will investigate how academics see their roles changing, whether they see their professional status as having changed, and if so how, and the sense in which they conceive of themselves as professionals today. It seeks to contribute to the field of higher education management research by employing mixed methods to collect data from a range of institutions and, in doing so, draws upon frameworks and methods from other disciplines. It is hoped that the research will provide some pointers for manager-academics on how to support and motivate academic staff.
Finally, it aims to derive robust recommendations which may well be of interest to those involved in universities, whether academic staff, managers or policy-makers.

In achieving these broad aims, the research has a number of specific objectives. Firstly, it seeks to investigate the effect of sector expansion in terms of academics' perceptions of workload. It then seeks to identify whether academics perceive conflict between government policy, managerial objectives and their own professional goals; whether they feel as stressed and disillusioned as the literature suggests; and how they are adapting to changing conditions. It identifies whether academics consider managerialism as positive, negative or neutral in terms of their personal experience. In doing so, it is intended to identify whether academics feel that their work is now more prescribed than in the past, whether autonomy is being eroded, and whether systems of accountability appear to constrain academic freedom. In relation to this last point, the research explores whether there is a general view that the burden of administration has grown as a result of formal systems of accountability. If so, what are the implications of this? Is it difficult to find time for research, is research constrained either by time pressures and/or increasing prescription? Do academics instrumentally develop strategies to cope with increasing workloads and external demands, and, if so, what are these strategies? It seeks also to identify how academics define their professional identity and ascertain whether they believe that hierarchical, managerial modes of organising threaten or support academic professionalism. Also, to explore whether academics are consciously adopting coping strategies to deal with increasing workloads and greater constraints, and if so, identify what these are. It seeks to identify good management practice with academic departments. Finally, it is intended to draw some meaningful conclusions and make predictions about future prospects for academic professionalism.

One important qualification should be made at the outset. In investigating the professional identity of academics, no distinctions are made between academics in different subject groups in this research. This is because to do so would have required a much larger study and the intention was to get a general overview of the state of academic professionalism as a whole. In pursuing this approach this study follows earlier research by Deem and Johnson (2000), Henkel (2000), the Carnegie Foundation Report (1994) (which surveyed Professors) and the Dearing Report No. 3 (1997), all of which sought to glean general impressions of the sector as a whole.
1.3 Research Design

In pursuing these aims and objectives, the early part of the thesis traces the emergence of neoliberalism as a political discourse and the accompanying changes in power relations between the State, universities and academic staff. The literature review traces how neoliberalism has influenced the governance of higher education since the 1980s, leading to a rapid expansion in student populations, year on year cuts in State funding, market-oriented models of resource allocation and competition, the commodification of university degrees, and the embedding of managerialist discourses within universities. Broadly following a Foucauldian epistemology it provides an essentially historically-constituted overview of governmentality in higher education, focusing upon how power relations between academics, universities and the State have changed over time.

The literature review begins by observing that the ongoing changes to the governance of higher education stem from the rise of neoliberalism during the Thatcher era. Spurred by the economic crisis of the 1970s and the collapse of welfare capitalism, Thatcher's governments embraced neoliberalism as the basis of economic governance. Characterised by a market orientation, deregulation of the private sector, privatisation of public sector enterprises and a shift in the role of the State from provider to regulator, neoliberal economics has had an enormous influence on the political governance of higher education. Competitor-oriented resource allocation, competition for students, targets and benchmarks, top-up fees, new kinds of leadership in universities (for example many Vice-Chancellors are now also 'Chief Executive'), a growing cadre of senior and middle managers with loyalty to the institution rather than faculties or departments, greater external representation on governing bodies, executive-led systems of consultation and communication, and a shift from bureaucratic-professional models to consumer-managerial models of accountability - these features are all symptomatic of neoliberal governance. A historical overview is provided in the following chapter; at this point it is worth noting that the authority of the State is augmented through invoking market mechanisms and shifting role from provider to regulator, fundamentally changing its relations with universities and the academics working within them.

The literature review also employs a broadly Foucauldian critique, exposing how underlying power relations have changed over time. In contrast to critique in the Frankfurt tradition, Foucauldian critique does not seek to expose any underlying 'truth',
but is pragmatic and pluralist in orientation. For the rationalists of the Frankfurt School, power is a *thing*: something which can be possessed and exerted *over* others. For Foucault, following Nietzsche, power is a *process*, fluid and dynamic, not possessed by one and exerted over another, but something that exists in a *web* of relations. Foucault’s variant of critique employs his theoretical notion of discursive practices ‘based on a minute and detailed analysis of practices that make particular forms of historical practice possible’ (Olssen, 2006: 137). This study is too general to claim to be a ‘minute and detailed analysis’; rather, what it seeks to broadly employ a Foucauldian approach to critique to identify changing relations of power within the field of higher education and to expose how discursive practices which evolve over time impact upon the academic professionalism. The approach is informed by Foucault’s concept of governmentality and technologies of control. Under traditional liberal models of governance the professions were recognised by a high degree of independence, self-regulation, autonomy and occupational control of work. Over the last twenty years or so the professions have increasingly been affected by politically-driven changes in structures and systems of accountability. In Foucauldian studies, how governmentality constitutes subjectivities is understood through technologies of power and practices of self. In neoliberalism this is expressed in the understanding that individuals will be responsible for themselves, that they will embrace risk and accept change. Such a change signals a consumerist orientation and a requirement for professions to reconstitute themselves and create new relationships in an ever-changing society of ‘supercomplexity’ (Barnett, 2000). The extent to which universities, and the academics working within them, are affected by neoliberal governmentality is explored in the later stages of the literature review.

Following the review of the literature, the research design is based upon the study of changes in social structure and observed interactions, inferences and beliefs, as illustrated in figure 1.1 overleaf:
Whilst simple, it is also appropriate since the issues under investigation lie at the interface between social structuralism and subjective interpretation, the former being relatively rigid and the latter relatively fluid. As such, the ‘observed interaction’ is operationalised not literally through observation of academics going about their work, but through direct input from academic staff concerning their thoughts, perceptions, judgements and beliefs about the interaction between themselves and the social structure within which they operate. The approach is Foucauldian in that it traces attitudes to neoliberal discourses and how they are changing as material conditions and social structures change.

It must be recognised that what is being probed here is individuals’ ‘espoused theory of action’ – that is, ‘the theory of action to which he gives allegiance, and which, upon request, he communicates to others’ (Argyris and Schön, 1974: 7). The theory that actually governs an individual’s actions is his ‘theory in use’, which may or may not be compatible with his espoused theory (Argyris and Schön, 1974). Furthermore, the individual may or may not even be aware of any incompatibility of the two. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to explore the hidden psychology of any such incompatibility, if it exists in individual cases, however it is important to note that individuals who are motivated enough to participate in the research are assumed for the purposes of this study to be giving voice to their espoused theories of action. Since this is not an action research study, respondents have not been observed going about their work and their responses are taken at face value in the first instance. The theory of action approach is a valuable starting point for this study since it begins with the conception of human beings as sense-
makers of their environment and designers of action. These two processes are crucial to understanding academics’ responses to change. In Agryris’ (1999: 241) view:

Agents design action to achieve intended consequences and monitor themselves to learn whether their actions are effective. They make sense of their environment by constructing meanings to which they attend, and these constructions guide action. In monitoring the effectiveness of action, they also monitor the suitability of their construction of the environment.

Underpinning this study is the assumption that in making sense of their experiences, creating meanings, rationalising changing contexts, formulating actions, monitoring the effectiveness of the chosen actions and reflecting upon them academics form perceptions and develop attitudes – and it is these that are explored in this research.

1.4 Structure of the Thesis

This chapter provides an outline of the background and reasons for the research. Chapters Two – Five contain a review of the salient literature: Chapter Two sets the scene, providing a short overview of the rise of neoliberalism and its influence on higher education before tracing and discussing the expansion of the sector, funding cuts, and the marketisation and commodification of higher education in recent decades. Chapter Three outlines and discusses the concept of managerialism and New Public Management, tracing how managerial discourses came to become embedded in modern universities. Chapter Four contains an essentially Foucauldian critique of technologies of power and practices of the self at large in English universities today. Chapter Five is concerned with academic professionalism and evaluates to what extent academic profession may be seen to be subjected to proletarianisation and deprofessionalisation. It considers whether, in view of the significant and ongoing changes to academic work, the academic profession could now be better described as a ‘semi-profession’. Chapter Six provides an overview of the research epistemology and onotology and details the research methodology employed in the empirical study. Chapter Seven presents participants’ responses and comments briefly on the main outcomes relating to each research proposition. Chapter Eight contains a discussion and analysis of the findings in relation to the literature. In Chapter Nine, the final chapter, the implications of the findings are presented along with a discussion of how this study may inform existing theory and contribute to the existing
body of knowledge. The limitations of the study are presented as well as some suggestions for further research. Final reflections conclude the chapter.
Chapter 2: Neoliberalism and Higher Education

2.0 Introduction

This chapter contains an analysis of the development of higher education in England over the last three decades, since it was during the Thatcher era that a number of significant political decisions were made that continue to shape higher education policy to this day. Echoing Schuerich’s (1994) Foucauldian approach, the aim is to explore the 'historical a priori' of policy agendas and to investigate the rules of formation of policy choices in order to gain insight into the conditions of their realisation. Epistemologically the brief is broad and draws upon the body of knowledge concerning the rise of neoliberalism and consequent changes to the role and character of higher education in the post-modern era. Following Scott (1997), it is argued here that the expansion and changing expectations of the scope, role and contribution of higher education is not an isolated phenomenon, but part of a profound transformation of the late-modern world. Governments in the developed world now look beyond national borders, embracing neoliberal discourses which conceive higher education as wealth creators in a competitive, global market. As Simkins (1999) observes, there is now an inexorable link between the macro-context of national policy and the micro-context of the educational institution. This chapter attempts to demonstrate the link.

The aim of this chapter is to trace the evolution of political discourses affecting university governance over recent decades to provide a meaningful contextualisation for the empirical research that follows. The approach is well rehearsed – Slaughter and Leslie (1997); Marginson (2000); Marginson and Considine (2000); Noble (2002) and Delanty (2001) have all employed similar. It outlines the rise of neoliberal governmentality and traces how funding cuts changed the face of higher education, arguing that these were not simply down to political expediency but symptomatic of a more fundamental embrace of market, consumer-oriented and managerial discourses. It concludes with an analysis of the implications for power relations between universities and the State.
2.1 The Rise of Neoliberalism

Marketisation, commodification and managerial governance of higher education are rooted in the ascendancy of neoliberalism during the last decades of the twentieth century. Neoliberalism emerged from the Chicago School, gaining credibility after the collapse of the international monetary framework, the Bretton Woods agreement, in 1971. Subsequent slumps across a number of developed economies (including the UK), characterised by a slowdown in growth, high inflation and a steep rise in unemployment further fuelled its acceptance as a viable model of economic governance. Traditional Keynesian economics seemed unable to cope with the seemingly contradictory problems of concurrent rises in both inflation and unemployment, leading to the emergence of a monetarism as a way of bringing inflation under control. This essentially signaled the decline of the welfare state and the demise of welfare economics, which had been the preferred model of economic governance since the Second World War. The aim of welfare economics was to maximise the social welfare of the nation (assumed to be the aggregate of maximising the marginal utility of individuals). This was to be achieved by balancing economic efficiency with income distribution, and an important role of government was to maximise social welfare through resource allocation. As such, welfare economics was essentially interventionist. In contrast, neoliberalism entailed a withdrawal of the State from many activities which could be provided by the private sector — in some cases so radical that Mishra (1999) describes it as a hollowing-out, downsizing and retrenching of the welfare and social State.

The challenge to welfare economics came from both left and right (Gamble, 2000), but the most successful came from neoliberals who promoted monetarism as the best way of achieving macroeconomic stability. Abandoning full employment and economic growth as goals, neoliberals instead prioritised control of inflation, reduction of public spending and taxation, elimination of public sector borrowing, privatisation of public sector enterprises and private sector deregulation (Gamble, 2000: 123). In common with traditional liberalism, neoliberalism emphasises the benefits of the free market; in stark contrast it demonstrates an antipathy towards state involvement in economic exchange. The central tenet of neoliberalism is the belief that the State cannot be assumed to be an impartial and omnipotent social guardian; instead it should be viewed as an organisation run by self-seeking politicians and bureaucrats who are not only limited in their ability to collect information and execute policies but are also under pressure from interest groups
Neoliberals argue that the costs of government failures in the forms of regulatory capture, rent-seeking and corruption are typically greater than the costs of market failure, therefore it is better for the State not to try to correct market failure but to withdraw to a much more inactive role. Advocates argue that 'the free market... achieves the highest degree of utility possible for each person' (Herbener 1997: 106) and, thus, neoliberalism calls for the de-politicisation of the market.

In Mishra's (1999) analysis, it was the American decision in 1971 to end monetary convertibility that effectively ended the Bretton Woods system. In 1974 the United States abolished capital controls, followed by the UK in 1979. By then neoliberal economics was in the ascendancy. When most OECD countries abandoned capital controls in the 1990s and money and capital were free to move across national borders, neoliberalism was firmly established as the only system capable of delivering economic growth. In the global economy, national governments have essentially lost control of their borders; crucially, both the welfare state and Keynesian macroeconomic management depend upon a relatively closed national economy which can be regulated by national government. In contrast, the global market has no such boundaries and nation states are deprived of viable alternatives to neoliberal and monetarist policies (Mishra, 1999: 6). It is generally acknowledged that the predominance of neoliberal deregulation within the discourse of globalisation is attributable to the power and influence of the United States, supported by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank – and that the discourse is becoming more pervasive. Spurred on by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the IMF, industrialised nations have little option but to pursue policies of liberalisation, deregulation, privatisation and commodification in the name of flexibility and international competitiveness in a global world.

For some, globalisation is nothing more than an economic constitution, which Gamble (2000: 115) defines as 'a distillation of dominant practices and doctrines which define the parameters within which the governing of the economy takes place in a particular period. It reflects the political purposes of particular agents as well as the distribution of political power between groups'. As such, globalisation is deliberately neoliberal; after all, there are several routes to flexibility and competitiveness (Mishra, 1999). As Marginson and Considine (2000: 46) observe, 'in some respects, globalisation is not necessarily neo-liberal at all....there is nothing inherently neo-liberal about faster transport or better communications.' Through this lens it is of some interest that neoliberal reforms are
lauded and their consequences seen as most beneficial, whilst social benefits such as unemployment insurance and social assistance are identified as 'distorting' labour markets and preventing 'adaptation' to change (Mishra, 1999: 10). As such, neoliberalism is a political discourse; a socially constructed, institutionalised way of thinking, promoted by supranational organisations and employed instrumentally to define and produce the objects of society's knowledge. For neoliberals, the end goals of freedom, choice, consumer sovereignty, competition and individual initiative, as well as those of compliance and obedience, must be constructions of the State acting in a positive role through the development of techniques of auditing, accounting and management. Lash (2003) writes of 'in-sourcing', referring to a reallocation of functions and responsibilities from the State to the individual, such that regulation may be undertaken at a distance. It is these techniques, as Barry et al (1996: 14) observes, '... that enable the marketplace for services to be established as 'autonomous' from central control. Neoliberalism, in these terms, involves less a retreat from governmental “intervention” that a re-inscription of the techniques and forms of expertise required for the exercise of government.'

For universities, the effects of neoliberal discourses are apparent. The formation of artificial markets, competitive resource allocation, competition for students, performance targets, league tables, commodification of degrees and managerial discourses in universities are all symptomatic of a belief in the primacy of market forces. Further evidence of neoliberal ideology is the growth of the regulatory role of the State in higher education governance through the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, and initiatives such as the National Student Survey, accompanied by greater emphasis on individual and institutional accountability. Government policy over the last thirty years or so clearly reflects a change of role for universities from seats of learning educating an elite for private gain to institutions charged with the responsibility for ensuring that young people are educated enough to be able to contribute actively to the 'knowledge economy' (Drucker, 1994) in a globalised world. For Kenway et al (1993), we are witnessing a de-nationalisation and reshaping of education and this is nothing more than a splintering of the cultural dominance of the commodity (and, as such, to be welcomed). Similarly, from a Schumpeterian perspective fragmentation and change are not to be feared or resisted, but welcomed as route to economic growth and national prosperity.
2.2 University Funding and the 'Marketisation' of Higher Education

2.2.1. Early 1980s

According to Nixon (2001a: 74), the challenges facing universities must be understood historically. Traditionally, higher education has been founded on two axioms; an epistemological axiom concerned with objective knowledge and recognised truths, and a sociological axiom which acknowledges that objective knowledge is most effectively maintained and disseminated in institutions which are relatively autonomous (Barnett, 1990: 10). With the formation of a Conservative government in 1979 under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher, a marked change occurred in the political governance of higher education. Essentially, universities were required to retrench in the name of cost-cutting and efficiency. The means-end orthodoxy of the neoliberal, neo-conservative ‘New Right’ challenged the sociological axiom of higher education by augmenting the importance of economic outcomes. Congruent with neoliberal ideology, market forces were proposed as the major determinants in life chances and educators in the public sector were made to compete with other suppliers. Market standards were employed to determine their success or failure (Bottery, 2000: 30).

Since resources are finite, 'market' describes the process by which individuals' decisions about consumption of alternative goods, firms' decisions about what and how much to produce, and workers' decisions about how much and for whom to work are all reconciled through the price mechanism (Jongbloed, 2003: 111, drawing upon Begg et al, 2001: 8). According to economic theory, in a free market prices are set at the point at which demand and supply are in equilibrium; in the artificially created conditions of the quasi-market in higher education the price of a degree is more complex involving subsidy, perceptions of value and satisfaction, competition and value for money. The concept of 'market' in higher education refers not to one single market, but a series; for students, research staff, lecturers, research grants and scholarships, donations, graduates and company training (Jongbloed, 2003: 111). As such, it is an intensely complicated environment which does not easily accommodate policies based on free market ideology. Notwithstanding the inherent complexity, as we shall see below successive governments have succeeded in introducing a market orientation to higher education through the dual support funding mechanism and, most recently, tuition fees for undergraduate courses (postgraduate courses having operated under relatively free market conditions for some
Most recently, the introduction of differential tuition fees for undergraduate degrees effectively increases the influence of the 'consumer' (students) in the exchange; with funding following students one may anticipate that universities will have to become still more responsive to student demands. The recent closure of several Physics departments across the country may well be followed by other relatively unpopular subjects as universities adjust their offerings in response to changing consumer tastes.

Since the early 1980s neoliberal, market-oriented policies have been favoured by successive UK governments in a quest to expand student choice and improve the quality and variety of services offered by providers of higher education. The overall objective is to encourage providers to pay more attention to students and innovation in teaching and research whilst simultaneously aiming to increase efficiency. In this way both institutions and students will be more aware of the consequences of their decisions in terms of costs (Jongbloed, 2003: 113). In the early 1980s central control over universities increased significantly as the emphasis turned to expansion alongside funding cuts in the name of greater efficiency and productivity. In July 1979 the Department of Education and Science (DES) asked the University Grants Committee (UGC) for its views on the effects of a number of funding assumptions. The UGC consulted the universities and who voiced concern that funding reductions would cause chaos and inefficiencies (Moore, 1996: 188). The UGC presented this view in its response to the DES. Notwithstanding the concerns expressed in the report, subsidies for overseas entrants were removed in 1980, causing a de facto cut of some 10% over the period 1980–83 (Moore, 1996: 189). To maintain income universities had to raise fees for overseas students and continue to attract similar numbers.

At the end of 1980 the Secretary of State then announced a cut in the recurrent grant for home students of 3.5% for the year 1981–82. Taken in conjunction with the earlier cut, this meant that the potential average reduction for the year was likely to be around 5–6% (Moore, 1996: 189). The UGC had little influence on government policy, resulting in a series of real funding cuts of around 8.5% per annum during the three-year period 1981–1984 (Moore, 1996: 189). The number of entrants was cut by almost 10% in aggregate, but the greatest challenge for the UGC was how to implement the cuts across the sector. According to Shattock (1989: 34), 'Within three days of Mrs. Thatcher's taking office in 1979, £100 million were cut overnight from the universities' budgets, and, between 1980 and 1984, 17% was removed from the grants made by government to the UGC.' The
result was short-term upheaval – according to Moore (1996: 192), in some cases so
focused on short-term expediency that many staff were paid off to save immediate cash
only for their universities to recruit in exactly the same subject areas a few years later.
This clearly represented a significant change in government policy towards universities
which was bound to alter the nature of the hitherto relatively harmonious, partnership­
based relations between Government and the UGC as well as power relations between the
two. It also changed relations between universities as the UGC pursued a policy of
differential cuts across the sector based on various performance measures, specifically
GCE A level entry scores, perceptions of research quality, unit costs, the distribution of
academic staff and their ages, and the relevant student numbers in the different subject
areas (Shattock, 2003: 2). In Moore's analysis (1996: 190) the UGC's motivation for
selectivity was to retain what it felt was good in the system; whilst for Shattock (2003: 2)
as well as protecting science and technology numbers the UGC was also keen to preserve
the unit of resource and correct previous imbalances. For some institutions the outcomes
were dramatic, with funding cuts of more than 25 per cent over a four year period.

Following the 1981 watershed, whilst the cuts were being implemented, in 1983 the
Secretary of State asked the UGC for advice on the issues facing higher education over
the next ten years. Having consulted the universities, in September 1984 the UGC
submitted to the DES a report entitled A Strategy for Higher Education into the
1990s. The response from the DES in the form of a Green Paper (1985) was 'a grave
disappointment to all working in higher education' (Moore, 1996: 193). Essentially, it
measured higher education in terms of its extrinsic monetary value and referred to
provision being determined in terms of what the country could afford, taking into account
other claims on resources. Whilst the Green Paper was being prepared, the UGC and
Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP) jointly commissioned an enquiry
into the efficiency of higher education, chaired by Sir Alex Jarratt. The Jarratt report,
published in March 1985, called for a strategic perspective with longer term planning and
funding indications to allow for sensible strategic planning to take place (Moore, 1996:
194). Jarratt called upon universities to become more efficient and effective and proposed
a formula-based resource allocation mechanism to reward ‘good’ universities (though this
terminology was not employed in the Report). At the same time, the UGC's decision to
allocate recurrent funding as 'dual support' – that is to say, on the basis of a unit of
resource for teaching and a qualitative assessment of research, signalled a shift in
relations between the State and universities such that they became more akin to that of
principal (the State) - agent (the university). Jarratt advocated a delegation of budgets to 'appropriate centres' (paragraph 5.5) which would subsequently be held responsible for outturn against budget. The Report was notable for proposing a more proactive approach (by universities themselves) to strategic planning and performance measurement. It was also notable for defining universities, for the first time, as 'corporate enterprises' (1985: 22) and for employing the language of human capital in proposing that 'the time of academic staff is the primary resource of a university and it needs to be managed and accounted for with appropriate skill and care' (1985: 28). In Jackson's (1999: 142) view, the Jarratt Report was highly significant - its publication 'in some ways marked a milestone for the management of UK universities.'

The Jarratt Report, along with dual support funding, the Education Reform Act of 1988, the NAB Good Management Practice Report (1987) and the Review of the University Grants Committee (Crohan Report, 1987) could be described as bringing a more business-like style to higher education management in response to government wishes (Peat Marwick McLintock, 1990: 3). In aggregate these important developments denoted a significant change of approach which should be understood within the context of evolving political discourses based upon neo-liberal principles of economic exchange, artificial markets, responsibilised actors and performance monitoring. In Barnett's view (1990: 4), justifications for changes to the system are couched in terms of economic need or individual rights to access; in other words, a primary belief in the value of higher education to the national economy or in higher education as a vehicle for improving life chances. It was clear from the changes that took place during the 1980s that Government was looking much more seriously at the role and contribution of universities in creating economic prosperity. As such, control needed to be increased, both in terms of Government control of the sector and universities' control of resources. Greater control was mirrored by greater accountability; in future universities would be monitored much more closely and required to demonstrate good husbandry of the resources allocated by the State. The strategic planning and performance monitoring regime proposed by Jarratt would provide the vehicle for greater accountability.

2.2.2 Late 1980s

Further changes were to occur during the late 1980s which continue to affect higher education today. In 1988 as part of the Education Reform Act the UGC was replaced by
the Universities Funding Council (UFC). The UGC was generally regarded as having performed well — according to Williams (1999: 158), 'the UGC was often considered to be the ideal model of public funding of universities. Its quinquennial grant system linked funding to institutional plans, but otherwise gave universities almost complete freedom in decision how to spend their money.' According to Salter, (2002: 249) New Right politicians wanted the UGC abolished, having viewed its handing of the 1981 cuts as 'an exercise in the protection of academic values' - (as though this was something undesirable). It is likely the academic community's self-interested responses to the public expenditure cuts of the early 1980s 'were at least partly responsible for the dramatic shift in funding regimes imposed by government' (Williams, 1999: 158). The creation of the UFC may also be indicative of a shift in consciousness concerning issues of governance. Whereas prior to 1986 the UGC had operated almost as a benefactor, the introduction of formula-based funding and new systems of coordination essentially changed the role of the funding council. Government became more interventionist; whilst employing the language of autonomy and empowerment, in reality control was shifting from universities to the State. Jongbloed (2003: 131) defines the changes as a paradigm shift:

The centrality of human capital in today's knowledge-driven economy requires that governments carefully arrange the frameworks, boundaries and playing fields for the providers of higher education.....This amounts to a new paradigm for government in which (quoting Dunning, 1997: 60) 'government should eschew negative or emotive sounding words such as “command”, “intervention”, “regulation” and replace them by words such as “empower”, “steer”, “co-operative”, “co-ordination” and “systemic”.

The formulaic, performance-oriented approach offered Government an opportunity to increase central control. Swinnerton-Dyer (1991: 225) illustrates this in his observation that when the UGC was replaced by the UFC, the Secretary of State for Education argued that because the UFC was established by statute it would have more independence than the UGC. In fact, the opposite was true; the UFC suffered much more nitpicking interference from DES civil servants (Swinnerton-Dyer, 1991: 225) and ultimately the UFC gave the Government much greater political control of the sector. The Secretary of State for Education wrote to the UFC, 'I shall look to the Council to develop funding arrangements which recognise the principle that the public funds allocated to the universities are in exchange for the provision of teaching and research and are conditional
on their delivery' (Williams, 1999: 160). Formula funding subsequently ensured that universities' income became almost entirely dependent on student numbers.

The market-oriented ideology was brought into being through a series of planning rounds, forecasting, performance indicators and benchmarking (see Swinnerton-Dyer 1991), most of which were naively simplistic. The change in style and substance to what may be termed responsive regulation allows the government to retain overall control whilst delegating responsibility through self-regulation (Lemke, 2001). The self-regulatory framework allows universities some self-management (for instance, the allocation of resources within the institution) but within strict parameters. A powerful, central framework of monitoring and control embracing such mechanisms as the Quality Assurance Agency’s (QAA) teaching audit and the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) determines the allocation of resources to universities. In operating a model based upon mechanistic processing, Government can imply a rationality and objectivity which may be overstated. Covaleski and Dirsmith (1988) assert that although cloaked in the language of objectivity, resource allocation fundamentally establishes and maintains hierarchies of status and authority. Thus, from a Fouculdian perspective, the funding mechanism may be regarded as a powerful apparatus of subjectivization, a technology by which institutional identity is constituted and maintained and by which universities may be disciplined.

Despite Government recognition of the key role of universities in the national economy, the exhortation for universities to become more like private companies in their approach and the promotion of rationality, there is some evidence that Government failed to take a holistic approach to policy formulation. In Pollitt and Bouckaert's (2004: 26) view this is not unusual - reform schemes are rarely comprehensive and it is easy to exaggerate the degree of intentionality in many reforms. They begin with a vision, but 'in terms of trajectories... they are highly normative omegas, which may or may not be accompanied by plans for how to get from here to there' (2004: 135). For Lindblom (1979) public policy-making is less a matter of rational-comprehensive strategies and more a matter of muddling through in an incremental manner, juggling various, often conflicting, priorities. For Scott (1995: 22), due to political expediency rather than robust planning 'Britain, in a fit of absent mindedness, acquired a mass system of universities and colleges.' Shatton (2006: 138) agrees, observing that there was never any grand plan as
to how higher education should develop; on the contrary it was simply pushed along in a piecemeal way, the product of a new Secretary of State or some other external prompting.

It is likely that, although lacking a 'grand plan, concern over the nation's declining economic performance during the 1970s and 1980s in some way drove the changes. According to Kogan and Hanney (2000), the oil crisis of the 1970s and the subsequent retrenchment changed perceptions of the role and potential of higher education. Following the dominant logic of human capital theory, education appeared to offer a route out of the nation's economic demise; more educated workers would mean greater productivity and an enhanced ability to compete effectively in the global market. This necessitated a more efficiency and productivity-based model of university governance - a model that could be forced into being through the funding mechanism. The substance and style of university management is influenced in turn by this rather narrow, utilitarian definition of universities as drivers of national prosperity.

2.2.3 The 1990s

Assumed causality between education and economic growth means that governments are becoming increasingly directive in order to secure the position of 'UK plc' in an increasingly competitive global economy. An essential element of this is an intensification of a market-oriented approach to university governance. Theoretically, to be successful in a market the provider must offer a high quality product at a price that consumers are willing to pay. From a neoliberal perspective there is no reason why this logic should not apply equally to public services. The logic of the market states that universities that provide high quality education and good value for money will attract more students, more revenue and enter a benign cycle of success. Concomitantly, higher education services that are below standard will be rejected, thus forcing higher education providers to improve or lose out on 'customers' and revenue (Naidoo and Jamieson, 2005: 270). It is assumed that competition between institutions for limited resources will produce a more effective, efficient and equitable higher education system (Naidoo and Jamieson, 2005: 270). Ignoring awkward realities such as market externalities and the fact that the market for higher education is artificially created and therefore cannot be expected to behave as a free market, market-driven ideology was clearly reflected in the 1992 Further and Higher Education Act. The Act replaced the UFC by Higher Education Funding Councils for England, Wales and Scotland respectively.
The Higher Education Funding Council for England, as those in Scotland and Wales, was set up as a non-departmental public body working within a policy framework set by the Secretary of State for Education (now the Department for Education and Skills), but officially at 'arms length'. Like its predecessors, the HEFCE emphasised strategic planning, but high quality education and value for money were given greater emphasis than in the past. The 1992 Act required the HEFCE to establish Quality Assurance Committees (QACs) and it was made clear that the results of quality audits would inform future funding decisions (Salter, 2002: 250). Political orthodoxy was becoming more consumerist in orientation; the State began to view itself as acting on behalf of the consumer (students) and the issue of service standards was being pushed up the political agenda (Salter, 2002: 249). Against this background, calls for greater accountability continued to increase across the all areas of the public sector, including higher education.

In response, the universities created the Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) in an attempt to retain some control of the quality assurance regime. According to Salter (2002: 250), 'by 1995 the language of quality assurance dominated the discourse of higher education governance.' Situated between academics on the one hand, and the State on the other was a new group of university managers, 'catapulted into prominence by the need for institutions to introduce and apply the new quality assurance procedures' (Salter, 2002: 250). In many ways this may be regarded as the beginning of 'managerial' governance of universities, the significance of which lay in a need to be seen to be introducing 'objective', bureaucratically regulated processes in place of more traditional collegial, dialogic practices. For McNay (1999: 37) the growth in bureaucracy offers a route to increased political control; the power of the State to intervene in higher education grows in line with the growth of corporate bureaucracy, spreading a culture of 'learned helplessness' and feelings of disempowerment amongst those working in the sector. The perceived need to control higher education is unsurprising given the importance accorded to it in terms of national prosperity, however as McNay observes (1999: 38) the policy rhetoric of markets and the bureaucratic reality of universities are in conflict – free competition and heavy regulation are simply dichotomous.

In 1996 Sir Ron Dearing was asked by the Government to make recommendations on the purposes, shape, structure, size and funding of higher education, including support for students, should develop to meet the needs of the United Kingdom over the coming twenty year period. The National Committee of Enquiry into Higher Education (the
Dearing Committee) submitted its report in July 1997. The Report noted that over the last twenty years the number of students had more than doubled; that public funding for universities had increased by over 45% whilst funding units had fallen by 40%. (Dearing Report, 1997). Overall, public spending on higher education as a percentage of gross domestic product had stayed the same. The Dearing Report highlighted the importance of a society committed to lifetime learning, stating that 'higher education is fundamental to the social, economic and cultural health of the nation' (Introduction point 6). To achieve a successful, thriving sector, Dearing identified two prerequisites: i) professional, committed members of staff who are appropriately trained, respected and rewarded and, ii) a diverse range of autonomous, well-managed institutions with a commitment to excellence in the achievement of their distinctive missions (Dearing Report, 1997).

Of particular interest to this thesis is a section of the Dearing Report, Report No. 3 entitled, Academic Staff in higher education: their experiences and expectations. This provided an overview of the effect on academic staff of changes in higher education. The report detailed a study of over 800 academics. The main findings of the survey were: academics felt that higher education should be better resourced (this was mentioned particularly by older, more experienced faculty); there was a sense of 'deprofessionalisation' (again, felt more acutely by older academics and those in post-1992 institutions); there was a perceived need for a better career structure, with excellence being rewarded – income generation and management was seen to be rewarded whilst excellent teaching and research appeared to be overlooked; administrative loads were seen to be heavy (particularly by Professors). Additionally, in relation to the content of this thesis some further findings were particularly relevant: in relation to resources, staff-student ratios were considered problematic; 'non-traditional' methods of assessment were being used increasingly to cope with larger classes; and administration was seen to be increasing. Regarding research, there was a perceived lack of time, with one in eight doing no research (one in twenty in chartered, one in four in post-1992 universities); over half of all staff always did research in their own time; along with time pressures, lack of funding was also cited as an obstacle to research. It is of interest to note that funding was more of a constraint in the pre-1992 universites, and time in the post-1992 institutions. Regarding employment conditions, one in ten lecturing staff were employed in fixed-term contracts (particularly those below the age of 35). Overall those surveyed expressed a desire to spend less time on administration, marking and examining and more on research. Stress levels were cited as significant, with stress
cited second most frequently as the reason that staff seek early retirement. There was a
sense of disillusionment, with over a quarter expecting to leave higher education before
normal retirement age (particularly true of younger staff and research staff); those
expecting to leave early complained of poor pay, job insecurity and lack of career
prospects; and stress was a particularly significant factor amongst those in post-1992
universities (Dearing Report No. 3, 1997).

It is worth noting that the Dearing Report No. 3 (1997) echoed many of the views
expressed in an international study of the academic profession funded by the Carnegie
countries the Carnegie Foundation study sought to identify similarities and differences in
personal and career data, professional activities and their perceptions of priorities for
higher education. The study found the academic profession facing challenges everywhere
driven by expansion, funding cuts, ever-increasing demands for accountability and
growing media criticism of universities (Altbach, 1996). In many countries universities
were being privatised there was great variance in patterns of academic appointment,
security of tenure and provisions for the guarantee of academic freedom (Altbach, 1996:
110). Where non-tenured employment was increasing, this was generally justified in
terms of improving flexibility and accountability. Demands for greater accountability
were particularly noticeable across the sample; as Altbach (1996: 109) notes, 'clearly the
era of unfettered professional autonomy following the award of tenure is coming to an
end.' Pressures for greater accountability, less autonomy were augmented by fiscal
pressures. Areas causing dissatisfaction were reported as the growth in academic
administration, institutional arrangements – such as feeling kept informed and having an
opportunity to have one’s say – and alienation from administrative authority and
government. In general the survey group felt alienated and lacking any influence with
managers. Distrust of senior managers and leaders was ‘pervasive’. Participants also
complained of lack of job security, poor pay and poor career prospects. In aggregate, the
study portrayed a profession ‘that has a vague sense of unease but little sense of crisis’
(Altbach, 1996: 115). Britain emerged as the country that had seen the most far-reaching
reform and greatest deterioration in conditions and morale. The Carnegie Foundation
Report (1994) noted a significant reconstitution of academic work; diminished
circumstances, decreased autonomy, and threats to the traditional role of academics,
framed by fiscal pressures and demands for accountability. Participants reported
declining commitment to their institutions and sagging morale. Accountability was seen
as politically motivated and participants felt that the greater their efforts, the less they were appreciated. The Report noted that an 'alarming number' felt victimized. Happily (and perhaps surprisingly), there remained a strong sense of commitment to the profession, particularly the role of educator and researcher. Just as surprisingly perhaps, in light of all this, the majority were reasonably satisfied with their work (Lewis and Altbach, 2000). The results of the Carnegie Foundation Report (1994) suggests that job satisfaction and professionalism for academics is inherently intrinsic and that they seem to be engaged in rationalising and sensemaking. This is perhaps not too surprising – teaching and research are very personal activities and it is not uncommon for academics to take work home and spend 'leisure' time working. Many do not consider it work at all – it gives personal satisfaction and is not viewed as unpaid overtime, but almost as a hobby.

The issues emerging from both the Dearing and Carnegie Foundation Reports are clearly relevant to the aims and objectives of this thesis, and will be pursued further in the empirical research outlined in chapter 6 onwards.

2.2.4 From 2000

The last six years have witnessed a continuation of Government policy along market and consumerist lines, with an injection of a more socially-democratic orientation. Market-driven discourses continue to determine educational policy, but in addition to economic and consumerist outturns more emphasis is now given to the social. Universities are called upon to continue to improve the quality of the education on offer, to provide value for money to students and taxpayers and to ensure the relevance of their offerings to business and the economy. The 1997 Dearing Report was followed by Green and White Papers concerning lifelong learning, research assessment and university funding. The 2004 Higher Education Act aimed to widen access to higher education institutions and to 'encourage them to remain competitive in the world economy' (HEFCE, 2007) by introducing 'top-up fees', revamping student funding to support poorer students, creating an independent body to review student complaints not related to matters of academic judgement and the 'Office for Fair Access' to widen participation. In essence, the 'New Modernisers' approach is to continue to invest in excellence, to offer greater access to universities to those from disadvantaged backgrounds and to encourage collaboration between universities and the corporate sector and regional agencies respectively (HEFCE,
Performance monitoring and benchmarking continue to play a central role, in a quest to ensure that 'this country has a higher education system matching the best in the world' (HEFCE, 2007). Unfortunately it is not always a simple matter to translate policy to successful implementation; writing of Third Way ideology generally Newman (2001: 165 – 166) observes, '...many of the discourses on which it drew were not new, but appropriated, extended and reworked into new formations, held together by the 'glue' of 'community', 'inclusion' and 'responsibility'. Regretfully, as the glue dries the ideology comes unstuck – as witnessed, for example, by the heavily bureaucratic 'Knowledge Transfer Partnerships' (KTPs) between universities and industry which, after much lengthy negotiation, often fold when companies are asked to reveal confidential information to project partners (academics).

The extent to which marketisation has become embedded in higher education is exemplified in a post-1992 institution by a recent full-colour booklet circulated to all staff by the Vice-Chancellor at the beginning of the 2006/07 academic year. In it the Vice-Chancellor states that '[the university] will now be competing for students, staff, research and enterprise support, rankings and various measures of prestige in ways that must seem alien to those who see higher education as being above marketplace values' (September, 2006). The booklet informs staff that 'competition is increasing' and 'students are becoming more demanding.' Presenting a new corporate logo and mission statement, the circular implores, 'it is up to all of us to deliver on the brand' and 'bring the brand to life in everything we do'. As a market-led organisation this particular institution is clearly focusing on 'competitors' (other universities) and 'consumers' (potential and current students), raising fundamental questions about the role of the university in modern-day England and the academic staff working within them.

2.3 The 'Commodification' of Higher Education

As the political discourses governing higher education have become more market-oriented, university education has been (quite logically) gradually redefined as a tradable commodity. Commodification of higher education is defined by knowledge production being characterised by greater prioritization of research for commercial development and greater direct transfer from the academic to the commercial sector (Naidoo, 2003: 254). Whereas traditionally education has an intrinsic 'use-value' which might, at some stage, be converted into an economic value, commodification emphasises economic value as
primary, and use-value as secondary. Naidoo (2003: 253), drawing upon Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (1997), McSherry (2001) and Newotny et al (2001) suggests that the profit potential of knowledge has resulted in the research functions of universities being repositioned to one of commodity production, validated primarily through utilitarian criteria. A recent Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI) report entitled *The prosperity of English universities and colleges: income growth and the prospects for new investment* (September 2006) and seminars on ‘The contribution of universities to economic and societal development’ (November 2005) and ‘The governance of higher education in a market environment’ (December 2005) are indicative of the primacy of economic value.

Value can be ascribed to outputs in terms of market value of the degree, value of the academic to the institution and value of the institution to society. Individuals can then be subjected to mechanisms of performativity to ensure that they are maximising their value — or made to improve their performance until they do. This, according to Olssen et al (2004) is a significant development which not only changes the entire purpose and worth of education — ignoring its intrinsic, intangible, unmeasurable value, but also devaluing human beings by measuring them in terms of their economic rather than their intrinsic worth. Naidoo and Jamieson (2005: 279) support this view, adding that the approach threatens to stifle innovation, challenge academic standards and further entrench academic privilege. In Naidoo and Jamieson’s (2005: 271) analysis, the commodification of education (and, by implication, of educators) is, in essence, an erosion and valorization of academic capital. Consequences are deep-rooted and fundamental changing not only the nature of the exchange, but also the underlying logic shaping academic practices.

Commodification leads to a restructuring of relations between academics and students — not only in terms of producer-consumer within a market exchange, but potentially even along adversarial lines, observed by Sacks (1996) as students defining themselves as consumers with ‘rights’ and ‘entitlements’ whilst academics retreat to providers with a commensurate loss of entitlements. With education repackaged as a commodity, the entire process becomes one of means-ends instrumentality. In Barnett’s (2000) view education then becomes a mechanism of performativity. Universities, academics and students alike are pulled into a discourse which focuses upon measurable outputs rather than intrinsic values.
2.3.1 Implications

In sum, from the 1980s onwards the higher education environment has changed substantively and demands on universities have intensified, creating significant challenges for universities. Universities have entered an age of turmoil for which there is no end in sight based upon a simple disjuncture between demands and their capacity to respond (Clark, 1998: 129). More students, more segments of the labour force demanding university graduates, higher expectations of universities and the growth of knowledge outrunning resources (Clark, 1998: 130) have in aggregate created demand overload. Political control over the sector has increased substantially; control has been steadily centralised and the powers of the Secretary of State for Education have intensified. The sector is monitored closely and quality assurance audit has become endemic. For Clark (1983: 158), 'the political become more powerful as they become more bureaucratic'; bureaucracy enables what might be described as micro-management from a distance. This produces a conflict between the policy and the bureaucratic reality; for McNay (1999: 38) slogans extolling the primacy of the market, endowed with the intelligence to operate freely and responsibly, and 'rolling back the frontiers of the state' are nothing more than rhetoric and do not reflect the reality of higher education governance today.

The broadening of the role of universities and the pursuit of utilitarian discourses has implications for the way that universities are managed. The managerial core within universities has strengthened and there is more central steering 'as manoeuvering among contradictory demands becomes necessary' (Clark, 1998: 138). Employing the vocabulary of the corporate sector, successive governments have encouraged universities to improve efficiency, effectiveness, quality, value for money and productivity. For Braun and Merrien (1999: 26-7) this includes three distinct elements: strengthening the intermediate administrative level of universities; priority setting (in terms of allocating finite resources); and client-orientation. These fundamental yet diverse elements can create ambiguities and conflicts within universities which may be difficult to resolve. Consequently responses are varied; whilst some universities embrace managerialism as an opportunity for reform, others respond more cautiously.

The utilitarian approach to university governance has many critics. For Shattock (2006: 139), the higher education sector is now more subordinated to government imperatives than in the past; imperatives which, in Deem's (2004: 110) view, ignore the strong value-
basis of public service work. For Deem (2004: 110) the values of higher education are so different to the 'for-profit' sector and so enduring that to ignore them in favour of market principles will result in long-lasting, negative consequences – not just for students and staff, but society as a whole. According to Codd (2001), the liberal notion of education as promoting independent pursuit of knowledge and preparing a literate and critical citizenry for its role in a democratic society is being undermined. In Gammie and Gammie's (2002) analysis academic knowledge has been reorganised along a utilitarian trajectory such that the dominant legitimating idea of public higher education has changed from that of a social institution to that of an industry. Certainly there is evidence lately of collaboration between the corporate and academic worlds; ongoing cuts in funding have succeeded in pressing universities to find new income streams – most commonly from the private sector. To attract corporate funding universities have to offer some overt value in terms of intellectual capital, redefining themselves as wealth creators in a globalised world. Domestically, the funding mechanism is a superbly well positioned and powerful disciplinary tool which ensures that universities play by 'the rules of the game'.

For academics, the main effect has been heavier workloads as student populations expand. The expansion has not been supported commensurately by new posts, resulting in heavier loads and (pleasingly from Government's point of view) greater productivity. As well as the sheer number of students, additional work may also result from increased bureaucracy in the name of accountability. As Housten et al (2006) observe, recent dialogue regarding the place of universities in the knowledge society has not necessarily reflected on the impact on workloads, challenging university academics in terms of stress and work-life balance.

2.4 Power Relations

Market and consumerist discourses have reconstituted relations between the higher education sector and the State. Government has employed market and consumerist ideologies to centralise power and become more interventionist and directive over the last three decades in recognition of the importance of higher education to national prosperity. The changes in governance are significant and highlight the centrality of the human capital to policy-making in the knowledge-based, global economy. Government has had to 'carefully rearrange the frameworks, boundaries and playing fields for the providers of higher education' (Jongbloed, 2003: 131), entailing a re-evaluation of the role of the State
and other agents. This may be conceptualised in Foucauldian terms as a dynamic network of power relations. Clark’s (1983) triangle of coordination illustrates how State authority, the market and academic oligarchy determine, through their interaction, the way in which higher education is co-ordinated. Changes in one part of the network affect all other parts, with power ebbing and flowing as circumstances, discourses and contexts change.

The analysis in this chapter has revealed an ebb and flow of power relations in higher education according to political discourse. Within neoliberalism the State occupies a central position, but is more limited in manifestation than other political models. In contrast to public perception however, the State is no less interventionist – it is simply that its role has changed from provider to regulator. In Olssen’s (2002: 2) view, increased activity by Government impacts upon others in the web; ‘utility-maximising man’ is converted into ‘manipulatable man’. Manipulatable man is created by the State and continually encouraged to be perpetually responsive. An integral component of this essentially Foucauldian perspective is that manipulatable man does not consider himself manipulated at all, but liberated.

Regarding academics, one may envisage that the majority would not welcome the ‘manipulatable man’ label; they might well argue that the desire to conduct high quality research and disseminate knowledge through good teaching is intrinsic. At the same time, it may be argued that since both teaching and research are monitored and benchmarked, academics may be somewhat self-delusional, underplaying the influence of external pressures and protecting their self-image as relatively autonomous professionals. Academics may think they have a high degree of autonomy, but is autonomy taken or granted? Would autonomy be constrained if individuals fall short of performance targets? Is the autonomy simply a manifestation of an unspoken agreement between principal and agent, the latter agreeing to play by the rules in exchange for being left alone? According to Foucault (1991) practices both establish and apply norms, controls and exclusions (‘juridicative’), and render true/false discourse possible (‘veridictive’). Participating in communities of practice shape the dispositions (italics added) of members. This suggests that academics, far from being passive subjects, may be active contributors to sustaining market and consumerist discourses in higher education.
2.5 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a context for the empirical research which follows and to present the argument that on-going changes in the governance of higher education and management of universities are simply logical outcomes of marketisation and commodification. The embrace of market values, competition for funds between and within institutions, requirements for productivity gains, performance management to achieve improved quality and value for money, and reconceptualising individuals and universities as assets to be exploited in a means-end model of production are all symptomatic of a neoliberal approach to governance. Essentially, it is an approach that apes private sector orthodoxy – and that in itself has profound implications for the way that higher education is conceptualised and managed. If higher education is considered crucial to economic prosperity and its product a tradable commodity produced under market or quasi-market conditions, then clearly the sector must not only be 'administered' in the traditional way of the public sector, but 'managed' in the same way as the private sector. Over recent decades it has come to be accepted that universities must be managed – and that the private sector provides a model of best practice. The following chapter explores managerialism in higher education; it looks at how it is defined and operationalised before exploring the assumptions and power relations that underpin it.
Chapter 3: Managerialism and Higher Education

‘Why can’t a cat be more like a dog?’
(Birnbaum, 2001)

3.0 Introduction

In this research managerialism is conceptualised as a discourse – that is to say, a way of thinking; an acceptance of a set of assumptions; and an acting out of those assumptions through organisational structures, systems and processes. Bottery (2000: 62-63) defines managerialism (paraphrasing Pollitt, 1992: 2) as:

... an approach to managing and leading underpinned by a policy which believes that social progress lies in the achievement of continuing increases in economically defined productivity; a distinct organizational function which plays the crucial role in planning, implementing and measuring the necessary improvements in productivity; such productivity increases will come about through the creation of a labour force instilled with this productivity ideal, who are vigorously tied into such corporate aims, and; to perform this crucial role managers must be granted the right to manage proactively available resources, both material and human.

Whilst Bottery thus defines managerialism in both ideological and organisational terms, in Deem and Brehony’s (2005) analysis it is very clearly an ideological rather than a technical reform. For Deem and Brehony (2005) managerialism is ideological in a Marxist sense in that serves to promote interests and maintain relations of power and domination. There is some competition between the two related concepts of ‘new managerialism’ and ‘new public management’ (NPM) Deem and Brehony (2005: 219). NPM is concerned with new forms of administrative orthodoxy about how public services are run and regulation. Debates around NPM tend to focus the development of less bureaucratic forms of public service organisations and quasi-market conditions. In contrast, new managerialism is an ideological configuration of ideas and practices brought to bear on public service organisation, management and delivery (Deem and Brehony, 2005: 219). From this perspective, NPM is more concerned with the implementation of a particular form of regulatory governance of public services whilst ‘new managerialism’ is
concerned with an ideological approach to managing public services connected to state regulation of and manager power over such services and their employees (Clark and Newman, 1997; Farrell and Morris, 2003 in Deem and Brehony, 2005). For new managerialism theorists, the activity is intensely political as well as technical.

Taking this as a starting point, this study is concerned with new managerialism, but it will not seek to eliminate NPM from the analysis since in practice the two concepts are inherently inter-linked. Both new managerialism and NPM are grounded in human capital theory and a means-end orthodoxy which apes the mission of private sector organisations to survive in a global, increasingly competitive world. Both include 'a set of beliefs and practices, at the core of which burns the seldom-tested assumption that better management will provide an effective solvent for a wide range of economic and social ills', (Pollitt, 1992: 1). For this research, the key element of both is the underlying belief that applying managerialism to the public sector changes the way in which problems are conceptualised, defined and dealt with. For Clarke and Newman (1997: 148):

Managerialist discourse offers particular representations of the relationship between social problems and solutions. It is linear and oriented to ‘single goal’ thought patterns. It is concerned with goals and plans rather than with intentions and judgements. It is about action rather than reflection.

In promising action, both new managerialism and NPM appear to promise solutions and improvements. Critics declare the means-end approach inappropriate for higher education however, citing fundamental differences in values and culture (Meister-Scheytt and Schyett, 2005; Deem, 2004; Marginson, 2000). For Birnbaum (2001: 191), ‘Thinking what is good for one kind of organisation is good for another is like thinking that what is good for dogs is also good for cats.’

This chapter explores how the ideology and practices of managerialism are applied to universities; whether what is good for dogs has been demonstrated to be good for cats. The managerial perspective has its roots in neoliberal governmentality, therefore later sections of this chapter are particularly concerned with the implications of managerialism for power relations between the State, universities and academics.
3.1 New Managerialism

Whilst it would be erroneous to suggest that universities had not been managed prior to the Thatcher era, the significance of the 1980s lay in the disjuncture with the past. Managerialist ideology embraced a more devolved management, quasi-market conditions accompanied, somewhat paradoxically at first glance, by greater State regulation (Pollitt, 1993; Deem, 1994). Ministers were called upon to play a new role as strategists and opinion-leaders, clarifying and communicating visions and values, choosing appropriate strategies and identifying allocation and committing resources at the micro-level. The managing of operations was to be done by professional managers, whose performance would be appraised against clearly defined targets (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2004: 150). It was assumed that what was good for private sector organisations would also be good for public. New Public Management (NPM) was devised, as its name suggests, as a means of operationalising the general approach by introducing to the public sector cultures, structures and processes more commonly associated with private sector organisations. For Thatcher's Conservatives the divide between the public and private sectors was no longer seen as an ideological barrier – both could and should be managed using a 'one size fits all' approach.

Ferlie et al (1996: 10) observe a lack of clarity surrounding NPM – what it is, what it ought to be and how it might be operationalised. To clarify, Ferlie et al (1996) constructed a typology based upon four categories: efficiency drive; downsizing and decentralisation; in search of excellence (the learning organisation); and public sector orientation. Clearly, excellence and public sector orientation present no obvious threat to public sector professionals, whereas the drive for efficiency combined with downsizing and decentralisation may well challenge not only their actions, but fundamental values. Similarly, the ideological assumptions underpinning NPM in many ways present a challenge to public sector professions:

- self-sufficiency, that is to say that a public organisation with responsibility for a function carries out that function itself and employs staff to do so;
- direct control, which is best exercised through continuous supervision by a hierarchy;
- uniformity, that is that the function is performed on a uniform basis within the jurisdiction of the organisation;
• accountability upwards, from the public servant through the political process;
• standardisation, that is to say standardised procedures throughout the service.

(McNay, 1994).

In addition, according to Bottery (2000: 66) NPM embraces two specific values relating to the nature of managerial work, namely that managers are proactive rather than facilitatory, and managers should have the freedom to innovate within tightly defined quality measures. This dovetails with the ideological assumption in new managerialism of managers’ ‘right to manage’ (see section 3.2). By emphasising managerial direction and discretion, it is claimed, bureaucracy may be pruned and public sector organisations become more accountable. Somewhat ironic then that managerialist accountability takes the form of targets, performance monitoring and benchmarking, introducing new bureaucracy at each stage. The imposition of external technologies of control expose the apparently rational, means-end, user-oriented, non-political approach to resource management as a vigorous reassertion of political control over the sector. As Pollitt and Bouckaert (2004: 156) observe, ‘any suggestion that public management can be radically depoliticized is either a misunderstanding or flies in the face of evidence from many countries.’

For universities new managerialism signalled a significant rise in the political importance of quality and accountability. This was justified (from the Government’s perspective) by a growing recognition of education as a driver of the knowledge economy. According to Walsh (1995: 30), the ideological objective was to go beyond operational and structural changes; the intention was to change values and attitudes, thought processes and actions. Bureaucrats and public sector professionals needed to become ‘rational actors’ who follow new initiatives ‘directly and unambiguously’ (Clarke and Newman, 1997: 85). To achieve this degree of change meant that work relations would have to be restructured through the introduction of a new managerial tier whose task was to ensure that employees conform, to perform well and become more productive.

Olssen (2002: 45) contrasts traditional and managerial models of internal governance of universities as follows:
Table 3.1 Contrast between traditional and managerial modes of governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal-type Model of Internal Governance of Universities</th>
<th>Neoliberal (managerial)</th>
<th>Liberal (traditional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode of control</strong></td>
<td>'hard' managerialism; contractual specification between principal-agent; autocratic control</td>
<td>'soft' managerialism; collegial-democratic voting; professional consensus; diffuse control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management function</strong></td>
<td>Managers; line-management; cost-centres</td>
<td>leaders; community of scholars; professions; faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Maximise outputs; financial profit; efficiency; massification; privatisation</td>
<td>Knowledge; research; inquiry; truth; reason; elitist; not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work relations</strong></td>
<td>Competitive; hierarchical; workload indexed to market; corporate loyalty; no adverse criticism of university</td>
<td>Trust; virtue ethics; professional norms; freedom of expression and criticism; role of public intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>Audit; monitoring; consumer-managerial; performance indicators; output-based (ex-post)</td>
<td>'soft' managerialism; professional-bureaucratic; peer review and facilitation; rule-based (ex ante)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing</strong></td>
<td>Centres of excellence; competition; corporate image; branding; public relations</td>
<td>the Kantian ideal of reason; specialisation; communication; truth; democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy/teaching</strong></td>
<td>Semesterisation; slenderisation of courses; modularisation; distance learning; summer schools; vocational; Mode 2 learning</td>
<td>Full-year courses; traditional academic methods and course assessment methods; knowledge for its own sake; Mode 1 knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Externally funded; contestable; separated from teaching; controlled by government or external agency</td>
<td>Integrally linked to teaching; controlled from within the university; initiated and undertaken by individual academics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Olssen (2002: 45)
A study by Deem and Johnson (2000) of manager-academics across a range of disciplines revealed an acceptance of managerial discourses and technologies. Manager-academics appeared to form communities of practices across academic disciplines, drawn together by a common concern to try to get academics to do things in an environment where there are few incentives or sanctions. As such, there was an acceptance of the task allocated to them in terms of improving colleagues' performance, although simultaneously some indication of attempts to mediate the impact of change. Interestingly, the study emphasised the learning aspects of those communities and revealed the lack of training of manager-academics for the roles and challenges they faced. Deem and Johnson’s (2000) study revealed little sense of solidarity or shared values however, suggesting a contingency-based approach to managerialism across departments and faculties. Manager-academics identified with others in similar positions, creating a ‘them and us’ scenario which was rank rather than discipline-based and in effect meant that the community of practice with which they identified was not inclusive of university staff as a whole (2000: 71). At the same time however, competition for students and resource allocation models caused some rivalry between manager-academics from different disciplines threatening the unity of the manager-academic cadre. To this day the focus remains on finding ways to improve academics’ performance; targets, performance indicators and league tables are becoming well established as very public and influential instruments of rewards and sanctions, both materialistically and symbolically.

3.1.2 Criticism of managerialism

For politicians, the apparent rationality of managerialism is a major part of its attraction. From Taylor and Ford onwards the commercial world has embraced models and methods which appear grounded in logic and quasi-scientific approaches. But there is concern that corporate values are misplaced in academia and that an economic orientation is overly simplistic; for Deem (2004), such an approach challenges the very assumptions of the notion of public service around which its practices and values are designed, resulting in radical shifts in culture as well as structure. For Marginson (2000) many managerial philosophies and principles are essentially anathematic to academic values. As a result, it is claimed that the academic profession is now in crisis, with discernable tendencies towards the deconstruction not only of collegiality, but academic professionalism itself (Marginson, 2000). It is easy to appreciate the appeal of the economic rationality of
management, however taking the long-term view it behoves us to question the salience of the approach and be mindful of the cost in human terms.

That the ideology of managerialism has survived for so long is largely due to its flexibility as political currency, being relatively adaptable not only to Thatcher's New Right but also Blair's New Modernisers. A need for change is inherent in the narratives employed (Du Gay and Salaman, 1992; Clarke and Newman, 1997), and in an increasingly cynical society and the promise of greater professional accountability is attractive (Power, 1997; Strathern, 2000). Changes have been presented in terms of improvement and modernisation, but the theoretical simplicity of managerialism has led to criticisms of superficiality; in Box et al.'s (2001) view it is nothing more than 'a superficial gloss in the name of efficiency' which diverts attention from more substantive, unresolved issues. Others argue that the quasi-business mechanisms of audit and incentivisation reflect 'not so much an application of contemporary economic theory to government as a naïve adaptation of an obsolescent version of that theory to modern political ideology' (March, 1992: 230.) According to Trow, (1994) as well as jeopardising the prospect of an effective, competitive market, such mechanisms also substitute for trust and create alienation - between government and civil servants and government and citizens. In Hood's (2001) view, politicians' demands for greater accountability implies that their trust in civil servants is diminishing. In practice, it has proved difficult to move away from the traditional rules-based, process-driven controls which are embedded within bureaucracies with the result that politically-driven targets are superimposed upon existing control mechanisms resulting in an expansion of rules and associated overseers. In addition, some rather undesirable changes in social relations within organisations have been observed - Smyth (1989: 143) goes as far as to describe NPM as '... a particularly nasty virus which has the potential to slowly but surely cripple and destroy the fabric of the social relationships of our organizations.' Such criticisms have tended to be ignored in the pursuit of economic gain.

Ignoring externalities does not make them disappear however – and failure to address them may ultimately weaken implementation. According to Kogan et al (2000) and Ball (1994), problems begin at the policy formulation level when micro-politics necessitate negotiation and compromise, and often the integration of opposing ideologies. This can result in sub-optimal, sometimes self-contradictory policy decisions which of necessity are over-simplistic and turn out to be impossible to implement cohesively or coherently. One such policy, cited by Trowler (2002) is the UK government's drive to widen
participation in higher education whilst simultaneously capping growth through the funding mechanism. Similarly, over-simplification can have unanticipated consequences, for example, whereas performance management is designed to motivate employees to work harder, in practice they may simply work towards meeting targets (see Taylor, 2001; Barnett, 1992; Cave et al, 1991) - which, in fact, for many may represent sub-optimal performance.

A further over-simplification is to define relationships between state and citizens as ‘providers’ and ‘clients’, challenging citizens’ expectations to be treated as partners and risking the rise of self-interest at the expense of any wider social or public interests (Clarke and Newman, 1997). In Pollitt’s (2000) view, where conceptual problems exist, methodological and interpretive puzzles follow; for example, what is the consequence of the extensive use of targets, performance measures, audits and increasing numbers of ‘professional managers’ on employee motivation and satisfaction? In sum, managerialist discourses are much criticised for their assumed rationality and inability to take account of externalities and human costs. In aggregate the literature suggests that, being heavily rationalist and ill-equipped to accommodate the social aspects of organisations or complexities related to the character of the work being undertaken, managerialism may not particularly well suited to academia.

3.2 The ‘Right to Manage’ and Systems of Control

In discourse terms, the real significance of managerialism lies in its rupture with tradition and acceptance of the right of government to closely manage the public sector, it is fundamentally different to bureaucratic / professional model which dominated the public sector for much of the post-war period. Starting from the assumption that ‘... the world is populated by rational egoists who are bent on outsmarting one another to get something for nothing’ (Hood, 1998: 98), managerialism rejects primacy of the professional and public service bureaucrat and the values that underpin traditional bureaucracy. It legitimises and extends the ‘right to manage’ (Clarke et al, 2000: 9), permeating areas of the public sector previously under the domain of trusted professionals. It is argued widely that this introduces new professional and managerial subjectivities for public service professionals (Miller, 1994a; Du Gay, 1996b; Halford and Leonard, 1999; Whitehead and Moodley, 1999; Barry et al, 2001 in Davies and Thomas, 2002). For Pollitt (1990: 9) it is very much in the interest of managers themselves to promote a set of beliefs which highlight the special contribution of management and thereby justify management’s
special rights and powers. It also suits other groups who, by conceding a certain ‘sphere’
to management, can then disown any responsibility for certain awkward decisions. In
normative terms managerialism represents a distinctive discourse based upon a set of
values which justify the assumed right to monitor and control the activities of others.
Following Pollitt (1990: 10), these do not simply spring into being but are the product of
active dissemination and reinforcement by particular individuals and organisations.

From an ethnographic perspective models of line management may be viewed as
‘systems of power and authority within which different personal and group strategies are
pursued’ (Child, 1977, in Akella, 2003: 46). In relocating accountability to institutional
level the State can retrench to a centralised regulatory position with increased scope for
direct political control. Although promoting ‘deregulation’, state retrenchment should not
be interpreted as a diminution of power – following Foucault, power does not act
‘directly and immediately’ upon others, but rather is an action which has an effect upon
the actions of others. According to Gamble (2000), the State has in some areas
disengaged from the economy but remains a key player in economic governance. As
such, he argues, ‘deregulation’ is a misnomer and ‘re-regulation’ a more accurate
description of the shift in emphasis from direct administrative responsibility to regulatory
responsibilities. In Discipline and Punish (1975, tr. 1977: 222) Foucault writes of the
efficiency of power, ‘its constraining force having, in a sense, passed over to the other
side - to the side of its surface of application.’ Following the principle of Bentham’s
Panoptican, Foucault argues that it is not necessary to commit an individual to continuous
surveillance, as he who is subjected to a field of visibility and knows it, assumes
responsibility for the constraints of power and becomes the principal of his own
subjection. ‘By this very fact, the external power may throw off its physical weight; it
tends to the non-corporeal; and, the more it approaches this limit, the more constant,
profound and permanent are its effects: it is a perpetual victory that avoids any physical
confrontation and which is always decided in advance’ (1977: 222). In Barnett’s (1997:
42) analysis, self-monitoring goes well beyond the academic environment and has
become embedded as a key assumption in ‘our conception of what it means to be a fully
participating member of society.’ Thus, academia has not necessarily been treated more
harshly than other areas of the public sector – it is simply that modern discourses have
embraced somewhat covert systems of control.
Systems of control vary according to context. In relation to academia McNay (1995) analysis identified four basic types of university; (‘traditional’) collegiate, bureaucracy, corporate and enterprise, identifiable by the extent to which policy is defined and implementation controlled. McNay does not offer these as ‘either/or’ types, but observes that all universities draw on some components of each type. There may be a tendency to assume that collegiality is ‘good’ and enterprise universities ‘bad’, but that would be an over-simplification of reality and somewhat pejorative. What is of primary interest in this regard is to measure if, and how, formal systems of managerialist control have supplanted and occupied the space formally occupied by collegial, community-based self-regulation. In Mcfarlane’s (2005) view, we need not paint too black a picture – after all, hierarchical authority has always been present in universities, even within the collegium; what is changing is that collegiality no longer plays such a strong balancing role. Kogan and Hanney (2000) note a shift of influence away from individual academics to institutions and elites and a growing culture of ‘them’ (the managers) and ‘us’ (the academics). Whilst there may be resistance to managerialist discourses at the level of the individual, managers increasingly assume the right to manage and, in today’s climate, there are few, effective countering voices.

There are those who argue that universities are becoming more relevant to society (Meyer, 2002) and, as such, it beholds them to demonstrate efficiency and effectiveness, and to be flexible and receptive to new ideas and opportunities. Collegiality may not be best placed to deliver these outcomes; for Dearlove (2002: 267) academics:

...recognise no boss, choosing to see themselves as individual entrepreneurs, albeit on a steady salary. Like rich peasants, they till their own patch but display little desire for collective action and little interest in the larger university, to which they are limply attached, as they grumble about the demands it makes on ‘their’ time and the problem of parking.

In light of this, from the Government’s perspective it would be too great a risk to allow academics to run a ‘closed shop’ if universities are expected to play a wealth creation role in the knowledge society. In their study of Australian universities, Marginson and Considine (2000) identify collegiate forms of governance being replaced by executive-led models driven by formulae, targets and plans. Similarly, in England the dominant discourse is entrepreneurial and managerial with universities not only aiming to be useful
to business and be run like a business, but to become like a business. Marginson and Considine (2000) interpret this as universities becoming less sure of themselves, of their place in society and their relationship with the State, the corporate world and students. Certain traditions have been destabilised, certain norms and traditions subsumed in the quest for efficiency and usefulness to the knowledge economy.

The line management design is a key feature of modern university management; whilst collegium designates a structure in which members have equal authority to participate in decisions which are binding on each of them, managerialist hierarchy assumes that the individuals in certain designated roles possess authority to affect the institutional behaviour of others (Becher and Kogan, 1980). This reduces the discretion of individual members to perform their own operations in their own way. In reality, of course, universities have not abandoned their collegial roots entirely — usually elements of collegiality remain even where universities are changing in structure, style or culture. Formal management models tend to be superimposed upon the rather more informal collegium, giving rise to a complex, hybrid model of governance comprising systems of executive roles and systems of committees which, according to Becher and Kogan (1980: 67) 'seldom resolve the overlaps and conflicts..... any logical way'. Braun agrees (1999: 260), observing that mixed modes of governance are emerging in universities where new executive bodies are established but being neutralised by existing representative bodies. Braun (1999: 260) also observes that in many cases new co-ordination and decision-making structures may be established on top of existing ones, resulting in universities having multi-layered and complex decision-making structures, badly co-ordinated and functioning inefficiently. In the final analysis, though critics decry the 'corporatisation' of universities (see Birmbaum, 2001), the pragmatist would be less concerned; in Kogan's (2000) view, universities can fill any purpose that society sets for them — they are social artefacts and can change and evolve over time, without disastrous consequences.

3.3 Coercion and Subjectivization

Managerialism affects not only the self-identity of institutions, but of the academics working within them. Foucault (1979) writes of 'subjectivization', a process in which the self is brought into being through reflexive relations by which people come to know themselves and become tied to a certain identity. For Foucault, the subject is constituted through many different types of practices, identity being derived when through culture
and education the dominant epistemological matrix is internalised. For Foucault, the self is constituted discursively and institutionally by power-knowledge organised in disciplinary blocks (Olssen, 2006: 32). From a Foucauldian perspective, therefore, managerialism may be regarded as a process of subjectivization; a way of bringing the self into being. Managerialism may be conceived as both cultural and educational, containing numerous disciplinary mechanisms which coerce the individual into behaving in particular ways. Over time, this learned behaviour becomes the norm and not only the behaviour but the underlying assumptions are also internalised, creating a framework which the subject uses to self-manage (Foucault's notion of governmentality). In Trowler's (1998) view, any attempt to understand how academics produce and reproduce social reality must take into how managerialism alters power relations between academics, manager-academics, institutions and the State. Shore and Selwyn (1998: 154-155) observe a clear “govermentalization” of universities - 'a process involving the subjugation of the universities and their staff to increasingly coercive systems of surveillance, bureaucracy, government intervention and disciplinary forces.' From this point of view, increasingly invasive systems of performance audit and benchmarking allow the State to dictate the terms and conditions of relations. Within institutions, the curriculum and research are more influenced by economic utility than in the past; students are more aware of employability whilst research councils have become more proactive in channelling funding to themes identified by Government. The result is to objectify universities and those who work in them as agent of the knowledge society and to forge individualities through subjectivization, employing disciplinary techniques of targets, performance monitoring and benchmarks.

There are many who bemoan this development. Referring to the imperative of finding external funding and having to prioritise the interests of those who hold the purse strings above one's own research interests, Mazzolini (1997: 1) remarks:

Unlike the unconditional love that characterized undesignated public funds, money from external sources is doled out conditionally, as from a stingy aunt who demands that you perform “I'm a Little Teapot” for your birthday money.

Sharing Mazzolini's concern, Lyotard (1999) argues that the reduction of research into a money-led, tradable commodity entails the jettisoning the philosophical detachment and jeopardises the ethical disinterestedness of the university tradition. For Codd (2004),
governmentalization is a transformation, driven by the instrumentalism of global market forces and the arbitrary power of partisan national interests; for Barnett (2000) the whole epistemology of the university is changing from contemplative to pragmatic.

Whilst it would be naïve to deny that government intervention has increased over recent decades, we must question whether the reality is as bleak as portrayed above. Prichard (2000) observes that within academia management involves particular embodied practices and bodies of knowledge which attempt to reshape social relations and identities. Examples include the Research Assessment Exercise and the National Student Survey. Yet, as Prichard observes, whilst the strategic intent of such processes is clear, actual implementation and elaboration is often highly problematical. For McNay (1999: 41) the changes imposed upon the sector during the Thatcher years amount to nothing less than the denigration of the authority of intellectuals — 'in a fashion somewhat akin to the bullying of clever children at school.' At the policy level academic representation on political decision-making bodies has been reduced and the funding councils are now overwhelmingly comprises of lay persons. Yet social relations and identities are more difficult to change at the chalkface. Whilst structures may change with relative ease, cultures and identities are more entrenched. Academics tend to be sceptical about market-oriented performance metrics (Stilwell, 2003), being imbued with the spirit of intellectual enquiry, liking their own judgements and not liking to be seen to fawn (Ramsden, 1998). According to Stilwell, whilst NPM may lead to improved performance in terms of measured variables' (2003: 54), it risks the coherence and productivity of the socio-economic system as a whole. It is difficult to operate a line management model within such an environment — particularly where the pursuit of personal goals is a necessary element of corporate success, albeit that corporate and personal objectives may diverge in the short to medium term. Thus, it may be that the coercive effects of managerialist discourses are not as robust in practice as implied in the literature.

3.4 Accountability

At the heart of the changes lies the concept of accountability. Olssen (2002: 43) identifies four distinct types:

- bureaucratic accountability, which is ex-ante, where rules and regulations are specified in advance and accountability is measured in terms of process;
• professional accountability, formulated in terms of standards, based upon expertise of those who work in a particular area;
• consumer accountability, associated with market systems, based on price, and;
• managerial accountability, which works in terms of contrasts in which a set of collective objectives are set and performance rewarded or punished according to the achievement of these.

Olssen (2002) reformulates these four, distinct types into two: bureaucratic-professional and consumer-managerial, the latter clearly a form of neoliberal, utilitarian accountability. Day and Klein (1987) also distinguish between two key types: political and managerial; the former containing contestable criteria of judgement whilst the latter makes those with delegated authority accountable for carrying out agreed tasks according to agreed criteria. Employing another typology, Olssen et al (2004: 194 – 195) identify two distinct types of accountability based upon external and internal loci of control. Table 3.2 contrasts the key features.

Table 3.2 Characteristics of external and internal accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External</th>
<th>Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-trust</td>
<td>High-trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical (line) control</td>
<td>Delegated professional responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual compliance</td>
<td>Commitment, loyalty, sense of duty, expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal process of reporting and recording for line management</td>
<td>Accountable to multiple constituencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced moral agency</td>
<td>Enhanced moral agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ethic of neutrality</td>
<td>• deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ethic of structure</td>
<td>• discretion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


External accountability is based upon line management, hierarchical organisational forms, formal monitoring and contractual compliance. The model is low-trust and within it the moral agency of the professional practitioner is greatly reduced (Olssen et al, 2004). In Thompson’s (1985) view, two distinct ethics are invoked to rationalise and render external accountability acceptable: the ethic of neutrality, in which the practitioner assumes that responsibility for a decision rests with those with greater authority (granted
by organisational status); and the ethic of structure, in which the practitioner assumes that moral responsibility is not possible because of existing political structures and power relations (Olssen et al, 2004). Moral agency is replaced, therefore, by obedience and conformity to organisational (rather than professional) values. In contrast, internal accountability relies upon moral agency, commitment, loyalty and duty in which the practitioner is required to render an account to several different constituencies. Internal accountability entails reflection, judgement and sometimes the resolution of an ethical dilemma. Professional discretion plays is key, rather than conformity to organisational values.

Of interest is the consequence of this shift in orientation – since external accountability is focused upon control and compliance, where does that leave professional integrity? If an individual behaves without integrity within a managerialist framework of control, where does the accountability lie? With the individual, or with the organisation? Within a model of internal accountability this is unproblematic – but when the organisation takes it upon itself to assure compliance with mechanisms of external accountability, then the issue becomes decidedly more complex. It is in relation to such complex realities, involving issues of problem and solution ownership that external accountability begins to unravel, resulting in a simplified, ‘tick box’ mentality in which it is of primary importance to be seen to have mechanisms of accountability in place.

In Ranson’s (2003: 468) analysis, accountability is now embodied as a disposition within which changing ‘practices, structures and cultural codes’ have effectively ended the ‘era of professionalism’ and launched ‘the age of neoliberalism’. Exploring the discourse of accountability in terms of purpose, relations, rules, organisation, power relations, and ground of control, Ranson (2003) concludes that professional equity has been replaced by the ascendancy of the ‘empowered consumer’, regimes of audit and measurable outputs. Professional self-regulation has been replaced by hierarchical reporting structures, formalised, external audit and a requirement to ‘give an account’, introducing prescription and eroding erosion of professional judgement and autonomy. According to Olssen et al (2004), it is in treating academics as workers rather than professionals that their commitment to values and principles which ought to define the field of educational practice is eroded. For Ranson (2003: 462), mechanisms of accountability ‘turn us into inauthentic subjects pursuing and resisting the imposition of extrinsic goods alone’ and are therefore to be resisted. Thus, whilst encouraging individualism and enterprise, the
managerial university simultaneously and somewhat dichotomously places and restricts these 'virtues' within a framework of performance audit and accountability. In Foucault's analysis, the self is always a direct consequence of power and regimes of power do not simply control a bounded, rational subject, but bring the self into existence by imposing disciplinary practices upon the body (in Callero, 2003). From this perspective managerialist governance neither liberates nor constrains utility-maximising man, but actually brings him into existence.

O’Neill (2002) notes a general propensity for professional communities to be called increasingly to account. Public trust in the professions is gradually being replaced by mechanisms of accountability that seek to ensure compliance with State-prescribed standards of practice. Since 1997 the New Labour Government has systematically reinforced mechanisms of accountability, to the extent that at the time of writing the police force has been re-branded a 'service', hospital performance is now measured against target, graded and made public, new legislation will allow citizens to challenge coroners' reports, the proceedings of family courts are to be made public and it is even proposed to introduce a 'voluntary' starring system for GPs surgeries along the lines of that used to grade hotels.

3.5 Performance Monitoring as a Mechanism of Coercion

A key element of accountability is performance monitoring. According to Caiden (2000), at a generic level performance monitoring may produce a number of positive outcomes such as providing a basis for rewarding good performance and setting standards for acceptable work norms. Thus, it might be argued that monitoring mechanisms might help to reduce blind bureaucracy and improve quality. In the public sector this could improve overall accountability for public spending. Another advantage of performance monitoring is that it enables managers to exercise coercive power, if required. Finally, it may also be advantageous in terms of encouraging individuals to manage their own behaviour. Foucault explores the last-named phenomenon (which he terms 'technologies of the self') in 'Discipline and Punish' (1977: 202):

A real subjection is born mechanically from a fictitious relation. So it is not necessary to use force to constrain the convict to good behaviour, the madman to calm, the worker to work, the schoolboy to application, the patient to the
observation of the regulations.’ Technologies of the self will ensure that individuals ‘effect by their own means.... A certain number of operations on their body and souls, thoughts, conduct, ways of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection and immortality.

On the contrary however, it might be argued that monitoring serves to exacerbate self-interest through its very overt focus upon individual performance. Further, that putting formal systems in place is no guarantee of improved outcomes. Writing of bureaucracy, but equally applicable managerialist regimes, Bottery (1992) warns of the dangers of rule-based models, arguing that the creation of rules, rather than making organisations more efficient, may have the opposite outcome. He writes (1992: 42), ‘... individuals, realising that their own job security or advancements rested upon the adherence to these rules, followed these rules for their own sake, regardless of whether such conformity was functional or not. A further consequence... was for the individual to conform to rules, and to avoid doing anything more’ – in other words, rules laid down as minimum standard may become the target performance. Ironically, far from improving overall performance, formal monitoring may lead to demotivation and satisfising. A further externality is in assuring accountability bureaucracy may increase significantly and divert efforts away from primary activities. Recognising that the bureaucracy associated with increased accountability might be counter-productive, the Government established a ‘Better Regulation Review Group’ in 2004. From this the Higher Education Regulation Review Group (HERRG) was created to review the regulation of the sector and produce annual progress reports.

Milliken and Colohan (2004: 389) condemn the whole system of monitoring and reporting as ill-conceived and unfit for purpose, and policy-makers as ‘prima-donnas who are intent on forcing their will on others regardless of the consequences on the main stakeholders – namely, students and academic staff’. Inadequate resources, an inappropriate structure to the academic year and a flawed policy on quality assessment reduce ‘quality’ to nothing more than an ideological symbol that legitimates government policy to spawn practices to increase productivity and control whilst reducing resources. According to Caiden (2000: 40 – 41) ‘the fact that efforts have been made for fifty years to develop and use performance measures in government programs (sic) and that major difficulties are still being encountered in doing so, should give some pause for thought. Since ‘quality’ and ‘value for money’ are essentially subjective, these are most
commonly translated into quantitative measures (which can easily be translated into 'productivity'). According to Caiden (2000: 41), key difficulties lie in:

- translating strategic goals to annual performance measures;
- specifying meaningful measures;
- linking inputs and outputs in a meaningful way;
- isolating extraneous variables which may (have) affect(ed) performance;
- measuring outcomes;
- quality of information, accuracy and timeliness.

Whilst such difficulties are well rehearsed, they have proved impossible to overcome. As a result, individuals may find themselves in a forced pursuit of targets in which they have little confidence, causing frustration and a sense of isolation, insecurity and hopelessness. Critics are numerous and vociferous in their condemnation of such prescriptive coercion:

It no longer matters how well an academic teaches and whether he or she sometimes inspires their pupils; it is far more important that they have produced plans of the courses, bibliographies, outlines of this, that and the other, in short all the paraphernalia of futile bureaucratisation, required for assessors who come from on high like emissaries from Kafka's castle (Johnson, 1994: 379).

Despite criticism, performance monitoring is embedded in academic environments and has shown itself to be a useful way of invoking change in systems and practices, if not culture and values.

3.6 Conflicting Norms

The shift towards external accountability and utilitarianism challenges traditional academic values. For Braun (1999: 245) the new managerialism implies a service philosophy which sits uncomfortably with the belief systems of academics. Certainly, it is relatively straightforward to identify some key differences between 'traditional' and 'managerial' departments both in terms of systems and culture:
Table 3.3 Traditional and managerial departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Academic Department</th>
<th>'Managerial' academic department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative and flexible</td>
<td>Bureaucratic and rule-following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-interventionist leadership;</td>
<td>Positional leadership; authority resides in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management by exception</td>
<td>rank; compliance expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making by debate and</td>
<td>Decision-making by rule application or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual power (academic</td>
<td>imposition (control over academics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom predominant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric of respect for all</td>
<td>Emphasis on one right way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points of view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict in adversarial</td>
<td>Conflict restricted; seen as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atmosphere; may be</td>
<td>destructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals vague and unspecified</td>
<td>Short term operational goals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reliance on algorithms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow learning and adaptation</td>
<td>Reactive, possibly impeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning and adaptation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Ramsden 1998:164)

For Prichard (2000), the underlying values, systems and cultures are so different that hostility is bound to develop between managers and the rank and file. Ramsden (1998) predicts that hostilities will occur along the following frontier (see over):
Table 3.4 Frontier between Managers and Academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academics' problems with management</th>
<th>Managers' problems with academics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of academic</td>
<td>Self-indulgence; lack of relevance; denial of managerial competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperatives, denial of specialist expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference with the right to work</td>
<td>Attempts to challenge proper administrative authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of collegiality and the right to open decision-making</td>
<td>Excessive emphasis on discussion and due process; time wasting; inefficient meetings; unwillingness to take responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure to lessen commitment to an</td>
<td>Poor departmental and institutional cohesion; marginal loyalty to work unit and university; lack of entrepreneurial spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'invisible college'; rise of corporate culture; individual needs ignored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less time to do core tasks owing to increased administrative load; larger classes; less able students; low morale</td>
<td>Unwillingness to share burden imposed by tighter budgets; negativism; culture of complaint and accusation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softening of key distinction between academic and support staff</td>
<td>Inability to accept blurring of roles in the modern university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasingly intrusive quality processes</td>
<td>Lack of accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion of core values of commitment to discipline and professional control</td>
<td>'Overprofessionalism': narrow, excessive specialism; slowness to change to accommodate new demands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ramsden (1998:27)

Certainly, there is little doubt that managerialism has introduced new 'modes of rationality' (Clarke and Newman, 1997: 61) associated with a particular type of organisation and the flows of power through and around them which may come into direct conflict with established norms and traditions. For Winter et al (2000), this is causing diminishing autonomy and demoralisation, whilst for Jensen (1995) outcomes include envy, frustration, regret, betrayal and feelings of isolation. Stokes and Clegg (2002: 226) warn of the creation of an unaccountable, personally politicised elite and a demoralised workforce, 'where some senior members engage in a capricious struggle for power and others struggle for remnants of bureaucratic meaning.' On the other hand,
following a Foucauldian line of enquiry, the product may be the self-managing academic, brought into being through the operation of external controls.

In McNay's (1999: 57) analysis, academics have three options: to subvert; to accept the trend towards 'proletarianisation' delivering standard packages in a standard production line process; or to collapse from the stress of preserving professional standards without adequate payment. A number of empirical studies indicate increasing pressure on academic staff (see Halsey, 1992; Prichard and Willmott, 1997; Dearing Report, 1997; Trowler, 1998; Deem and Brehony, 2005; Parker and Jary, 1995; Trow, 1994; Barry et al, 2001). Demotivation is understandable, since all key areas of academic work; teaching, research and academic administration, are now subjected to rigorous audit, whether it be peer or student module evaluation, managed research, or the RAE. Echoing Barry et al (2001), Houston et al (2006) observe a notable effect upon academic staff at a very practical level in terms of workload and accountability, leading to stress and disequilibrium in the work-life balance. Lacking the political clout to mount a robust defence, academics have found themselves unable to challenge the changes to long-established norms and power structures. Being highly individualistic, academics have difficulty in formally acting collectively (Howell, 2002) such that power struggles are more likely to occur between individuals from different groups than between principal/agent. In addition, the plurality of the academic workforce, the increase in temporary contracts and growing disparity between senior and junior staff means that groups, and individuals within them, are divided from one another by task, influence and seniority (Nixon, 2001b.)

In Jary and Parker's (1995) analysis, it is the failure to acknowledge that universities have multiple, often conflicting goals and that staff loyalties may be divided between institution and discipline that causes demoralisation and hostility towards managers. This can act as a real drag on progress towards an efficient, productive institution, but is generally ignored by policy-makers and managers alike. In McNay's analysis (1999: 57), there is a gap between strategy and systems; whilst the basic strategy may be good, systems may not be developed to give good data to heads of departments. It may also be that departmental heads are simply not up to the task. Failure to integrate strategy, structure, systems and lack of managerial/leadership competence is high-risk in an academic environment. As Ramsden (1998) observes, academics have a tendency to become cynical, disaffected and isolating, developing negative attitudes towards
colleagues, denigrating the departmental head, subverting meetings through sarcasm and lack of cooperation, and being destructive in discussion. In some cases this may even involve 'outright condemnation of the organisation which provides their support and salary' (1998: 30). The Fordist response to this would be to quash such responses, however a more balanced, and possibly effective response would be to attempt to understand the specific actions engendering such behaviours and even consideration of how certain traditions and practices may be retained and accommodated within managerialist regimes.

3.7 Conclusion

'Managerialism' embraces not only structures, systems and processes, but ways of conceptualising, verbalising and acting. As such, it is a discourse with a specific epistemological and ontological perspective embedded in neo-liberal notions of efficiency, effectiveness, quality, value for money and accountability. It is a component of a broader political embrace of market and consumer-oriented discourses which seek to both improve the quality of higher education and give students more information, choice and rights. The nature of professional accountability is changing, moving towards what might be described as a managerial mode, complete with target-setting, performance monitoring, benchmarking and public reporting. For Government, New Public Management offers an apparent rationality, introducing quasi-market conditions, standardisation, bottom-line orientation and relocating decision-making authority. It requires institutions and individuals to take responsibility for monitoring their own performance. For many, this is nothing less than a Pantopican-driven form of subjectivization which threatens the very foundations of academic work. In this sense managerialism in higher education is of symbolic as well as pragmatic significance.

There is a growing body of literature which queries the relevance of managerialist axioms to the academic world – a world in which knowledge may be intangible as well as tangible, and value may be intrinsic as well as extrinsic, nebulous as well as definable and measurable. For many there is a widening gulf between 'traditional' and 'entrepreneurial' values in academia which ultimately may threaten not only academic professionalism, but the very foundations of the academic world. For numerous (predominately academic) critics, dogs and cats are simply separate species; universities and private sector organisations should not necessarily be expected to cross-fertilise or emulate each other's
behaviour. The following chapter explores managerialism and professionalism in terms of power relations between the State and academics, and considers whether academics sub-consciously be in the process of becoming ‘cats behaving like dogs’.
Chapter 4: Technologies of Control and Practices of Self

'Governing people, in the broad meaning of the word, governing people is not a way to force people to do what the governor wants; it is always a versatile equilibrium, with complementarity and conflicts between techniques which assure coercion and processes through which the self is constructed or modified by himself.'

(Foucault 1993 in Lemke, 2001)

4.0 Introduction

This chapter employs a Foucauldian epistemology to explore the nature and shape of power relations in the modern university. It draws upon Foucault’s notion of governmentality, which he defined as a form of reason of state in which ‘the state is governed according to rational principles which are intrinsic to it’ (1991: 97). Central to the analysis is the problematic of how power is exercised. This chapter explores issues of governmentality, specifically how ‘the academic self’ is brought into being through what Foucault terms ‘technologies of power’ and ‘practices of the self’. Of central interest is how external technologies of power operate within higher education and the extent to which these may be internalised and promoted by academics, consciously or subconsciously, through practices of the self.

4.1 Technologies and Practices

In Foucault’s view, power is not a thing to be possessed, but a process to be exercised. It can be productive as well as repressive and can arise equally from the bottom up as from the top down (Olssen, 2006: 19). For Foucault, an analysis of power should be concerned with power at the extremities, in regional, local forms and institutions. Secondly, power should be considered at the level of real practices rather than at the level of conscious intention or decision. Thirdly, power is not to be taken as one individual’s domination over others, but rather as something that circulates. Finally, rejecting the traditional descending analysis, one should conduct an ascending analysis of power, starting from its infinitesimal mechanisms, each one of which has its own history, its own trajectory, its own technologies and tactics (1980a: 99, in Olssen, 2006). These principles inform the ontological perspective of this analysis of the relationship between managerialism and
academic professionalism. As such, the approach employs a method of enquiry that seeks to expose the intensely individualistic and subjective perceptions of academic staff.

Foucault (1980a: 89) poses the question:

If power is exercised, what sort of exercise does it involve? In what does it consist? What is its mechanism?

In the empirical research that follows in chapter six onwards, the exercise of power is explored in terms of discourses and the discursive practices which sustain and promote them. These are important in understanding how academic professionalism is defined and lived out. According to Barnett (1997: 34), ‘the self constitutes itself through the discourses it encounters’, thus in exploring the academic as a professional it is important to understand how ‘the academic self’ is constituted and lived out in the modern university. How power is exercised in universities is driven by the dual forces of the Government’s requirement for accountability on the one hand, and on the other, academics’ need to retain ideological control of their work. Consequently, how power is exercised within universities and the mechanisms which support it are in focus in the chapters that follow.

4.2 Academic Identity and the Constitution of the Self

In Foucault’s view, the self is constituted through two main mechanisms: ‘technologies of power’ and ‘practices of self’. Technologies of power are external whilst practices of self are operated by individuals themselves. Crucially, those engaging in practices of self must have the agency to utilise strategies of power to manage and affect their constitution as subjects through a recognition of the possible subject positions available (1982a: 208) – thus, they are individuals with free will. Far from being powerless, the subject brings himself into being and governs himself in relation to the matrix of relations constituting his environment.

Contrasting with the existentialist position, Foucault’s conception of identity is pluralist and fluid, raising the possibility that it is dynamic and perpetually influenced by relations with others (people, institutions, discourses etc). Identity, thus, lacks a stability of meaning by which it could be defined ahistorically. In this relational ontology (in which
Foucault follows Deleuze, 1990; Spinoza, 1985; and Nietzsche, 1968), identities are constituted in experience, defined in terms of complex effects and relations that are anchored in a historical physical process of emergence. Crucially, this analysis has no end point, since any attempted conclusion as to an object's identity introduces further changes and new differences in its matrix of relations to other objects (Olssen, 2006: 68). The importance of the Foucauldian epistemology in relation to this thesis is that it highlights the fluid, dynamic nature of identities over time, draws attention to the concept of governmentality which concerns power-knowledge relationships between actors and the notion of governmentality, and acknowledges that both by internal and external forces shape academics' concepts of self-identity.

In recent decades a range of external technologies of power have called academic staff increasingly to account. The funding mechanism has proved to be a powerful tool in the State's armoury at individual as well as institutional level. Universities' desire to maximise their share of State funding results in strategic decisions which indirectly affect the spaces within which individuals work and over which (s)he has control, for example, large student cohorts leading to heavy teaching and marking loads and additional student administration. In Salter and Tapper's (2000) analysis, increasing use of external technologies represents a significant shift in power relations between the State, universities and academic staff, with politicians and bureaucrats on the offensive and academics, both individually and collectively, 'on the back foot' (2000: 79). Certainly, since 1980s there is evidence of an increasingly directive and prescriptive external regime, starting with the relatively benign requirement to document course content in relation to teaching and learning outcomes, and latterly, expanding through teaching observation, formalised student feedback and the RAE to a requirement for academics to document their time (in half-hour slots) in the biennial ITAS survey. From a Foucauldian perspective, these developments represent increasingly invasive technologies of power, generated by the state and affecting, albeit indirectly, the discursive constitution of the self within a particular domain.

One must take care not to overstate the case, however. If power is conceptualised not in principal-agent terms as something exerted by managers over academics, but as a process flowing between managers, academics and others then this suggests a more complex and subtle set of relationships. Following a Foucauldian line of enquiry, the apparent decline may instead be analysed in terms of a realignment of relations and a reconstitution of the
self within a dynamic context. For Foucault, individuals are continually engaged in reconstituting themselves in relation to their environment, so as the social, political, and regulatory structures change, so does the constitution of the self. From this perspective, it may well be that, far from feeling overwhelmed and demoralised, academics are simply engaged in recreating their definition of self within evolving structures of contractual, institutional and political control. This they do, in Foucault's view, through practices of the self (manners, customs, norms and habits), through which they attempt to work out, transform themselves and attain a 'certain mode of being' (1991: 2). In Olssen's words (2006: 160) this 'enables them to integrate and manage the relationship between themselves, the societal rules and practices of that period.' For Foucault, that academics respond to changing conditions by reconstituting themselves in relation to the context is a rational response, since in his view, practices of the self can be found in all cultures in different forms through the ages. We should, therefore, not regard this line of enquiry as radical or as a departure from historical tradition – on the contrary, recent literature (Nixon, 2001a and 2001b, Hall, 1996) promote the concept of dynamic self-conceptualisation and evolving professionalism. Additionally, one of the predominant discourses in modern society is that of an ongoing quest for self-improvement, encompassed in formalised practices such as Continuing Education (CE) and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) (critiqued, incidentally, by Foucault and others such as Bobbitt, 2002; Griffin, 1999; and Thompson, 2000, as a disciplinary technique pursued in the name of creating an adaptable, flexible workforce in which educational responsibility is individualised and privatised).

4.3 Inter-dependency

Continuing the Foucauldian ontology, there is some evidence that academics are not simply prepared to be coerced into roles and positions in which the value of their work is defined in purely economic terms. Barnett (1988: 91) opines that 'academic pursuits, carried out in academic settings, by academic persons, should be ultimately directed by those academic persons.' If academic freedom means that academics should have the right to pursue research, to teach and to publish without control, restraint or the threat of sanctions from the institutions that employ them (Turner 1988, in Tight, 1998), then this would almost certainly lead to clashes with university managers and, ultimately, Government. Clearly, however, there is some restraint – in the form of professional codes of conduct and, secondly, through practices of self. From a management perspective this
is fortunate; in Prichard’s (2000: 126) analysis whilst (a Vice-Chancellor) ‘.. could be influential in setting targets with which he sought to station the activities of his staff... their implementation depended upon mobilizing or transforming the locale which maintained these competing identities.’ Prichard (2000) also draws attention to another potentially problematical aspect of university management – that of implementation *representational practices* (e.g. plans and strategies) which tend towards didactic articulation, whilst simultaneously engaging successfully in *dialogic practices* which, in Prichard’s analysis ‘tend to provide the basis for locales’ (2000: 126).

It must be recognised that in universities dialogic practices are tremendously important. Academics have high levels of tacit knowledge and personal expertise (what Bourdieu, 1988, terms ‘scientific capital’), making them difficult to manage, even by those possessing ‘academic capital’- i.e. academic-managers (Bourdieu, 1988). As a departmental head observed, ‘I have actually no sanction over my staff. If they care to raise two fingers to me and go and do something else there is literally nothing I can do about it’ (Prichard and Willmot, 1997: 309). The nature of the academic role, the possession of scientific capital, the relative autonomy and the flexibility of location suggest that in academia the tacit approval of the community is important to managerial success.

Following Foucault, it may be argued that this tacit approval reinforces the existing power structures; for Foucault, power can only be exercised if the recipient acknowledges the legitimacy of the source. Where the community, comprising individuals with scientific capital, has a high level of autonomy and through its actions implies support of those with academic capital (academic-managers), then this can be interpreted as tacit support not only of the role-incumbents, but of the social, political and regulatory structures supporting their position. Critical of the part played by academics, Shumar (1995) observes that academics are implicated in the systematic working out of managerialism. Without their explicit or implied compliance managerial governance simply would not exist. Shumar’s view, and the manner in which it is expressed, suggests that the community may be aiding and abetting their disciplinary masters and that they may actually be in a more powerful position than they realise. Again, through a Foucauldian lens, it could be countered that academics are fully aware of their role in sustaining managerial structures; they may well recognise the political and social construction of their autonomy and accept managerialism provided it allows them to
retain a high level of autonomy and their self-concept. For their part, academic-managers are also criticised for supporting managerialism (Slaughter, 1985) and in doing so altering not only the shape but the very purposes of higher education. Here also the Foucauldian lens provides a different perspective and interpretation. It could be argued that conflict may simply lead to a further reshaping of the network of power relations towards policy-makers, increasing the relative role of external technologies of power in the constitution and maintenance of the academic 'self'. In reflecting thus, both the finely balanced nature and the level of complexity inherent in power relations between academics, academic-managers, institutions and the state becomes apparent.

Middlehurst (1993) reflects this line of analysis (in her work on leadership) by observing that the actions and influences of management may be socially constructed, residing in the minds of the beholders or the systems of norms of the group. In these terms, the collective consciousness of the group may actually be creating and shaping what the community understands as managerialism. Similarly in Trowler's (1998: 25) analysis, individuals do not simply adopt a set of predetermined values and attitudes, but are instrumental in constructing them. Thus, one might expect managerialism to be acted out differently in different locations. Brown and Scase (1994) predict that the relative position of universities will be determined by the distribution of academic capital and the associated reputational capital of institutions, which will determine their level of autonomy from political and economic fields (to avoid confusion, it is worth noting that Brown and Scase employ a different definition of 'academic capital' to Bourdieu's definitions above). It may be that some of the power of managerialism and the academic-managers who embody it lies in academics' need to believe that the system within which they work, and those who maintain it, are important. In a recent study Akella (2003) identifies employees who recognise the unfairness of the management's regime but do not overtly resist or attack management because they recognise that their long-term career growth is linked to survival of the regime. At a deeper psychological level, it has long been recognised that individuals need to have meaning in their daily lives and to believe that that which they are engaged in is meaningful and worthy - in Foucault's view, the construction of self is discursive, and inextricably linked to the social and regulatory structures surrounding them. Foucault recognises that individuals might regard managerialism as a technology, not only of power, but of the self, '...a practice we engage in willingly in the process of producing ourselves as free subjects of a certain kind (Peters, 2001: 78).
In sum, much of the literature appears to employ a particular lens which conceives of relations between the State, universities, manager-academics and academics in terms of the powerful and the powerless. Coercion, demotivation and deprofessionalisation are suggested which may or may not be supported when viewed through a different lens. Following a Foucauldian ontology, the same literature could simply demonstrate that academic possess (to borrow from Bourdieu) scientific capital and acknowledge managerialism as a social and political construction. Far from decrying or undermining the managerial dialectic, it may be viewed as a discursive practice in the same mode as the individual’s discursive constitution of ‘self’. Far from being taken in by the prospect of compliance and reward, the individual consciously determines to ‘play along’, recognising that managerialism is simply a form of governance which goes alongside and is inextricably meshed with governance of the self. Whilst such an approach has led to Foucault being labelled a ‘relativist’ (a charge he was at pains to deny), there does appear to be some merit in exploring how by employing different lenses, perspectives and interpretations may change. The following section continues the Foucauldian epistemology to explore relations between managerialism, the State and universities, how these are critiqued in the literature and how, by adopting a different lens, the interpretation may be different.

4.4 Reworked Relations between Government and Institutions

In aggregate the literature presents a somewhat one-dimensional portrayal of the sector being subjected to substantive, sweeping changes from above. Certainly, from the perspective of power as a thing to be possessed and exerted over others, the potency of the Government’s power appears to be illustrated by the CVCP’s (subsequently rebranded ‘Universities UK’) embrace of managerialism. At the macro level, universities were becoming accountable to society in new terms, specifically in terms of their relative contribution (using financial metrics), whilst at the micro level academics were becoming accountable in terms of their (measured) contribution to institutional objectives. For both institutions and individuals this immediately suggested a conflict with the academic traditions of cultural detachment, relative isolation and disciplinary strength. Why the CVCP should embrace this new discourse appears incomprehensible at first glance.

Through the ‘power as a thing’ lens, it could be that the CVCP felt powerless to resist – perhaps the government quite simply was able to exercise significant and pervasive,
coercive power, supported by the threat of disciplinary action if required in the form of the funding mechanism (Svara, 1985 and 1999). From this perspective, overt resistance may well have been futile. Certainly, Tapper (1997) opines that since universities were so dependent on the state's largesse, it is hard to imagine that there was a viable alternative. Additionally, noting how the government emphasised repeatedly just how important management was in the new model, it may simply have been that vice-chancellors were seduced by the prospect of enhanced prestige within a managerialist regime (Deem, 1998), the less enthusiastic being persuaded by the enthusiasts. The prospect of possessing power and being able to exert this in new ways over members of their institutions may simply have been an attractive prospect. Also, since Western society as a whole places an overwhelming emphasis on rationality, the economic rationalist model proposed by the government may simply have chimed with vice-chancellors' personal beliefs and values.

Alternatively, it may be envisaged that some vice-chancellors may be more receptive than others — in Hood's (1998: 24) words 'what counts as a bad smell is not likely to be the same for everyone. What to one person is an intolerable stink may be scarcely noticeable to another.' From this perspective, and drawing upon Foucault's governmentality thesis, in the state setting out a managerialist framework which in the first instance devolved some strategic planning to institutional level, some vice-chancellors may have welcomed the opportunity to (to all intents and purposes) take control of the management of their universities, believing that the management of state, universities, academics and themselves were somehow part of the same social and political structure, sharing the same moral obligations to contribute to the collective — in other words (as is common at the higher echelons of both corporate and state management), they straddled two worlds and in their own, individual ways, had to reconcile conflicting objectives, as well as conflicting expectations of them from different groups. Interestingly, also, again, recognising the inter-dependence of power relations, drawing upon the dichotomy-duality model of decision-making, it may have been that due to the inter-dependence of the state and the CVCP and the nature of state-CVCP relations (recalling the nature of the relationship between the UFC and universities), vice-chancellors' enthusiasm for the managerialist dialectic may actually have led the government to deal with the sector more robustly than intended originally.
Pursuing this latter point, from a Foucauldian perspective power exists in a network and, as such, ebbs and flows in a complex interplay of structures, processes, norms, cultures and human interactions. Hansen and Ejersbo's (2002) study of administrators and politicians suggests that, as Foucault intimates, the behaviour of one party is shaped by the other and, supporting the dichotomy-duality model appears not only inter-dependent but mutually deterministic. In fairness, there is little research on the CVCP's response or their role in creating new managerial frameworks so much of this is speculation, however it is fair to say that the CVCP was anxious to maintain good working relations with policy-makers and bureaucrats and, though speculative, one can envisage that the government, recognising this, was keen to draw the CVCP into policy-making. It is not difficult to imagine that upon the publication of the Jarratt Report the government must have felt validated in its approach.

4.5 Academics' Resilience to Managerialism

In relation to academic staff, as intimated earlier, it may be over-simplistic to portray them either as outraged but ill-equipped to resist, or entirely compliant. Such a dichotomous approach serves to oversimplify both the inherent duality of Government-sector relations and the variation and dynamism of networked relations within the sector. Despite worsening conditions, it would be premature to suggest that staff feel themselves completely crushed. There has been no mass exodus from the sector, nor mass protests. It is likely that staff do not feel that 'the game is up', but rather somehow manage to retain strong sense of belonging to their discipline, if not their institution. In Hall's (1996:4) view, because identities are constructed within, not outside discourse, we need to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formation and practices, by specific enunciative strategies.' Following this approach, it may be argued that the self is brought into being within prevailing systems of knowledge and discourse, but at the same time individuals are knowledgeable, problem-solving agents have the possibility of action and free thought. Foucault has been criticised for conceptualising identity formation purely as coercive socialization, underplaying the role of individuals' free will (Best, 1994; Callero, 2003). Whilst this may be true in his earlier work, during the 1980s Foucault became increasingly interested in the formation of self, in which he argued was achieved by developing a new dimension of subjectivity which derived from power and knowledge but was not dependent upon them (1985; 1986). Thus conceived, the self has agency, creative action and the possibility of
emancipatory political movements (Callero, 2003: 120). Power is a constitutive force, without doubt, but individual identity is a product of reflexive process of social interaction. This is supported by Trowler’s (1998) observation of the importance of agency in the sense of the power of the actor to influence policy and its implementation.

In Kogan et al’s (2000: 29) analysis, policy-makers over-simplify the complexity of bringing about change, assuming that ‘target groups can be counted on to act as if they are subject to no other influences than the policy itself. This is clearly wildly over-simplistic. To define academics purely in terms of human capital and to anticipate that they will respond to managerialism by becoming more ‘efficient’ and ‘productive’ is clearly naïve. Similarly, to suggest that they are passively accepting change, or becoming ‘reformed’ (perhaps suppressed or submissive) would be to over-estimate the coercive power of managerialism as a structuring force. Gidden’s theory of structuration is important here – as well as playing out the dominant discourse, actors are key to its ongoing construction and shaping. They are also capable of acting to preserve the dominance of disciplines as they are traditionally perceived (Trowler, 1998).

Trowler’s (1998) observation highlights the potential for resistance. From a Foucauldian perspective one should anticipate resistance; according to Bourdieu (1998) this is to expected within a field of forces where individuals seek to maintain or to alter the relations of forces and the distribution of the forms of capital specific to it. According to Foucault, power always begets – indeed presupposes as its adversary and target what it seeks to shape and overcome – forms of resistance. In Foucault’s account resistance is inevitably encountered as individuals engage in ongoing formation and reformation of the self (1980a; 1980b; 1982). In Foucauldian terms, resistance is also in part created and perpetuated by the discourse itself; thus, taking this as a starting point we may anticipate that academics will resist managerialism. The diversity of academia and the nature of academic disciplines as well as academics themselves may allow resistance to flourish. According to Prichard and Willmott (1997: 289) ‘each university is a mix or organisational practices which are historically located and variably resilient and resistant to being wholeheartedly overthrown by the “new” managers’. Marginson and Considine’s (2000) extensive study of Australian universities uncovered a significant heterogeneity throughout the sector. Universities varied in structure, form and processes according to the individual history, status, mission, and so on of each institution. The means that there can be no blueprint for ‘good management’ across the sector, but rather than management
practices must develop within context, providing opportunities for subversion and covert resistance.

It must also be recognised that individual's reactions to managerialism vary markedly (Trowler, 1998). Some may feel excessive pressure and growing concern, yet fearing unemployment (Bourdieu's 'symbolic violence of unemployment'), remain silent. Others may ignore or reject change, other subvert it for their own purposes whilst the remainder embrace it (Deem and Brehony, 2005: 228). A study by Chandler et al (2002) suggests that academics do not reject managerialism outright, but resent the way in which it is implemented. Where implementation is deemed harsh and staff feel victimised, stress and anxiety are likely to follow. Others may experience 'ethical ambivalence' — according to Jansen and Van Glinow (1985), a form of sociological uncertainty in which the behaviours, attitudes and norms that are shaped and maintained by the organisational reward system are in conflict with the behaviours, attitudes and norms which correspond with the ethical values and judgements of organisational stakeholders. Alternatively, some may experience little dissonance, being content to work within a managerialist regime provided they are allowed some space and freedom to pursue their own interests — in an unspoken, but mutually understood contract with the university. At this stage it would seem sensible to anticipate that a high degree of rationalisation and instrumentality in which efforts are concentrated upon those activities where performance is measured.

Finally, it may be that some will be not openly confrontational but, rather, covertly subversive through 'hidden action' (originally analysed as 'moral hazard' by Arrow in 1962). Despite a range of sophisticated surveillance techniques, academic specialisation and the non-transferability of specialised, tacit knowledge creates difficulties between the principal and the agent, as the former may understand neither the subject matter nor the complexity of knowledge transformation. This creates a fog within which the academic may engage in hidden actions whilst working instrumentally towards agreed performance targets - 'giving an account is seen to be a way of avoiding an account' (Day and Klein 1987: 244). In Trowler's (1998) analysis staff fall into one of four categories (and may switch between them as circumstances demand). They may either 'sink', feeling completely overwhelmed by the demands of the job, or 'swim', by developing new modules and programmes which would have been unacceptable in a more elitist environment, 'develop coping strategies' by instrumentally, for example, minimising contact with students and skimming assignment and exam marking, or engage in 'policy
reconstruction' by rewriting syllabuses and assessment methods and interpreting and even redefining policy at implementation. It is entirely plausible that individuals might struggle with the ethics of such instrumentality, which may well come into direct conflict with an individual's professional code — indeed a study by Trowler (1998) identified that almost all of those using such coping strategies expressed regret, but felt that there was simply no alternative if their health and sanity were to be preserved.

Alternatively, following the neo-Durkheimian analysis of Douglas (1982, 1987) and Hood (1998), we may view academics not as instrumental rational actors at all, but purely as sense-makers, seeking to understand the world around them. Research in this area has focused upon grid-group cultural theory which postulates that certain forms of social organisation recur and keep recurring in human affairs. These social organisations are classified according to two dimensions, the extent of group loyalty and, the pervasiveness of societal rules. Although culture is not explored in this thesis, turning to the current context, academics may immediately be categorised as possessing relatively low group loyalty. Of greater interest and possibly greater debate is the pervasiveness of the rules by which they are governed. In the context of academia, whilst it might be argued that academic freedom provides a defence against direct organisational control. Foucauldian analysis would suggest that academic freedom is but another instrument of control indicating not an absence of regulation, but an acceptance of self-regulation. In this respect grid-group cultural theory is useful in highlighting the need to identify the underlying patterns of practices, interpersonal relationships, and the inherent biases, patterns in assumptions which occur within the local setting within organisations. These are important factors in how individuals make sense of their environment.

Finally, in seeking to understand managerialism and professionalism this study assumes that sense-making and instrumentality form two interwoven, interdependent, yet distinct stages of an ongoing process — that is to say that having made sense of the world around him/her, both cognitively and affectively, an individual then determines an appropriate behavioural response. It is assumed further neither process nor outcome are fixed, but subjected to continual review. In Barnett's (1988: 102) view the academic community, being a much more fragmented and instrumental entity than thirty years ago, appears content to 'play its part in contributing to UK plc', but 'does not appear to notice its acceptance of the gradual loss of academic freedom' (1988: 92).
In sum, it may be timely to suggest (tentatively at this stage) that the bulk of the literature may be overly negative in relation to the impact of managerialism, since there is some evidence that academics are accepting of the regulation it imposes and resilient to (any implied or attempted) coercion. In seeking to understand this, it is important to recognise that individuals are constantly engaged in an ongoing constitution and reconstitution of identity and, as such, they are already employing technologies and practices of self-governance. In light of this, the reaction to a new set of managerial controls may simply be an accommodation – after all, it may be viewed as just one more (amongst many) external technology operating on the self.

4.6 Professionalism as a Technology of Control

Whilst much of the literature analyses academics' responses to managerialism, there is correspondingly little written about academic professionalism as a technology of control. Yet, applying the same logic of discursive formation, it is apparent that professionalism is also instrumental in constituting the self. Both managerialism and professionalism as discourses have the capacity to engender subjectivization, in which the individual is created by exercising practices of the self in response to political domination of discursive construction of self. For Deluze (1988, in Olssen, 2006), in his understanding of Foucault, the subject comes into being when the forces that constitute power fold back on themselves, thus creating the conditions for self-mastery. Whilst critics cite managerialist regimes as evidence of political domination, in truth individuals can be constituted equally well as subjects in notions of 'the professional self'. Fournier (1999) analyses the appeal to professionalism as a device of control as an element of a broader shift in the discourses and practices of work organisation. Viewed through this lens it fits neatly into the Schumpeterian ideal of responsiveness to change, continuous development, flexibility and self-management.

One explanation for the discourse of professionalism attracting less criticism than managerialism may lie in perceptual differences between managerialism as a technology of power, operating externally upon the individual, and professionalism as a practice of self, straddling the divide between external and internal regulatory regimes and, possibly, incorporating a greater degree of normative, self-awareness and self-regulation. There may be fundamental differences in psychological responses to what are seen as external and internal loci of control. Managerialism is a classic example of external
accountability, in which there is low trust, formal monitoring and reporting, contractual compliance and a comprehensive system of controls and sanctions. In contrast, the locus of control in the professional domain is internal, the environment is high trust, compliance to values and norms is assumed to be grounded in the moral agency of the professional, commitment, loyalty and sense of duty (see Codd, 1999). Accountability comes in various forms, to a variety of constituencies, and requires judgement, collective reflection and deliberation. The ideological basis and social practices associated with managerial and professional discourses are grounded in different sets of assumptions, the former attracting criticism since they are seen to be anathematic to 'traditional' values, norms and practices of academic life, whilst the latter is seen to protect them. Yet, in might be argued that in practice, 'professionals are the target of professional rationality; they are both the governor and the governed' (Fournier, 1999: 285).

Following this line of enquiry, Hall (1996) suggests that a theory is needed concerning the mechanisms by which individuals as subjects identify (or do not identify) with the positions to which they are summoned, as well as how they fashion, stylize, produce and 'perform' these positions. In Hall's (1996) view, we need to understand why some achieve this, whilst others never do, and are constantly engaged in the agonistic process of struggling with, resisting, negotiating and accommodating the normative or regulative rules with which they confront and regulate themselves. This would certainly be valuable in relation to the current context. Why is it that some academics make the transition to a contract-based form of accountability relatively smoothly, whilst others have difficulty accepting and conforming? It is suggested here, although only speculatively, that it may be something to do with professionalism being perceived by those who consider themselves professionals as a more normative and a more productive (and therefore, acceptable) form of power than managerialism and that, therefore, to identify with the norms, ideals, values and practices associated with professionalism causes less cognitive dissonance than identifying with managerialism. Could this have a significant role to play in the production of self as an object and the practices of self-constitution and definition by which the individual regulates him or herself? The following chapter explores the nature of academic professionalism, the regulatory mechanisms of control operating within the discourse, the issue of normative professionalism, and introduces the deprofessionalisation and proletarianisation theses which spring from the somewhat pessimistic body of literature on the present and future prospects of academic professionalism. Throughout, the sub-plot is concerned with the dual concepts of
technologies of power and practices of self – combining in an exploration of self-identity within the framework of professional being and practice.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined how managerialist discourses enable the operation of external technologies of power, affecting power relations between academics, universities and the State. Following a Foucauldian ontology, it suggests that the constitution of the self is an outcome of both external and internal mechanisms and is constituted discursively within particular domains and times. As such, it is proposed here that much of the extant literature is overly negative. Adopting a Foucauldian lens, this chapter suggests that if power is conceptualised not as a thing to be exploited by the principal over the agent, but as a process circulating within a network of dynamic relations, then perhaps there exists a degree of inter-dependency which is not represented adequately in the literature. There is some evidence that academic-managers acknowledge that their positions are maintained as much by the goodwill of the staff over which they have line management responsibility as by contract, or academic capital. In seeking to understand why academic staff would conform and 'play along', it is suggested in this chapter that (contrary to the literature) perhaps managerial structures allow them to retain autonomy and in doing so, maintain their self-concept. It is suggested further that critics tend not to look beyond managerialism as a technology of control; however professionalism may be similarly viewed. The lack of animosity towards professionalism contrasts with widespread criticism of managerialism; probably due to the former having an internal locus of control, whilst the latter employs external modes, reinforced and maintained by contractual accountability.

The following chapter continues to explore professionalism, looking at the interdependence of relations between the State, the professions and individuals and how these are evolving over time.
Chapter 5: Academic Professionalism

'The postmodernists’ most pessimistic view of the demise of the self has not been borne out; rather, the core self has adapted to contemporary conditions and thrived.'

(Adler and Adler, 1999:54)

Part I

5.0 Introduction

In this research professionalism is explored from a constructivist perspective focused upon members of the occupational group that labels itself 'the academic profession', the State and society at large. Professionalism is a challenging concept to research, since the field is relatively under-researched and such research as exists is criticised as ambiguous and lacking a solid theoretical foundation (see Burrag and Torstendahl, 1990; Dingwall and Lewis, 1983; Freidson 1994). This is not to suggest any shortcomings on the part of theorists (since it is they themselves who voice these criticisms), merely that it is inherently difficult to pin-point the constitution and characteristics of professionalism. Freidson (1994) provides an excellent overview of the complexities involved, including problems of epistemology, time and place, variability of practice, interpretation of trends and, crucially, the lack of sound theory. With regard to the current study it is therefore important to set out the parameters of what will be explored and the epistemology employed.

If we do not take for granted that we know what a profession is, the whole field of professionalism becomes open and complicated and a rationale must be found for the separation of certain occupations and their behaviours (Tostendahl, 1990). For Tostendahl (1990: 2), the theory of professionalism has to do with how knowledge is used by owners as social capital and not only for purposes connected with the immediate problem-solving to which the system itself may refer. This chapter explores academic professionalism as a response to political discourses and analyses the implications for the profession of changing relations between academics, the State and society. Epistemologically it is concerned with knowledge systems, considering to what extent they serve a problem-solving purpose as opposed to creating symbolic value to give academics occupational status. Later sections of this chapter consider claims that the
academic profession is being 'proletarianised' and 'deprofessionalised' and analyses how academics might employ mental mapping and sensemaking to rationalise the effect of changing conditions and maintain the basis of their professionalism.

5.1 The Academic Profession, the State and Society

From the earliest writings the professions were judged to make a positive contribution to social improvement, offering society a high level of competence, knowledge and skill, with an element of altruism not found in the business world, in return for the freedom to run their own affairs. Durkheim (1992) regarded the professions as a positive moral force which protected society from rampant individualism and an authoritative state. From the 1960s onwards the literature became increasingly critical however, and the focus shifted to the occupational honour given to professionals which for many was simply an extension of 'the primitive and feudal usurpations of functions that asked for veneration' (Torstendahl, 1990: 4). Doyal (1979) Larson (1977) and Gilb (1966) criticised the professions for exploiting their power to gain social capital, enhancing their prestige, remuneration and influence within society, whilst others questioned their ability to make a useful contribution (Illich, 1975; Brewer and Lait, 1980). Social economists analysed societal-professional relations in terms of market distortion (Galbraith, 1973; Green, 1975) in which the professions served to distort the market, creating cartels and monopolies. For Torstendahl (1990) knowledge is central and groups which have had problem-solving capacities or, at least, have given the impression that they have, have been asked, implored or ordered to help (in ordering society).

Whilst some groups have managed to establish a privileged position, others have not – some knowledge-based groups have become part of the elite in their societies whilst others have failed to do so. As an occupational group academics (in England) belong to the latter category. Though possessing problem-solving knowledge, they have capitalised on this to the extent that other professions have. To some extent this is a function of the elitist education system that existed broadly until the 1960s which allowed them to exist quite comfortably in a relatively stable position within society (in 'the ivory tower'). The economic crisis of the 1970s threatened this position, but the impact was not felt fully until the 1980s when, as already explored in chapters 2 and 3, the sector expanded rapidly and there was a re-evaluation of the role and position of higher education in society. To analyse the implications of this in theoretical terms it may be useful to employ a
Weberian epistemology and consider how the professions are embedded in the functioning of society. The relationship is illustrated below:

Figure 5.1 The professions and society

In relation to Fournier's (1999) model, as intimated in earlier chapters, relations between actors in higher education have changed substantively over recent decades. Criteria of legitimacy have been reinforced by demands for increased accountability backed by external audit. This challenges directly one of the fundamentals of professionalism, namely 'the principle that the members of a specialised occupation control their own work' (Freidson, 1994: 173). To be granted control, an occupation must be organised as an identifiable group, not just a mere aggregation of individuals who claim to have the same set of skills (Freidson, 1994). In relocating accountability from inside to outside the occupational group, the State may be seen to be 'standing up for' what Fournier (in figure 5.1) labels 'the sovereign customer'. In addition, the State is challenging professional competence (see figure 5.1) by increasing control over academic practice, increasing prescription and eroding responsibilised autonomy (based upon being trusted to act ethically and with moral integrity). The personal conduct of the practitioner is also challenged – in this case through formal quality assurance mechanisms which ultimately are used to inform funding decisions. The final frontier is the erosion of the value placed on the professional as an expert with specialised knowledge. From a post-modernist perspective all knowledge is subjective and biased - according to Quicke (2000:302) 'all
knowledge it is located within a paradigm, or "language game" which has its own discourse rules and truth criteria, and which provides one of a number of possible vantage points from which to describe and explain the world. Thus, there can be no knowledge claims which are ungainsayable or uncontestable.' Whilst this may appear liberating at first glance, it raises some fundamental questions; if the experts (academics) can not be trusted to create and disseminate knowledge, who is better placed to do so? Who is to decide what is to be accepted as knowledge? How is the accepted knowledge confirmed? Whilst post-modern scepticism has reined in the academic profession through politically-driven mechanisms of accountability, there is little evidence that politicians are better placed to govern knowledge than the subject experts themselves.

Of course, there has long been some debate about the extent to which academia can be labelled a 'profession'. Perkin (1973: 77) writes 'Some people, of course, would deny that it is a profession at all- at best a collection of bits of professions, assembled on the principle that those who can, do, and those who can't teach'. For Perkin (1973) the emergence of the academic profession was based upon changing social conditions: growing demand for higher education from the 1960s resulting in an increased reach and influence of universities; the size and complexity of universities leading to formal, institutionalized hierarchies with the accompanying bureaucracy; demands for longer and formal periods of training for young academics and, finally, demand for professional organisation with real influence over the terms, conditions and standards of work performed by its members. Certainly, following Torstendahl's (1990) line of enquiry, it could be argued that over recent decades academics have to exploit their knowledge systems as social capital in response to rapidly changing conditions. An increasingly structured environment, increased accountability and a shift of focus from individual expertise to the university as a driver of the knowledge economy create challenges to which academics must respond. According to Henkel (2000), in contrast to other occupational groups which have long used the label 'profession', academic professionalism is relatively new and has evolved in response to changing political ideologies. As such, it is an outcome - a response to a rapidly changing external environment and new ways of conceptualising the role and position of higher education in society. But, having exposed how the concept of academic professionalism has come about, how does one define what is in essence a diverse group of individuals from various disciplinary backgrounds?
5.2 Defining Academic Professionalism

In Freidson's (1994) view, much of the difficulty of definition is that theorists have attempted to treat profession a generic rather than a changing historical concept. For Freidson (1983: 22):

The definitional problem that has plagued the field for over half a century is not one created by squabbling pedants, to be solved by eschewing definition entirely. Nor is the problem created by the adoption of a static 'structural' or 'functional' approach, to be solved by a 'process' or 'conflict' approach. Nor is the problem created by including traits or attributes in a definition. The problem, I suggest, lies much deeper than that. It is created by attempting to treat profession as if it were a generic concept rather than a changing historic concept, with particular roots in an industrial nation strongly influenced by Anglo-American institutions.

Reiss (1955: 109 - 38) produced a typology of professions in relation to a body of knowledge and its application as follows:

i) Old established professions founded upon the study of a branch of learning, e.g. medicine

ii) New professions founded upon new disciplines, e.g. chemists and social scientists

iii) Semi-professions based upon technical practice and knowledge e.g. teachers and nurses

iv) Would-be professions who have familiarity with modern practices in business, e.g. personnel directors, sales directors etc

v) Marginal professions based upon technical skill, e.g. technicians and draughtsmen.

Using this typology, the academic profession might be defined either as a new profession or a semi-profession, depending upon discipline. In fact, the range of disciplines and type of individuals employed as academics is so broad that it might be appropriate to define the group in Bucher and Strauss's (1962) terms as a loose amalgamation of segments pursuing different objectives in different manners and more or less delicately held together under a common name at a particular period in their history. Recognising the diversity of backgrounds of those working in academia (many of whom are simultaneously members of other professions), it will be of interest to observe the degree
of homogeneity or heterogeneity of responses in the empirical research that follows. For the purposes of this research, the recognition of sub-groups within the all-embracing label 'academic profession' might suggest that the sample should be stratified in a way that recognises the pervasive external influences on academia at this particular time. Looking to disaggregate, one might be tempted to sub-divide academics into segments not only according to discipline but according to whether they are 'research active' or 'teaching staff', or primarily one or the other. In modern society, mainly influenced by the ability of information communication technology (ICT) to deal with huge datasets, sort and order data according to multiple categorisations, there is a tendency to disaggregate groups in order to profile, 'understand' and target communications more effectively. The danger in doing so is that in seeking to differentiate one imposes categorisations and actively looks for differences that may be more artificial than real. For the purposes of this research, therefore, the 'academic profession' will be treated holistically and any sub-divisions will be on a continuous scale (other than 'institutional type'). This approach is informed by Henkel's (2000) text on academic identities in higher education, and echoes the 'bird's eye view' taken by the Carnegie Foundation study (1994) and Dearing (1997) in an attempt to get a broad overview of the academic profession as a whole. It is essentially functionalist and pragmatic and seeks to avoid imposing the researcher's assumptions and potential bias upon the dataset.

However one approaches the measurement of academic professionalism it is important to acknowledge the appropriateness of defining those working in teaching, learning and research in universities as members of 'a profession'. For Jarvis (1983:29), at the heart of every occupation claiming professional status lie two elements: knowledge and its application. From this it is possible to draw out the key characteristics of academic professionalism – of what it means to be an academic in the modern world. From the literature one may identify some generic characteristics of 'academic professionalism'. Firstly, starting with some generic features of professions:

- professionals share a knowledge base which is not shared by those outside the profession (Eraut, 1994);
- professionals belong to discrete group with definable boundaries in which members share a sense of responsibility and common values (Eraut, 1994);
- professionals possess an expertise which is to a large degree tacit and not readily transferable (Eraut, 1994);
• professionalism concerns both tools (such as expert knowledge) and values (integrity, respect for truth and for others) (Stilwell, 2003);
• since the recipients of expert knowledge are not knowledgeable enough to evaluate its value, the professional him(her)self controls professional practice (Eraut, 1994);
• professionalism involves competence, born out of predictability, reliability and acting according to predetermined standards (Barnett, 1997);
• professionalism involves the capacity to hold forth with authority on a subject (to ‘profess’) (Barnet, 1997).

Barnett’s lens is broader than most, focusing on the notion of the professional self as an active, practising, critical expert. In Barnett’s (1997) view, the concept of professionalism goes beyond expertise, competence, integrity, trust, shared norms and value sets to something much more profound – namely the professional as a ‘practising epistemologist’ with a duty to exhibit critical thought and participate actively. For Barnett (1997:133), ‘provided one remains within one’s sphere of competence, one not only has the right to speak out; one has a duty to do so.’ This is a very active notion of professionalism in modern society (and, given societal fragmentation and the post-modern propensity to challenge authority, also a very challenging one).

In addition to these generic characteristics, the following characteristics of academic professionalism are identified in the literature:

• shared values, such as the need to demonstrate evidence and logic behind statements (Kogan et al, 1994);
• an altruistic concern for one’s students (Kogan et al, 1994);
• educational expertise and subject expertise (Chown, 1996);
• a high degree of autonomy, including making decisions for which they are ultimately accountable (Eraut, 1994);
• service to the client, informed consent and accountability (Chown, 1996);
• mutual trust built on mutual respect and belief in the value of professional services (Middlehurst and Kennie, 1997);
• new knowledge generated through accepted processes of discovery and testing and through following the logic of the issues being tackled (Kogan, 2000);
• the application of logic, use of evidence, conceptual and theoretical rigour and creativity and the disinterested pursuit of truth (Henkel, 2000).
In Freidson's (1994) view, scholars and scientists are among those occupations that resemble an ideal model of professionalism. Scholars and scientists are concerned with the development and practice of their specialised body of knowledge and skill and committed to the goals or purposes of their craft. 'They may pursue the unexamined logical implications of what is known and extend them well past immediate practical necessity' (Freidson, 1994: 178). The collective provides the general shelter within which highly critical modes of thought can develop well past what is conventionally accepted. For Freidson (1994: 178), 'these innovative cognitive activities characteristic of professionalism provide a source of growth and enrichment in knowledge, values and technique that could not be produced by workers who are wholly dependent on satisfying the demands that others formulate.'

Figure 5.1 and table 5.1 illustrate the challenges facing the academic profession. In a dynamic world where 'constants' are no longer particularly constant, exclusivity is being eroded and the State increasingly intervening in issues that once defined academic professionalism. For Barnett (1997) it is the decline of the notion of 'professing-in-action' that is contributing to the 'emasculating' of professionalism. Jarvis (1983) writes of this emasculation in terms of academia becoming a 'semi-profession', bound by external constraints and characterised by a rebalancing of the relative role and importance of practice and knowledge. If knowledge and expertise are downplayed then a new approach is required – for Barnett (1997: 149) this entails knowing about knowledge (rather than necessarily having knowledge oneself) and securing legitimacy by demonstrating an understanding of the rules for generating and choosing between knowledges. For Barnett, the academic is a problem-solver, an endorser and with the potential (and the responsibility) to reclaim the intellectual world – in other words, the academic profession can and must justify its existence by becoming an occupational group of practicing epistemologists, as much in society as the university, understanding and engaging with the world (1997: 149).

5.3 Academic Professionalism and Discourse

Another important approach to understanding professionalism is to distinguish between elements that remain constant and those that change with context over time. Freidson (1999) identifies institutional constants that define professionalism and institutional
variables that represent the interacting contingencies of the process of professionalisation:

Table 5.1 Constituents of Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constants</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an officially recognised body of knowledge and skill which is believed to be based on abstract concepts and theories and require the exercise of discretion</td>
<td>the organisation and policy of state agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an occupationally negotiated division of labour</td>
<td>the organisation of the occupation itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an occupationally controlled labour market based upon training credentials</td>
<td>the dominant ideologies of time and place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an occupationally controlled training programme that is associated with a university and segregated from the ordinary labour market</td>
<td>the substance of the particular bodies of knowledge and skill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Freidson 1999: 32)

Applying table 5.1 to academia indicates that higher education is much influenced by the variables of professionalism. Political ideology, governance models, the prestige and culture of individual institutions, the way that academic work is organised, and the substance of academic work all fluctuate over time. According to Freidson (1999), it is precisely through analysis of the variables that one may gain an understanding of the degree of professionalism that historic occupations can attain. In relation to the academic profession, the variables have fluctuated significantly over the past thirty years or so in, influenced significantly by political ideologies and discourses. Neo-liberalism, consumerism, sector expansion, marketisation, commodification, communitarian egalitarianism and policies aimed at equal access have all had an impact. Additionally, ideological changes over time have eroded the student/teacher, novice/expert relationship; trust and deference have been replaced by customer/provider exchanges which are much more balanced in terms of power relations.

Another important element of political discourse is the modern emphasis on individuality. This not only affects the citizen-society relationship but also the embeddedness of individual practitioners in professional communities (Beck, 2000; Beck and Beck-
Gernsheim, 2002; Evetts, 2003). For Lash (2003), disjuncture and unease are reflected in a dual motion of outsourcing and insourcing; an outsourcing of functions through managerial and bureaucratic controls, and insourcing of responsibilities placed upon the individual – in other words, technologies of self-governance. It is noticeable in academia as in other environments that self-governance is supported by external regulatory mechanisms that seek to govern at a distance through explicit standards that individuals are supposed to realise (Fournier, 1999; Evetts, 2003; Amoore, 2004). Adopting a Foucauldian lens, it is suggested here within academia both the constants and variables of professionalism are in a state of flux reflecting a realignment of power relations between the State and the academic profession. The form of that realignment and the immediate and medium-term consequences continue to be a matter of some debate.

5.4 Managerialism, Proletarianisation and Deprofessionalisation

As intimated in chapter 4, there is much to suggest that the position and status of the academic profession is diminishing in today's society. For Jarvis (1983: 22), the degree to which an occupation may be defined as a profession is concerned in some way with both the mastery of an identifiable body of knowledge and the control of its application in practice. Practitioners who have mastery over an area of knowledge have a degree of power by virtue of their expertise. The professional also continually seeks the mastery of the branch of learning upon which his occupation is based so that he may offer a service to his client (Jarvis, 1983: 27). There may be some conflict in trying to achieve these two objectives simultaneously as they may pull in different directions (hence the conflict between research and teaching), nevertheless the duality of function is a prerequisite of professionalism.

For politicians the professions, being knowledge-based, are unpredictable and difficult to control. From the government's perspective, therefore, it is desirable to emphasise the practical elements of professionalism by having bureaucratic systems of managerial control to reduce unpredictability. Whereas knowledge and expertise can be intangible and difficult to measure, targets and performance monitoring can benchmark professional practice relatively simply. Critics maintain that focusing on practical elements of professional practice is an assault on professionalism (Halford and Leonard, 1999; Peters and Olssen, 2005). Targets, benchmarking, monitoring and public reporting are symptomatic of neo-liberal patterns of power, oriented towards compliance and
accountability. For Olssen (2002: 55) private spaces are threatened by managerialist performativity and monitoring:

With the erosion of liberal spaces in terms of which free professional conduct can be practised, so also there is a demise in the immanent basis, a basis located in the conceptions of autonomy and freedom, in terms of which criticism and resistance can be sustained and mounted. Put another way, as the possibilities for disinterested academic enquiry are replaced by the professional requirements of the new functionalism, the provision built in to liberal rule, whereby it provided reflective space for its own criticism and rules for its own transformation, is eroded away.

For Barry et al (2001) the erosion of liberal space is such that academic labour is becoming an ‘academic assembly line’ and for Parker and Jary (2005) an ‘academic production line’ – terms used to describe the deskilling of academics in today’s ‘factories of learning’ (Schapper and Mayson, 2004: 196). Commonly termed ‘proletarianisation’, the deskilling process entails employing managerial directives to wrestle control from employees and having gained control setting out to diminish workers’ power vested in their knowledge of work processes based upon experience and traditions (Schapper and Mayson, 2004: 196). Braverman (1974) was the first to use the term ‘proletarianisation’ in relation to academic labour, which was later further developed and identified as two elements. The first includes objective elements subject to empirical observation, such as less pay, worse conditions, poorer resources per worker, less discretion and more routinisation. The second element includes more subjective elements such as a changed class identification or different ideological outlook (Wilson, 1991: 251). For Wilson, in universities there is evidence of a broad kind of proletarianisation in universities in which professional academic values are being eroded by managerialism and replacing internalised consent by externally imposed control. Ainley (1994) supports the proletarianisation thesis, whilst Stilwell (2003: 57) posits that academic professionals are being ‘commodified’ as ‘labour’, echoing in this respect the conversion of artisans into a working class in the early stages of capitalist industrial development. Halsey (1992: 13) writes of ‘the don becoming increasingly a salaried or even a piece-work labourer in the service of an expanding middle class of administrators and technologists.’ Thus, there is a broad consensus that the nature of academic work is changing as a result of less generous
funding, external mechanisms of control, standardised work practices and attempts to change the outlook and values of those working in academia.

At the heart of the proletarianisation thesis is the claim that academics are becoming deskillled and, in consequence, more pliable and manageable in the Taylorist tradition of industrial work. Hartley (1995) writes of the ‘McDonaldisation’ of higher education, whilst Ramsden (1998) asserts that academics have been transformed from largely autonomous professionals in indulgent organisations to something more akin to supervised workers in tightly-managed businesses. In a similar vein, Trowler (1998: 50 - 54) identifies the key effects of managerialism as ‘work intensification and degradation, bureaucratization, power shifts and surveillance.’ In Trowler’s (1998) analysis looking at the system as a whole confirms the Fordism thesis – flexible contracts, prescription, heavy workloads, techniques of surveillance and performance management all play a part in constraining academic life. For Selway (1995) the Fordist onslaught diminishes academics through task intensification, loss of control, loss of job satisfaction, reduced control over the use of time, loss of autonomy, and deskilling. More recently, citing numerous studies from the UK and abroad (Altbach, 1996; Enders and Teichler, 1997; Finkelstein et al, 1998; Harman, 2000; McInnis, 2000; Martin, 1999) Bryson (2004) identifies the outcomes as declining salaries, recruitment difficulties and increasing obstacles to promotion; the diffusion and blurring of roles; work intensification and overload; casualisation of employment and job insecurity; deteriorating autonomy; and declining collegiality and commitment to the institution. In Bryson’s (2004) view, the result is work fragmentation, intensification and degradation, a transfer of power from academic autonomy to managerial prerogative, and the loss of ideological control over academic work, resulting in declining morale an increase in instrumentalism.

Standardisation is employed to deliver reassurance of consistency of quality and through standardisation processes can be made more efficient and outcomes measured and benchmarked. Scholarship and personal research interests are converted into research outputs suitable for assessment mechanisms (Bryson, 2004) and as part of an input-output model of education. For Schapper and Mayson (2004: 197) ‘The serious business of knowledge creation is now the privilege of corporate decision-makers far removed from teaching contexts, displacing academic staff, the previous custodians of teaching and learning in higher education.’ They conclude, ‘Academic staff are no longer valued for their intellectual contribution to student learning but for their ability to deliver pre-
packaged education with efficiency and economy' (2004: 17). This is the essence of the proletarianisation thesis.

The outcome of proletarianisation is said to be deprofessionalisation. The term was first employed by Haug (1973; 1975; 1979) to mean the loss of professionals’ prestige and trust. In Haug’s (1973) analysis deprofessionalisation entails a loss of monopoly over knowledge that is relatively inaccessible to lay people, dilution of the positive public image built around altruistic rather than self-serving motives and diminution of the ability to set rules as to what constitutes satisfactory work. Peters and Olssen (2005: 47) define deprofessionalisation in terms of a shift in regulatory mode, an epistemic shift in Foucault’s sense whereby liberal norms and values based on authority and expertise of the academic-professional are progressively giving way, slowly but imperceptibly, to a neo-liberal regulatory regime. For Bertilsson (1990: 130) this is simply the outcome of the professionalized society - somewhat paradoxically, the very success of the professionalized society results in ‘deprofessionalisation’ in which organisations among citizens and clients force upon professional practitioners the necessity to review their actions from the point of view of the larger citizenry.

Deprofessionalisation entails the growth of internal and external regulation and monitoring (Newton, 2003). For Jarvis (1983: 26), if training for any occupation were to change and become more practically oriented and less knowledge-based, then it might be argued that occupational deprofessionalisation is occurring. In Skelton’s (2004) analysis, there is some evidence in academia that approaches to teaching and learning have gone from individual to ‘guided’ and ‘directed’. Employing Jarvis’s (1983) framework this could be regarded as a redefinition of academia as a semi-profession – that is to say, having a degree of autonomy yet simultaneously bounded and constrained by a prescriptive bureaucratic framework that imposes prescription and threatens autonomy. In recent years there has been a formal attempt to ‘professionalise’ academia by prescribing standards for the more practical, measurable elements of the job (teaching and learning). Employing a different lens, somewhat paradoxically perhaps, this could be interpreted as a form of deprofessionalisation precisely because it is prescriptive. In 2004 the Universities UK Briefing Service issued consultation document entitled ‘Towards a framework of professional teaching standards’. In it professionalism was defined as, ‘...an individual’s adherence to a set of standards, code of conduct or collection of qualities that characterise accepted practice within a particular area of activity. It can be
applied or measured in a variety of ways, though most usually this is linked to membership of or recognition by a professional body. The professional body may hold a register of approved practitioners, and administers - and often sets - the standards required of the area of activity, monitoring individual practice and approving or providing training meeting the standards.' Appendix A of paper provided a brief summary of other professions' approaches to, and their use of, professional standards. Essentially, the key components were reported as: i) an individual's adherence to a set of standards, code or conduct or collection of qualities that characterise accepted practice; ii) an institute that specifies the qualities required of individuals admitted to membership; iii) a need for professional membership in order to gain employment in the sector.; iv) a commitment to Continuous Professional Development (CPD). The document proposed a framework of required standards in teaching and an accreditation process. This consultation document led to the establishment of the Institute of Learning and Teaching (ILT) in 1999 which later became the Higher Education Academy (HEA).

The proposed framework was never implemented in full, instead the HEA created a broad, non-specific framework for teaching to recognise good practice. This is a far cry from the initial membership scheme, but is linked instead continuity professional development (CPD). The central positioning of CPD can be regarded as an example of how the State tries to ensure, in Olssen's (2002) words that professionals are 'kept up to the mark'. It could also be indicative of academia as a semi-profession in which an external agent (the state) decides that those with a particular role in a certain sector should commit to ongoing development as a principle rather than on the basis of need. On the other hand, there is little evidence that the HEA has had much impact in terms of creating a coherent, sector-wide approach to training. Academics enter the profession from a through a variety of points and universities vary widely in terms of the extent to which their probational training takes account of the HEA's good practice guidelines.

Observing that since the 1970s regimes of accountability have been strengthened systematically. Ranson (2003), echoing Foucault, observes that accountability is 'no longer merely an important instrument or component within the system, but constitutes the system itself.' Certainly, the performance of academics is now monitored closely by various mechanisms, such as Quality Assurance Authority's (QAA) teaching audits, the Research Assessment Exercise (the RAE), and formalised systems of performance appraisal. Academics are having to balance research with the increased requirements of
administration and teaching, and having to respond to externally directed necessities in line with the requirements of the RAE and other quality assurance processes. Not content with measuring outputs, the government has introduced a system of monitoring inputs in the form of the ITAS survey which requires academics to account for how they spend their working day, in half-hour slots. This is not a one-off exercise, but is to be repeated biennially. Many authors suggest that such intrusion creates stress for academic staff; in their analysis of Australian universities Zipin and Brennan (2003: 357) opine that institutions ‘have become infused with such dissonant norms and rules, relative to the dispositions that have drawn many to become educators, as to verge on a psycho-emotive identity crisis’.

It could be argued that the external mechanisms designed to enhance accountability are pulling academics away from engaging in disinterested enquiry and pushing them towards a model of semi-profession in which their role is training rather than educating. Increasing prescription and task standardisation, increased monitoring and formal reporting, benchmarking exercises and league tables fundamentally change the relative power positions of universities, disciplines, academics and the State. A study by Bauer and Henkel (1999) reports increasing pressure for greater differentiation in conceptions of the academic role. In a comparative study of England and Sweden academics in both countries were exposed to new types of managerialist decision-making which appeared to challenge the definitions and knowledge base of the academic profession. In Freidson’s (1994) view, if professionals are required to work within mechanical, albeit permissive, standards they will have to forsake the collegiate and communal principle that lies at the very heart of professionalism. Bauer and Henkel’s (1999) study suggests that academics are unwilling to do this; on the contrary they sought to accommodate the pressures on them within their existing conceptual and value frameworks. As such, ‘academic values and academic disciplines remain a formidable cosmopolitan force (1999: 259). At the same time, for Bryson (2004: 53), ‘pressures to be more productive have driven up workloads and most staff seem to be at (or beyond) the limit of their personal resources in trying to cope with this.’ Thus, a careful balance has to be struck between increasing productivity and accountability on the one hand and ensuring that workloads do not become so overwhelming and autonomy and self-direction so eroded on the other that academics end up as demotivated ‘semi-professionals’. In Nicholls’s analysis (2001:77), ‘what the changing structures of accountability fail to recognise is that these intrinsic goods do not inevitably square with the extrinsic goals and targets of the institution and
that, when push comes to shove, practitioners must, in the interests of their own professionalism, back the values implicit in practice.'

5.5 Practising Epistomologists

It has been suggested that the proletarianisation and deprofessionalisation theses may be over-stated. Murphy (1990) observes that the available evidence refutes the proletarianisation hypothesis; on the contrary (citing Kornhauser, Larsohn, Freidson and Spangler and Lehman) Murphy (1990: 73) claims that professionals in large, highly bureaucratised organisations continue to have technical authority and discretion and that the de-skilling described by Braverman (1974) has not been typical of any major professional group. Freidson (1999) argues that there is little evidence of lay people being able to claim equal knowledge; empirical evidence suggests that professionals have retained a high degree of self-direction and autonomy and have demonstrated an ability to counter external regulation by devising instruments of self-regulation (including peer review). As Davies and Thomas (2002) observe, the literature underplays the many and complex ways in which individuals respond to dominant discourses. One-dimensional analysis largely ignores the socially constructed nature of organisations, the plurality of competing discourses and personal characteristics. Indeed, Ferlie et al (1996) observe that the effect of managerialism is not distributed equally across universities; on the contrary there is evidence that some have gained, whilst others have lost.

In Hall’s (1996: 4) view, ‘Precisely because identities are constructed within, not outside, discourse we need to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formation and practices....’. Thus, it might be argued that, far from experiencing an identity crisis, academics are merely going through the process of readjustment to the post-modern era, redefining their self-image and professional identity and creating a new definition of professionalism within a highly politicised, dynamic environment. As such, academics may simply be accepting the changes as symptomatic of broader, societal changes and their self-concept may be of the rational intellectual, capable of responding positively to the changing environment. In his exploration of ‘the ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom’ Foucault defines the self not as a ‘substance’, but a ‘form’. ‘and this form is not always identical to itself... in each case one plays, one establishes a different relation to oneself’ (1984: 290). Echoing Foucault and following Heath’s ‘suturing’ approach, (1981), Hall (1996: 6)
conceptualises identities as points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which
discursive practices construct for us—in other words positions which we are obliged to
take up knowing that they are representations and thus, never identical to the subject
processes which are invested in them. As such, identities are an articulation of a subject
situated within a discourse at a particular time and place—in other words, not fixed, but a
process (Hall, 1996). Since processes are fluid and dynamic, it should come as no surprise
that professional identity changes over time. In Schumpeterian terms this is not necessarily
negative, but part of an unavoidable reshaping of self-identity in response to an
increasingly dynamic external environment. Post-modernists would argue that academics
should expect to have to re-articulate themselves and restructure relations with themselves
within the professional sphere. Further, they should anticipate that such reshaping may be
transient and fluid, changing not only over time in relation to changing environmental
conditions, but daily, perhaps hourly in relation to the particular case. The pragmatist
would argue that a reformed self is not necessarily a diminished self and taking a positive
view, academics may simply be focusing upon how intellect, character, and action can be
reconciled in living in the context of practical affairs in the present (Marshall, 2003).

As such, the academic profession is simply continuing to evolve along with other
professions in the face of changing political discourses and societal values. This thesis is
supported by the likes of Nixon et al (2001a and b), Halford and Leonard (1999) and Du
Gay (1996b) who argue that a new form of academic professional identity is being
constructed which is more suited to managerialism. Following Jarvis’s (1983) definition
of academia as a semi-profession, it may simply be that all professions now have to come
to terms with a new reality in which the State plays a much more proactive role in
regulation. As such, the academic profession has not been singled out, but along with
others is simply in the process of being redefined as a semi-profession, working within a
regulatory framework designed and operated by the State. If this is indeed the case,
becoming a semi-profession need not necessarily be threatening; after all, self-reflection,
flexibility and a quest for personal improvement play a central role in the post-
modern narrative and there are numerous voices extolling such change. Barnett (1997),
for example, proposes that professionals must become ‘practising epistemologists’, open
(in cognition, self and action) and deploying cognitive frameworks (without restriction) to
make sense of their dynamic, post-modern reality, both in terms of meaning and potential
actions. This requires acknowledgment of inherent conflicts and incoherence which the
professional must somehow manage.
The practicising epistemologist approach underpins the concept of 'the learning professional', popular in education, in which individuals are encouraged to become reflective practitioners, striving for self-improvement. In Habermasian terms, the learning professional needs to develop a 'communicative competence' in which their capacity for understanding and mastering the many ways that language can be used to create social relationships characterised by consensus and agreement (Quicke, 2000: 305). Barnett (1997: 142) claims that:

Through taking on frameworks with large narratives – of freedom, equity, empowerment and emancipation – professionals can intervene purposely in the world. 'The professional is both the interpreter of new discourses and can enable society to understand itself through new discourses. The professional, through her critical thinking and her action, is a discursive creator.

Rather less gushing in style, Exworthy and Halford (1999) argue that whilst managerialism is typically portrayed as a control mechanism and inherently at odds with professionalism, in fact in some circumstances it may actually herald new patterns of collaboration and compromise. Additionally, they observe that many professionals are actually embracing managerialism as a means of career progression and as decentralisation continues patterns of compromise and collaboration may become more pervasive still. In aggregate, the literature suggests that professionalism is in a constant state of evolution, reflecting the dynamism of societal change. It is also apparent that opinions are divided over the extent to which professionalism is under threat, the nature of that threat, and academics' responses. These issues will be explored in terms of academics' perceptions in the empirical research outlined in chapter 6 onwards.
PART II

5.6 Instrumentality and Sensemaking

Management aims to structure and simplify reality and facilitate decision-making. As such, managerialism might be seen as a means of simplifying an inherently complex environment. Critics argue that the rigour of management 'occludes aspects of reality and encourages reductionist understandings of social life' (Trowler, 1998: 101). In Trowler's (1998) analysis, many writers under-theorise the role of academic staff within a managerialist regime, simplifying complex issues such as individual responses, resistance and subversion within a rationalist, top-down model. Thus, Allen and Layer's (1995) continuum of 'resisters' through 'disciples' to 'gurus', Watson et al's (1989) structures and systems to support 'the modular course', Weil's (1994) analysis of the effect of change upon staff and Bocock's (1994) analysis of professional identity tend to portray academics as victims of change and encourage generalisations about staff behaviour. Trowler's (1998) study differs from other empirical literature in that it suggests that whilst academics may indeed be feeling the effects of managerialism, they are not simply passively accepting these but rather are developing strategies to avoid Fordist de-skilling and enabling them to retain autonomy. 'After all, academics are clever people... rebellion and innovation are their forte....' (1998: 55). Foucault (1976) recognises the need to examine power relations within social structures, but offers no explanation as to how individuals make sense of their social situation. To understand more fully how academic staff might respond to the changing environment and make sense of it, it is opportune to borrow from the academic discipline of psychology frameworks of social cognition and social construction.

Social cognition has three elements: cognitive schema, attributions and implicit theories. Cognitive schema are simply mental frameworks that individuals develop to describe the way in which knowledge is organised. Schema are crucially important however, as they are employed to create meaning and make sense of situations. As such, they influence both perceptions and memories. Building upon the concept of cognitive schema, attributions are sets of ideas that suggest that individual perceptual bias acts as a filter on the interpretation of events and outcomes. Implicit theories enable individuals to give meaning to events, to attribute causes to phenomena, and to see patterns and regularity in the world around them.
One can easily envisage that academics are well equipped to create cognitive schemas that enable them to rationalise their personal situation and make decisions about how best to employ their time (although in some instances managerialism may hinder their ability to execute these decisions). Employing attribution and implicit theories, academics may well pursue a much more individualistic path based upon self-centred instrumentality. Drawing upon theories of human capital and rational choice, one could envisage a situation in which academics' self-identity becomes increasingly individually oriented and their behaviour increasingly instrumental, with efforts are directed towards activities where performance is measured and away from those which are not. Power (1997) observes that when the emphasis is on 'holding to account', a culture of 'performativity' is created that strives to optimise performance by maximising outputs and minimising inputs. For Gammie and Gammie (2002: 8) academics 'formulate an individual cost-benefit analysis on the various areas of their work in a bid to retain some control over what they actually do and the consequent rewards attached to each activity.' Individual academics may well become more calculative and instrumental in their approach, marginalising those that are not measured. An instrumental response should not come as a surprise; indeed neoliberals would expect the 'enterprising self' to respond instrumentally in such circumstances. One may foresee increased efforts in certain directions which result in enhanced 'productivity', 'effectiveness' and 'quality' (however defined), counter-balanced by correspondingly less effort and worsening outcomes in other areas. It is in these non-target related areas that direct negative impacts might be felt and unmeasured social costs generated.

Managerialism has no answer to these externalities; this could be justified in terms of Adam Smith's invisible hand theory in which it is claimed that the instrumental pursuit of self-advancement results in the advancement not only of personal utility, but of the greater good. It might be assumed, therefore, that a fortuitous synergy exists between the priorities of academics, management, support staff, students, politicians, bureaucrats and society alike — although this is not made explicit in the ideology. In addition, somewhat paradoxically, it may be that managerialism may actually result in an enhanced sense of collegiality. Writing of the perceived loss of community, and noting that this is not a new phenomenon, Barnett (1994) posits that talk of such a loss occurs when there is a marked disjunction between the interests of the academic world on the one hand and the perceptions of the academics of the demands of the wider world upon them. According to Barnett (1994), academics will respond to such dissonance by attempting to re-identify
their common core, shared values and norms, distinctive identity, and contribution to society. 'It is hardly surprising, therefore, if we find such concerns being voiced at a moment when higher education is being urged to take on the values and concerns of the wider society and its operating procedures' (Barnett, 1994: 11). Thus, it might be argued that managerialism actually enhances, rather than reduces collectivism – academics may consciously reject instrumentalism in favour of a deeply held, value-laden commitment to civic duty. Support for this is suggested in recent studies by Trowler (2001) and Bryson (2004), the latter noting that ‘academic staff seem to have been reasonably successful in resisting the “commodity discourse” and have retained the capacity to defend traditional values, indicating that “deprofessionalisation” does not seem to have advanced too much in recent years’ (2004: 55).

5.7 Social Construction

The principle of social construction is widely accepted throughout both traditional and new sociological approaches to theories of the self, identity and sensemaking. Within this, there is widespread agreement that the leader plays a key role in creating and shaping the day to day reality that individuals are trying to make sense of. As intimated above, the importance of the dominant coalition, or reality-shaping agents, is their influence over rewards and sanctions. Their actions are, therefore, important to the individual even if they only serve to reinforce non-internalised attributions. This recognition of the power of the leader or the dominant coalition is reflected in Foucault’s musings on the self as a direct consequence of power (1976, 1979, 1980a, 1980b, 1988, 1998). According to Foucault, regimes of power bring the self into existence by imposing disciplinary practices on the body. Disciplinary technologies (audit, performance measures, and so on) serve as vehicles of power and mechanisms of domination. From a Foucauldian perspective therefore, sensemaking occurs within the confines of a disciplinary framework such that retrospective rationalisation serves only to justify continuing domination. On the other hand, it might be argued that what Foucault terms ‘domination’ is in fact a deliberate strategy of apparent compliance which serves to mask a conflict between an individual’s internalised beliefs and non-internalised shared attributions. It should not be assumed, therefore, that sensemaking serves to support regimes of domination – apparent compliance should not necessarily be interpreted as submission. A general criticism levelled at postmodernists is that they reduce identity formation to coercive socialisation and fail to grasp the individualising possibilities created by
modernity (Best, 1994), however in relation to Foucault this is to undervalue his insight that power is not exercised over, but in unspoken, but mutually understood networks of power relations.

Treading a middle path between structuralism, symbolic interactionism and postmodern critique, Rose (1996b) advocates a ‘genealogy of subjectification’ in which localised attempts are made to create meaning, especially as this occurs through professional vocabularies, technologies and practices. The approach recognises the relationship not only between the individual and the social context, but also examines the self within relations of control, recognising that it is deeply embedded within systems of knowledge and discourse. Adler and Adler (1999, in Callero, 2003: 128) observe that ‘the postmodernists most pessimistic view of the demise of the self has not been born out (sic); rather, the core self has adapted to contemporary conditions and thrived’. This is the intended end point of this study – to uncover how academics conceptualise their identity, to expose their sensemaking and the coping strategies which allow them to thrive in contemporary conditions.

5.7.1 Symbolic processes

The process of sensemaking is not confined to social relations and behaviours, however, but is also influenced by symbolic processes. According to Greenberg (1995: 186) a symbolic processes refers to any action, phrase, ritual, story, or object that takes on a meaning that is much greater than that of the individual object, and does not simply reflect the relationship between two situations, it also creates this relationship by providing coherence and understanding. The body of literature on symbolic processes indicates that they assist members of an organisation to develop appropriate understanding, to re-establish shared understanding and move away from confusion by providing a familiar structure within unfamiliar situations. Consequently, though intangible in themselves, symbolic processes can influence reality and are, therefore, part of social construction. (Feldman and March, 1981; Frost and Morgan, 1983; Sackman, 1989; Boland and Greenberg, 1988). According to Dandridge (1983) they occur naturally and are inherently social, being concerned with interpreting, and creating a shared reality.

Within the academic context, one might anticipate that the extracted cues and the cognitive framework constructed to facilitate the process of sensemaking will be intensely
individualistic, that is to say that the individual is engaged in a personal quest of sensemaking. Yet, despite the individualistic epistemology, if Weick is correct then sensemaking can not occur in isolation taking into account only one’s own behaviour, but is of necessity anchored in social relations. Due to the nature of academia it is anticipated that symbolic elements may be quite influential, for example, the decline in academic autonomy is highly symbolic, going far beyond practices and behaviours. Echoing Harris (1989), Greenberg (1995) highlights the importance of leaders and managers in sensemaking. According to Greenberg (1995) it is important to manage the process of symbolic interpretation as, left to their own devices employees’ sensemaking my lead to unintended, undesired outcomes. In addition, the symbolic importance of actions and practices must be recognised – in Greenberg’s (1995) study two groups were formed and ‘by creating disparate group procedures, the two new leaders showed department members that the groups would maintain different norms and values’ (1995: 200). Further, ‘leaders statements and actions directed the staff’s attention in ways that unconsciously shaped the meaning of the situation (1995: 201). Thus, as indicated at the start of this thesis, when considering how academics might evaluate the effect of managerialism upon professionalism, managerial practices are of some interest. As intimated above, it is not only the tangible, measurable actions and practices that are important in this respect, but also the symbolic elements of what is done, or left undone.

5.8 Sensemaking

Sensemaking theory provides some support for this line of analysis. According to Weick (2001) the job of the sensemaker is to convert a world of experience into an intelligible world – rather than the quest to discover a hidden code which explains reality, the sensemaking approach acknowledges that individuals ‘scratch around trying to make our experience and our world as comprehensible to ourselves in the best way we can’ (2001: 9). Weick deems sensemaking an essentially social activity, performed not in isolation but through inter-dependent interaction with others and the environment. There is no ‘correct solution’; only maps which individuals construct to make sense of the welter of their experience – meaningful only at a subjective level, at a particular moment in time and space, but no less valuable for that. A study by Barry et al (2001) lends support to this view. Cataloguing a range of individual responses which mediated and moderated senior managerial values as they progressed down through the managerial hierarchy, the study concludes that ‘people muddle through’ (2001: 98) (like the professionals in Strauss et
al.'s [1963] 'negotiated order') in chartered and statutory universities alike. Barry et al.'s study suggests that middle and junior managers make sense of their day to day reality by a two-pronged strategy - compliance and collusion on the one hand, and accommodation, lip-service and open rejection on the other. Interestingly, these responses are manifested at both individual and collective level (2001: 99), lending support to Weick’s (2001) view of sensemaking as social. Barry et al.'s (2001) study indicates that although managerialism appears to dominate the sector, within institutions the approach is one of open-minded pragmatism. If senior management’s managerialist values are considered disingenuous or inappropriate, they are simply ameliorated and worked around with a high degree of pragmatism by middle and junior management. If such practice is widespread and academic staff behave similarly, then the level of cognitive dissonance experienced by the academic community may actually be less than suggested elsewhere. It may be that sensemaking permits the individual to find a comfortable cognitive position in which they neither feel compelled to resist the common enemy nor consciously work instrumentally towards personal goals - individuals may simply muddle through in a rather unconscious, unstructured state, which in the circumstances may serve them well.

5.9 Mental Mapping

According to Weick, sensemaking is a 'process of committed interpretation' (2001: 11), based upon a definition of commitment as something that binds an individual to his or her behaviour. Sensemaking is an attempt to create order, make situations rationally accountable through justification. Skaalen (2004) observes that sensemaking is essentially constructivist - 'about writing the text as well as reading it' (2004: 252), in that individuals actively create the environment from which they draw cues as well as reacting to it. The process is essentially an attempt to rationalise and reduce cognitive dissonance, however the process of rationalisation also embraces imagery and symbolism, which may encompass varying degrees of rationality.

Both sensemaking and commitment to behavioural outcomes constitute the cognitive process of mental mapping, which Gioia and Chittipeddi (1991: 446) outline as:

calling into question an obsolete interpretative scheme, framing a new interpretative scheme in understandable and evocative terms, providing guidance for action toward the incipient change and exerting influence to accomplish it.
Mental models establish images and an understanding of how things fit together. They articulate what is important and unimportant depending on underlying values, share interest and common understandings (Kiesler and Sproull, 1982) and assist individuals to predict and control their environments. However, according to Barr et al (1992) individuals will be successful in this process only to the extent to which their models are accurate and fitting for the given situation. Additionally, the models must be articulated and accepted within the organisation for them to be effective. Articulation of the concept is an important step as means of both developing the mental model and conveying it to others. Hill and Levenhagen (1995) identify four distinct stages of the process of mental model development; intuitive models, metaphors, formal models, and action. At the intuitive level cognitions may be felt, rather than consciously identified – vague feelings rather than clearly defined ideas – and are not yet verbalised.

5.9.1 Cues and Schemas

It is generally accepted in the literature that individuals make sense of their environment through a combination of extracted cues and cognitive frames. Schemas consist of cognitive structures used by individuals to encode, simplify and manage incoming information, or cues. Cues are drawn out as the centre of attention from the environment and put into the context of a cognitive frame in which the sense making occurs, for example sense (and acceptability) of an annual performance review meeting is made by approaching it cognitively as an opportunity to identify ways to remove barriers to research, by reducing teaching duties, administrative responsibilities etc. Harris (1989) suggests that schemas direct behaviours aimed at the exploration of the environment, again indicating social construction. According to Harris (1989), individuals employ four categories of context-specific schemas to assist them to make sense of their experiences. This forms a matrix (see overleaf):
Internalised beliefs are accumulated from experience – some shared, and thereby validated as ‘correct’ and some private. The non-internalised beliefs are those which are expected, valued and believed by others, but do not correspond to the individual’s internalised beliefs and values. They become worthy of schematic summary if the individuals to whom they are attributed have substantial control over personal experiences – particularly those involving reinforcements and sanctions. Attributional schemes operate more consciously than internalised (see Schein’s (1985) cultural level of values, and Sathe’s (1985) level of cultural communications and justification of behaviour) and can be heavily influenced by leaders and other members of the dominant coalition (Harris, 1989). According to psychological theory, if congruence exists between internalised and attributional schemes, the individual becomes emotionally attached, or ‘committed’ to the organisation (Sathe, 1985). This commitment in turn facilitates the processes of sensemaking.

During exploration information is assimilated which may lead to a modification of the schema, thus the schema construction is a cyclical, not a linear process. Weick (1995) also notes the interdependence between the individual, sensemaking and the environment, positing that identities are constructed out of the process of interaction .... ‘the individual is a typified discursive construction’ (1995: 20), yet simultaneously the direction of causality flows just as often from the individual to the situation as it does the other way. According to Weick (1993), meanings affect frameworks, which affect meaning. The interdependence between schemas and environment is recognised in both the literature on
schemas and structuration theory, the latter being understood as the mutual constitution of frameworks and meanings. Whilst at first glance both schema formation and structuration appear overtly positivistic, in fact a key element of both is the recognition of the fluidity of the processes and structures involved.

Similarly, scripting as a sensemaking tool also implies dynamism and fluidity. A script is a ‘procedural’ schema (Hastie, 1981) or an ‘event’ schema (Taylor and Crocker, 1981) concerned with the retention of context-specific knowledge of common or conventional behaviour and event sequences. The purpose of a script is to provide a guide to behaviour and a means of making sense of the behaviour of others. In relation to the current study it is important to note Gioia and Manz’s (1985) observation that individuals do not actively process all information cues anew in order to decide how to behave, but frequently depend upon personal or consensual schemas to understand and respond to organisational situations with relatively little active information processing. Of importance also is Klein and Ritti’s (1980) observation that people often consciously develop and monitor their scripts in a purposeful manner – for instance, to satisfy their needs, preferences or self-interests or simply to create a desirable impression, thus script-writing is essentially constructivist and socially-oriented. Illuminating the inherent vulnerability of schemas and the process of structuring (constitutive relations between meaning and frameworks) in sensemaking, Weick (1993) observes that the may produce a ‘deviation-amplifying cause loop’, capable of intensifying either an increase or decrease in either of the two connected elements. From this it must be concluded that sensemaking, though essential to cognitive dissonance reduction may in fact amplify dissonance-producing elements.

Returning to the process of mental mapping, once individual schemas have been constructed and understood, they are then verbalised. According to Gioia and Manz (1985) at this stage metaphors are commonly employed as a means of enabling the sensemaker to confirm his/her cognitions to him/herself and express them clearly to peers. Once verbalised, cognitions can be formatted and given structure in a mental model which allows the sensemaker to interpret his/her perceived reality such that both the environment and the sensemaker’s relation to it becomes understandable.
5.10 Behavioural Outcomes

The endpoint of sensemaking is not cognitive, but behavioural. Social learning theory holds that behaviour is an interactive function of the individual, including cognitions, the individual's enacted behaviour, and the environment in which the behaviour occurs (Bandura, 1977). The link between sensemaking and behaviour is complex and not fully understood, yet the literature suggests that sensemaking generally ends with socially, rather than individually, oriented behavioural outcomes. According to Drazin et al (1999) the process may be understood as follows: i) an individual develops an intra-subjective cause-and-effect map of events, actions and consequences, ii) places himself in this map, and iii) takes action according to this map as events unfold. Thus, during any experience individuals not only develop a sense of what is going on but also a sense of how to engage. As frames change and develop over time, they mediate between events and his/her actions, determining how an individual responds to a context. Behaviour, thus, is rationalised in relation to features of the environment, and the rationalisation is affected by norms and expectations. Though encapsulating a large amount of symbolism and drawing upon predetermined dispositions, the rationalisation process legitimises and justifies behaviour in such a way that cognitive dissonance is reduced and makes behaviour acceptable to the individual. Weick (2001) posits that explanations that are developed retrospectively to justify committed actions are often stronger than beliefs developed under other less involving conditions because the search to find these explanations requires more effort and more of the self is on the line.

Behavioural outputs are the end point of sensemaking and the manifestation of individual coping strategies. Trowler's (1998) text describes a number of negative outcomes, such as retreating from innovation, working to rule, deliberately making oneself unapproachable, setting up departmental procedures to eliminate the need to deal with central administration, changing pedagogic techniques – essentially displaying instrumentalism in their teaching and administration related duties. Many of the respondents in Trowler's study were unhappy with their responses, but felt unable to control them. Only one appeared to be employing an adaptive, social reconstructionist ideology, utilizing reprofessionalising strategies to resolve dilemmas without jeopardising personal or professional values (1998: 134). This is not too surprising - an important characteristic of behaviour rationalisation is that justifications tend to be made in social terms. Within any organisation there will exist a multitude of diverse frames. The frames become inter-
subjective, with some elements being shared and merged, and others causing antagonism and conflict (Drazin et al, 1999). The nature of the inter-subjectivity depends entirely upon individual roles, status, ideologies and perspectives. It is through the process of individual sensemaking within frames that individuals form commitments to behaviours, the latter occurring within a social framework.

Weick (2001: 15) identifies five important properties of commitments to behaviours which are of interest to this study:

- they begin as commitments to social relationships rather than commitments to individual behaviours;
- these social relationships often generate their own conditions of commitment;
- since social relations rather than behaviours are what people become bound to, justifications tend to invoke social entities rather than individual reasons;
- reifications that justify social commitment tend to set up expectations that operate like self-fulfilling prophecies;
- efforts to validate these social justifications tend to spread them to other actors.

Thus, in the current analysis the behaviour of individuals, though superficially intensely personal and individually-motivated, should not be disassociated from social relations within the broader context. Likewise, commitment to personal behaviours should be analysed with reference to the social group within which the behaviours occur.

5.11 Sensemaking and Professional Identity

It is apparent from the literature that identity formation and reinforcement lie at the heart of sensemaking and, as such, professional identity is not simply a derivative of the environment, but a much more centrally positioned, normative concept. In relation to academia this may be a key factor - if one were bold enough to hypothesise at this stage one might hypothesise that academics, being relatively independent and self-assured in the main, would not be able to reconcile themselves easily to a situation in which their identity was dictated and their role limited to passive compliance. One may anticipate that they would be unlikely to make sense of such a situation, or to remain within it for long. The literature on change in academic environments holds some evidence of retrospective rationalisation and committed interpretation occurring within social entities, however the variety responses makes it difficult to sum up behaviours and sensemaking without over-
generalising. At this stage, therefore, it would be premature to form even tentative conclusions about academics’ sensemaking and coping strategies based upon the emergent body of relatively immature literature. Of interest is a study of how managers in US universities make sense of changing conditions; Gioia and Thomas (1996) suggest that perceptions of identity and image, especially desired future image, are key to the sensemaking process and serve as important links between the organisation’s internal context and managers’ issue interpretations. Gioia and Thomas (1996) conclude that managing change requires consideration of the effects of change on the interpretative schemes of organisational members, but that it is not the existing identity or image, but rather then envisioned identity – those to be achieved – that imply the standards for interpreting important issues. The study suggests that perceptions of identity and image appear to be related (differentially) to political and strategic interpretations, yet that the proximal context for sensemaking is construed mainly in internal terms. The authors conclude that changes to identity can be encouraged by design, and, further, that an influential avenue to changed (organisational) identity is a changed image - ‘A plausible, attractive, even idealistic future image would seem to help organisational members envision and prepare for the dynamic environment implied by strategic change’ (1996: 398). It will be interesting to observe whether (some of) these findings are echoed in the current study. Although the notion of selling academics an idealised image as a means of smoothing identity transformation may seem inappropriate at first glance, it must not be discounted on these grounds. Gioia and Thomas (1996) observe that a compelling future image provides something for people to associate with and commit to, thus easing the launch and eventual institutionalisation of strategic change. This may be universally applicable, and equally valid for both managers and academics alike.

That stated, there is little doubt that the quest to understand sensemaking is complicated by its intense subjectivity. Sensemaking is based upon presumptions which individuals construct, perhaps sub-consciously, to facilitate the process of rationalisation and justification. In addition, individuals will have a variety of personal, and highly individualistic, dispositions which affect their perceptions of a given situation. According to Pratt et al (2001), task-identity mismatch, which devalues identity and causes feelings of inadequacy, leads to a drive for meaning or seeker-ship. Identities are based upon past, present and idealised conceptualisations of individual’s organisations and professions and are intensely influential upon how experiences are viewed and interpreted. Professional identities are reaffirmed by two sources: one’s own, internalised role identity; and other
sources, such as organisational stories learned during socialisation. According to Pratt et al (2001), identities are thus constructed using context and socialisation to build a picture of oneself that can be used to make sense of situations that cause cognitive dissonance (such as surgeons undertaking necessary administrative tasks). Conceptualisations are inherently and intensely private and subjective, thus it is not uncommon for professionals in the same organisation to have widely differing interpretations of 'reality'. As such, it is unsurprising to find distinct sub-identities within a larger group (for example, a profession) with a shared identity at group level. In a study of a graduate medical education centre, Pratt et al (2001) found that professional identities were used as the primary lens for interpreting work tasks, and that individuals drew upon not one, but several social identities from an ‘identity menu’ to help understand their professional identities. Where such lenses ‘failed’, individuals moved to different professional identities as well as organisational identities to help facilitate sensemaking.

In light of the above, and taking on board Pritchard and Willmott’s (1997) observation that we lack data on the discursive positions taken up by rank and file academics, individual subjectivity lies at the heart of the ontological construction of this study. The value of this, however, lies not in insights about any one individual perspective, but the extent to which multiple perspectives may be aggregated and translated into generalisable findings. It is this that is sought in the methodology outlined in the following chapter.

5.12 Research Model

The literature is broad and complex, however some clear themes can be discerned from the review of the literature contained in chapters 2 - 5. These themes are now organised into a research model which the remainder of this study explores in some detail with the aim of shedding light on the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism. The research model is drawn from the literature and seeks to explore the inter-relationships between the key phenomena affecting academics. The literature suggests that workload has increased dramatically in recent years due to larger classes, more marking, increased bureaucracy, increased pressure to publish, and so on. At the same time, universities have been put on a more business-like footing with a bottom-line focus and greater accountability. The research model proposes that heavy workloads lead to feelings of diminished autonomy, loss of freedom in research and worsening overall
performance. Workload is defined as an 'external factor', that is to say, a factor over which academics have little or no influence.

The ontological basis of the research recognises the importance of participants' perceptions, thus the next section of the model is labelled 'attributions', that is to say, variables to which academics attribute their ultimate performance. In this research the attributions consist of a number of key perceptions about; performance, autonomy, freedom in research, accountability and control, and management supportiveness. This stage is very much concerned with cognition, since it is here that mental mapping, rationalisation and sensemaking occur. The next stage of the model concerns an individual's affective response to the outcome of their cognitive processes – essentially the emotional response which follows cognition. Affective responses can be positive, negative or somewhere in between and, of course, may vary over time. An individual's affective response to an external stimulus will influence behaviour, thus the next stage of the model is concerned with behavioural responses, specifically coping strategies that enable individuals to maintain their role and their professional identity. Essentially, it is proposed that workload and managerialism are related to academic professionalism, but in order to understand and explore how we must take into account cognitive, affective and behavioural frames. The research model is explored in some depth in the empirical research that follows.
5.13 Research Propositions

The variables in the research model are explored in the empirical research that follows by means of the following research propositions:

i. Academics perceive workloads to be heavy and increasing rapidly, impacting upon their:
   - Performance (proposition 1)
   - Freedom in research (proposition 2)
   - Autonomy (proposition 3)

ii. Academics perceptions of managerialism are constructed in terms of:
   - Accountability and control
   - Management supportiveness

It is proposed that managerialism has a significant impact upon academics' daily working lives, in that mechanisms of accountability are perceived as invasive (proposition 4) and manager-academics are perceived as unsupportive (proposition 5).
iii. As a result, academics perceive a gradual worsening of performance, loss of freedom in research, diminishing autonomy, increasing accountability and low management supportiveness. In response, they are consciously developing coping strategies to enable them to protect their 'private, autonomous spaces' (proposition 6). It is proposed further that these coping strategies include a high degree of instrumentality (proposition 7) (thus academics themselves, whilst resisting means-end discourses are, somewhat ironically, employing them themselves).

iv. By consciously adopting coping strategies, academics manage to maintain their professionalism (proposition 8).

The research model and the research propositions draw upon a broad body of literature on higher education in the UK, managerialism, professionalism, power and governmentality. To date, no other studies have addressed the specific research propositions or the constructs explored in this empirical study, although Dearing's Report no. 3 (1997) investigated issues of workload, staffing, stress and satisfaction. It is intended that in exploring the variables in the research model and the inter-relations between variables, this research may potentially make an interesting addition to the existing body of knowledge on managerialism and academic professionalism in English universities.

5.14 Conclusion

The concept of profession is contested and the literature complex and contradictory. It is clear, however, that the professions are in a state of evolution and that professionalism is a normative concept. Amid this flux, Friedson's (1999) contribution which identifies constants and variables provides a simple but useful framework: key constants include the possession of expert knowledge and public acknowledgement of that expertise; key variables include dominant ideologies, state policies, organisational discourses and the organisation of the profession itself. Recently, the characteristics of post-modern society have begun to alter one of the constants quite markedly, namely the relationship between society and the professions. Declining respect for experts and the ascendancy of a consumerist and experience-based discourses present significant challenges to the contemporary professional. It is expected that professionals will respond by becoming reflective self-improvers.
In practice, academics must adjust by making sense of the changes and taking a position. They do this by drawing upon explicit cues in their environment and evaluating these within cognitive frameworks which facilitate rationalisation and sensemaking. Although this is intensely personal, sensemaking may be conceived as a social activity which both draws from and contributes to the immediate environment. Like professionalism, it is dynamic, seeking to create order and meaning through retrospective analysis. As such, sensemaking is essentially constructivist – indeed the contribution is an essential element of the sensemaking activity. This two-way flow between environment and individuals’ sensemaking is considered likely to be an important factor in the current context, given academics’ relatively high level of cultural capital.

The following chapter presents the research methodology designed to explore the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism. The author has consciously attempted to design a methodology which is as bias-free as possible, though acknowledging that inherent researcher bias can never be eliminated fully.
Chapter 6 Methodology

6.0 Introduction

Yin (1994: 18) defines research design as 'the logic that links data to be collected and (the conclusions to be drawn) to the initial questions of the study.' Hence, the purpose of this chapter is to describe and justify the methodological basis of the study. The structure of the chapter is as outlined:

Section I
Critique:
Overview
Justification for the use of Critique
Issues of Objectivity and Researcher Bias
Principle of Rationality and the Logic of Choice
Power Relations
Research Question, Aims and Objectives

Section II
Research design:
Structure
Development of the Research Instrument
Definition of Research Population and Sampling Methodology
Sampling Frame
Recruitment of Participants for Interview
Semi-Structured Interviews
Outcome of Interviews
Limitations and Assumptions
Summary
6.1 Section I

6.1.1. Critique

This study broadly employs Foucauldian critique, which Olssen observes (2003: 73) is aimed at '.... identifying and exposing the unrecognised forms of power in people's lives, to expose and move beyond the forms in which we are trapped in relation to the diverse ways that we act and think'. According to Foucault, critique is:

... not a matter of saying that things are nor right as they are. It is a matter of pointing out what kinds of assumptions, what kinds of familiar, unchallenged, unconsidered modes of thought the practices that we accept rest upon.... Criticism is a matter of flushing out that thought and trying to change it: to show that things are not as self-evident as one believed, to see that what is accepted as self-evident will no longer be accepted as such (1988: 154-155)

In these terms, the objective of this study is to explore the assumptions, modes of thought, practices and patterns of power relations in academia.

For Foucault, critique entails a freedom to think differently from what we already know. Positioning himself in the tradition of Kant, Foucault saw critique as, 'an analysis of the conditions under which certain relations of subject and object are formed or modified (in Miller, 1994a: 138). Foucault's objective was to identify and expose previously unrecognised operation of power in social practices. As such, as indicated in chapter four, he was essentially much more of a pragmatist and less of an idealist than the critical theorists of the Frankfurt School, or Habermas, who engaged in a quest for 'rationality' in a seeking to expose 'truth'. In exposing how power operates, Foucault sought to alert others to the dangers of unacknowledged, yet often pervasive, power. Methodologically this research also draws upon Rose's (1996b) social pragmatic genealogy of subjectification, which attempts to produce meaning within local contexts through evaluation of professional vocabularies, technologies and practices. It is by pinpointing these and the assumptions that underpin them that one may begin to expose and understand the nature of power relations within the academic community and by so doing also increase our ability to identify implications and make predictions which may be of
interest and relevance in the increasingly complex environment of higher education in England.

It is widely recognised that critique entails the prerogative to think differently from what we already know – not for personal gain, but for the benefit of the players in the arena. As such, the selected design is influenced by Bernstein’s (1979: 156) observation that social and political reality have distinctive characteristics that affect the ways in which we explain reality - individuals in their social and political lives are self-interpreting beings and the ways in which they interpret their own actions and those of others are not externally related to, but constitutive of, those actions. Thus, the way that players interpret reality, their perceptions, opinions, beliefs and views are of fundamental importance, as these are not merely subjective interpretations, but inputs that actually serve to shape reality.

6.1.2 Rationale for Employing Critique

Critical theorists reject the assumption in mainstream social science that social and political reality is ‘simply a given which is the starting point for a correlational science of society and politics’ which in Berstein’s words ‘encourages a variety of distortions and misconceptions’ (1979: 156 – 157). Thus, this study is rather more fluid in design than some other studies in the social sciences. It is constructivist in that it aims to identify the political, organisational and individual aspects of human behaviour and practices in the higher education context and in doing so reflects in its design one of the fundamental cornerstones of critique - that the world exists independently both of practice upon it, and theories about it. As such, the approach accepts the validity of various forms of knowledge and in common with Habermas rejects empiricism as the ‘definitive’ form of human knowledge, and the validation thereof through technical control. Noting that Habermas defined knowledge as including interpretation and self-reflection (on which his belief in communicative interaction as an essential element of human reality, and his interest in the human quest for understanding and emancipation were founded), the epistemological foundation of this study is similarly constructed. Ontologically the study is anchored in social pragmatism, concerned with individuals' perceptions, views, beliefs and opinions of context, yet simultaneously constrained by context. There is no quest to uncover ‘facts’, but rather to focus upon interpretation and self-reflection. These are essential elements, not only because of the ontology and epistemology, but also because
of the character of the subjects and the context. In employing critique I seek to understand how reality is constructed for the subjects, how such reality arises, what sustains and challenges the meanings within it, and how behaviour and practices are shaped.

Keat and Urry (1975) sound a note of caution over the Habermasian interpretative approach, expressing concern that it might lead to a division of critique into two distinct and irreconcilable components: the investigation of causal relationships that do not involve the subjective states of human agents; and the interpretative understanding of human actions and beliefs. In designing the current study great care has been taken to be neither purely structuralist, nor purely interpretative, or existentialist. The approach is pragmatic and (it is hoped) balanced – following Keat and Urry (1975: 227) a position is sought which, whilst involving both interpretive and explanatory understanding, unifies these in the analysis of structural relations, and of the way in which these affect, and are affected by, the subjective meanings of human agents. Echoing Bourdieu, the approach recognises human agency, but acknowledges constraints imposed by the social. It includes elements of social construction, yet the approach overall is not social constructionism— if one has to attach a label it may be labelled social pragmatism.

Pragmatism requires an appreciation of the existence of a hidden sub-plot which though not apparent is nevertheless important. Following this line of thought Nash (2003: 189) observes that: ‘people are not bound by “unconscious rules”, but have a “feel for the game,” and so are able to make choices within the limits of what is made possible by the habitus - with the emphasis upon specific practices and durable individual dispositions. Further, ‘We may... say that as a result of their socialisation, members of a social group come to acquire a set of dispositions which reflect the central structural elements... of their society, and therefore behave in ways which necessarily reproduce those structural elements, although in a modified form’ (Nash, 2003: 191). Practices, both of managers and the managed, social norms, individual dispositions and sense-making are key elements of the current analysis. Willmott (1987) identifies three distinct strands to earlier empirical studies on managerial behaviour — the political, the cultural and the institutional. Following Gidden’s (1979) approach to structuration, Willmott argues for an integrated approach, linking structure to resources, institution, relationships, interpretations, norms, dispositions and actions. Structure is conceptualised as a medium of strategic conduct rather than a framework within which action takes place. Giddens’ structuration theory shares with Foucault a recognition of the inter-relatedness of power.
relations and the danger of disaggregating these artificially. This study is equally pluralist in design, though practices rather than structures are in focus.

In addressing the research aims it is necessary to go beyond simply mapping the relationship between managerial practices and individuals' professional identity. Following work by Foucault (1991; 1997), Bourdieu (1998), Giddens (1979; 1991) and Rose (1999), the study seeks to identify how practices and norms both shape and are shaped by assumptions, dispositions and sense-making. In seeking this end, it is important neither to overemphasise the social at the expense of the individual, nor underplay agency in a quest for an understanding of the social — in Scott's (2003: 230 — 231) words 'An oversocialised view....condemns us to the adoption of methods which fail to capture the intentional dimension of human agency in the production and reproduction of social institutions. Likewise, too great an emphasis on agency may be reflected in the adoption of methods which fail to capture the institutionalised nature of social life.'

Another reason for adopting critique is the quest to foster understanding by injecting a self-consciousness which may currently be lacking. In Bernstein's words (1979: 182), 'critical theory aspires to bring the subjects themselves to full self-consciousness of the contradictions implicit in their material existence, to penetrate the ideological mystifications and forms of false consciousness that distort the meaning of existing social conditions'). Of course, this aspiration lies at the heart of the debate about the legitimacy of critical theory. From Marx onwards it has been argued that such an aspiration is pretentious and delusional — the reality is that those who stand to benefit most from critique may never even become acquainted with it, and even if they did they might not necessarily understand the issues or share the analyst's view. From such a perspective the effectiveness of critique as a tool of self-awakening is severely limited. In this particular case, however, it is likely that the audience for this thesis will indeed comprise the subjects — both respondents and members of the larger research population under examination — and, since the core function of academia is research, study and scholarship, that the subjects will be both interested in and able to take a view on the subject matter. In adopting critique, it is recognised that descriptive and evaluative components of theory can not be disentangled. It is selected consciously however, as it appears to offer the greatest opportunity to link theory and praxis within the specific context. Further, it is anticipated that the audience for the research is well equipped to deal with any value judgements contained in the text.
In addition, critique is criticised for being normative and value-laden and as such in conflict with the tradition of neutral, empirical research. This need not be an insurmountable hurdle however, as it might be countered that even positivism, anchored in scientific method and aiming to be entirely objective, neutral and rational, cannot avoid reflecting the value judgements of those who design and conduct the research. Weber's claim that facts should be separated from values, and that value judgements should not affect the objectivity of causal explanations has been much debated and criticised (Keat and Urry, 1975, provide an overview of Taylor, Gouldner, Becker and Strauss and MacIntyre's criticisms). - As Keat and Urry (1975: 44) observe, the realist and positivist approaches are based upon two key concepts of objectivity and rationality: firstly, that theory must be objectively assessed by reference to empirical evidence; secondly that there are 'objects' which exist independently of our beliefs and theories about them — in other words a dichotomy between 'the world' and our various attempts to describe and explain them correctly. Personally I do not believe this to be so, believing rather that both science and social science are constructive as well as descriptive of the nature of that which exists — just as they are of social structures, systems and ideologies. This is not to admit to a belief in relativism and to deny completely the existence of universal, objective standards, but rather, an adherence to Keat and Urry's (1975: 204) position that 'reason-explanations are open to two, mutually compatible, modes of assessment: causal and evaluative' (italics added) — that social formations may be analysed in relation to theoretical frameworks and belief sets. According to Marcuse (1964) reason lies at the heart of critique, which seeks to make sense of social reality by (according to Keat and Urry (1975: 219):

- evaluating existing reality as fundamentally irrational;
- attempting to identify the possibilities for change in that reality;
- challenging the ideological, reified consciousness which is generated by existing reality;
- opposing positivism and the positivistic assumptions of most types of social science.

Methodologically this study involves a quest for reason and a conscious decision not to be constrained by artificially imposed, quasi-scientific methods which may hinder rather than facilitate the creation of new knowledge in an emergent field. Thus, care will be taken to ensure that the epistemology contains a rigour born of the desire to expose new
perspectives without imposing assumptions or bias, rather than a grander aim to uncover hidden ‘facts’ or ‘truths’.

It is claimed that critique is ‘a substantive, normative theory which cannot be justified by an appeal to the formal conditions of reason and knowledge’ (Bernstein, 1979: 209) and that in critiquing the current reality one is merely highlighting gaps between what is and what ought to be but providing no solution, however, in fact I seek to offer an approach which in Ray’s (1993: xiii) words ‘develops the Habermasian idea that modern systems have evolved mechanisms of crisis displacement and technocratic management of potential conflicts in ways which avoid threatening the identity of the system’ – in other words, this thesis aims not simply to identify what ought to be, but rather to expose specific perceptions, opinions and actions (and coping strategies) of those employed within the system. The relevance of this is that it not only pinpoints prevailing attitudes and behaviours, but identifies what it is that enables the system to continue to exist. If dissonance is uncovered, I seek to identify coping strategies that allow individuals to remain within the system, as well as the system itself to survive. It has already been observed that the audience for this research comprises the subjects themselves, thus it is argued here that the approach possesses an inherent rationality and logic – certainly no less so than a more positivistic approach might contain – and is supremely fit for purpose. Critique facilitates the examination of one of the key themes of the thesis, namely power. It offers an effective means of analysing the Habermasian query about where the bases of authority lie in a situation where traditional solidarity has been exhausted but where post-traditional structures of integration have yet to be established. Power relations, authority, autonomy, management structures and the inter-relationships of these are key issues, both in relation to government / university and manager / academic relationships.

Within the study of relationships, agency and instrumentality are two issues which require specific attention. This thesis seeks to expose agency and instrumentality through the exploration of a range of specific issues concerning how academics make sense of the current context: for example, what are the practices of management and how do they affect academics; is there a clash between personal and managerialist values; do academics act instrumentally in pursuit of their own personal objectives for reasons of self- gain; are professional norms being subordinated to instrumentality; is professional identity being redefined as a personal quest such that the concept of a shared belief system as the basis of a sense of professionalism as well as the beliefs themselves are
changing? Such an approach is founded upon the Habermasian view that the erosion of traditional identities opens up the potential for self-reflexive identities, and hence for a radically transformed relationship between individuals and collectives. According to Ray (1993), such post-conventional identity is the medium by which (Habermasian) communicative ethics enter into concepts of the self, the conditions for which pertain in the 'lifeworld'. The core of this thesis is, in Habermas's words (1984: 119) 'how the lifeworld (as the horizon within which communicative actions are always already moving) is in turn limited and changed by the structural transformation of (in this case academic) society as a whole.'

6.1.3 Objectivity and Researcher Bias

It should be noted at this point that where, as here, the researcher is examining his/her own environment attempts must be made to remove any intrinsic bias and approach the subject matter as objectively as possible. In Bourdieu's (1988) analysis, this entails making a break with one's initial relation of intimacy with modes of life and thought which remain opaque because they are too familiar. In practice it is impossible to step away from one's own experience, dispositions, preconceptions and perceptions and achieve complete objectivity — it would be naïve to claim otherwise. In selecting critique I am prepared for accusations of prejudice and, worse, of displaying prejudice disguised as analysis. In reply I would argue that the apparent and much debated weakness of critique (that is to say, that it is normative and value-laden) paradoxically, is its strength in this particular context. The research objectives demand an analysis that goes beyond quasi-scientific methodologies which seek to expose 'facts' and identify instead the underlying forces that shape, maintain and reinforce managerial/academic relations. It is proposed here that the academic environment is highly politicised and heavily value-laden and to ignore or attempt to neutralise this through artificially-imposed rationality would be naïve and counter-productive. Acknowledging the interdependency of structural relations, the subjectivity of human agents, the highly politicised and value-laden positions and nature of relations within the context, the approach is pragmatic and realist. In addition, there is little to suggest that any other approach offers more rigour — across the spectrum from ethnography to positivism it can be argued that the underlying assumptions in design are both value-laden and normative. Perhaps it is simply that critique is less disingenuous. According to Bourdieu (1988) the native reader, familiar with the context, will be able to form a judgement on the analysis, internalising, accepting or rejecting as he sees fit,
whilst the foreign reader, because he has no direct stake in the game, will be less inclined
to offer resistance to the analysis. As intimated, the intended audience for this thesis is
fellow academics and academic managers, whom I am certain will be able to identify and
deal with any unintended prejudice.

6.1.4 Principle of Rationality and the Logic of Choice

Much of the extant literature about the changing conditions of academia assumes
rationality and logic of choice in both managers' and academics' decisions which may or
may not exist in practice. Following pure logic of choice, rational individuals are able to
distinguish alternatives; their alternatives are arranged in a transitive preference ordering;
they always choose the most preferred alternative; and, they always make the same
decision and opt for the same preference in similar situations (Downs, 1957; Riker and
Ordeshook, 1973, in Barry, 1976: 145.) However, as Lehner and Shutter (1974 in Barry,
1976: 145) observe, 'as a definition of rational decision-making this formula is of little
relevance because it is a convention, and as a nomological hypothesis it is false.
Psychology and plain practice tells us that individuals are quite often unable to distinguish
alternatives, that a lack of transitive ordering of preferences causes decisional conflicts
and that individuals quite often do not behave consistently over time.' Thus, rational
decision-making by managers would result in a strong goal-orientation, logical structures
and systems, and consistent target setting, audit and performance-management over time.
Similarly, rationally-based decisions by academics would result in a prioritising of
activities where outcomes are measured and high degree of instrumentality. It may be
surmised that such rationality would ultimately produce irrationalities within the system,
for example, individualism may lead to diminished collegiality, redirection of efforts from
teaching towards research, minimal contact with students etc. According to Ray (1993),
instrumentality recognises no rational foundation for conduct other than the most efficient
maximisation of self-interest, thus the underlying question within this particular context is
whether academics are working rationally and instrumentally towards maximising their
personal utility, and, if so, does this affect academic professionalism and, if so, how? Of
course, following Derrida, Laclau and Baudrillard, the notion that individuals possess a
core, rational unitary self, endowed with an essential nature and an independent
consciousness is merely a function of the European Enlightenment (Callero, 2003) – thus,
we must recognise that this study makes assumptions about rationality which may be
countered philosophically.
Weber identified a typology of behaviour based upon different types of rationality: purposive; value; and tradition. In academia, since the product is in economists’ terms a ‘public good’, conflict may arise between purposive and value rationality. According to Lehner and Schutter (in Barry, 1976), however, Weber’s typology is of little significance in the descriptive sense because it defines ideal types of behaviour; ‘Of greater interest are the implications of statements like the principle of rationality in relation to the empirical conditions to which they are applied. Further, ‘And it might be that the term rationality cannot be operationalised but must remain a purely theoretical term’ (1976: 144). The research instrument seeks to expose precisely this issue: whether the principle of rationality is operationalised by academic staff. Whilst academics may be superbly equipped intellectually to make highly rational, logical decisions, when applied within a highly complex empirical setting awash with conflicting objectives and priorities, do their behavioural choices appear to be grounded in rationality and logic of the current climate, or are their decisions value laden and seeped in the traditional ethics of the academic profession? Following Lehner and Schutter (1976), whilst neoclassical economics assumes that *homo economicus* is incapable of learning, behaviourist learning theory, cognitive theory and instrumental conditioning agree that the success or failure of actions determines to an important degree whether preferences are maintained or changed. Thus, in the current context, in Lehner and Schutter’s words (1976: 146) ‘the results of instrumental action and information about chances of success are important factors in the motivation for changing preferences’ – in other words, drawing purely upon neoclassical economic theory one might assume complete rationality in academic decision-making and behaviour, incorporating behavioural theory highlights the importance of uncertainty and evaluations of potential outcomes in a dynamic environment in which power relations have been substantively restructured. Thus, the epistemological foundation of the current application of critical theory integrates economic and social-psychological theory in an attempt to reformulate the theory of rational action in behaviouralist terms. Unlike the theory of rational choice, using this broader perspective the subject may or may not seek to maximise individual utility and may or may not (through intent or serendipity) succeed in doing so.

6.1.5 Power Relations

Finally, it is important to acknowledge the importance of power in terms of it being a force which may facilitate or impede progression towards utility maximisation. Imagining
a scenario in which an individual wishes to maximise his utility, and deliberately sets out to do so, a key determinant of his ability to do so (or not) is his relative position within the immediate environment. Were the individual in a position of power, with a high level of influence over his environment, potential impediments might be small and the uncertainty of the possibility of utility maximisation relatively low, and vice versa. Thus, it would be purely theoretical to explore the rationality of decision-making and utility-maximising behaviour without consideration of the reality of power relations within a university setting. I do not intend to repeat the analysis of power covered earlier, merely to recap at this juncture that qualities such as ‘freedom’, ‘autonomy’, ‘professionalism’ and ‘rights’ are key assignments of power, and to note that relative position, strength and dependence occupy central positions in power relations – the crucial point being that power is not possessed but exercised. Of course, it is extremely difficult to be exact about power and influence, both of which are relative concepts and, as Mokken and Stokman (1976: 51) note, can not often be observed clearly because they are rarely manifested in the form of clearly recognisable ‘power’ or ‘influence’ on behaviour.... ‘the disguise of power is often an important means for the maintenance of power’.

The current reality of power relations within academia is complex. Within a representative organisation such as a traditional university the concept of ‘self’ includes a high degree of autonomy and self-direction. A high degree of individual freedom of action and expression is tolerated or encouraged within a collegial culture. It is this cultural, value-laden tradition which permits the archetypical academic to operate with relative autonomy, with personal credibility emanating from a high level of cultural (and often, social) capital, within a professional, democratic environment. In theory, at least, (s)he is in a position to exercise a significant amount of knowledge-based power (or ‘academic capital’). As such, it might be surmised that academics enjoy significant freedom of action and a relatively solid power base. Many would argue that managerialism has impacted directly upon power relations between academics and managers, reducing the former’s possession of capital, autonomy, freedom of action and ability to exercise power not by curbing actions directly, but by a more subtle normative, coercive power which threatens disciplinary action where ‘transgressions’ occur (such as failing to meet performance targets.) One can detect clear parallels between the imposition of performance targets, monitoring and audit and Rose’s (1992:159) description of citizen empowerment:
Political authorities can now rely upon a range of technologies through which citizens themselves can act upon themselves in order to avoid what they have come to consider undesirable and achieve what they have come to think will make them happy. Citizens now no longer need to be instructed by their political authorities in how to conduct themselves and regulate their everyday existence. We can now be governed by the choices that we ourselves will make, under the guidance of cultural and cognitive authorities, in the space of regulated freedom, in our individual search for happiness and the fulfilment of our autonomous selves.

According to Nixon (2001a) ‘the institutional conditions of academic work are so tightly hedged in by reward and accountability systems that academic freedom, although still evoked, is in practice difficult to exercise.’ ‘A freedom that rebounds negatively upon those that try to exercise it is not particularly liberating.’ Barnett (1997: 53) observes that ‘academic freedom is not taken away; rather, the opportunities for its realisation are reduced’ – thus, of what practical value is such knowledge-based power that can not be exercised?

On the other hand, looking beyond the visible, overt power relations, it might be that academic staff still manage to exercise power in rather more subtle ways – either by taking on some managerial tasks and becoming part of the machinery of power or by not doing or actively resisting. Barry (1976) outlines four distinct modes of power: the ability to activate commitments – by invoking some standard commitment to obey some source of instruction; the capacity at one’s own discretion to change people’s perceptions or goals – such that they want to do something they otherwise would not; the capacity to physically restrain or constrain the actions of others; and finally, the possession by one actor of the means to modify the conduct of another. In relation to universities, the last-named form of power, activated through the embedding and acting out of managerial axioms and structured around principal-agent relationships is most commonly cited and criticised.

As Barry (1976) observes however, this mode of power requires compliance from the subject in order to be effective. As noted earlier, the academic community has repeatedly demonstrated its inability to counter overtly the sweeping, ongoing changes to higher education governance. If we conceptualise this as a power struggle, ostensibly therefore
the academic community has capitulated. *However,* Barry’s (1976: 76) economic analysis of power and compliance, which takes into account the utility gained from various levels of compliance, identifies ‘pockets of relative congruence of interest within a general context of conflict of interest’ – in other words at stages where A makes it worth B’s while to comply. For the model to work, A must calculate the cost of compliance, of non-compliance, and of implementation of the threat which secures compliance, whilst B must balance the cost of compliance against that of non-compliance and sanctions and the likelihood of A carrying out the threat. ‘A making it worth B’s while to comply’ simply means that B must believe that on balance he will be better off if he complies than if he does not. *Thus,* it may be that the academic community, despite initial indications to the contrary, in fact has not capitulated at all but simply made a conscious decision to comply based upon an evaluation of the above and the identification of relative congruence between some elements of government objectives, institutional objectives and their own personal objectives. For example, within a target-setting regime an academic manager (the agent) sets the member of staff (the subject) performance objectives, and agrees teaching, marking and administrative loads. Thereafter, provided the member of staff fulfils his or her obligations, (s)he is given relative autonomy – to decide whether to work from home, schedule office hours, preparation and marking time etc. – in other words, once the outcomes are agreed how the individual achieves those outcomes is (within reason) up to him or her. In this instance B may consider that non-compliance with the target-setting regime would incur greater costs than compliance – the ‘pocket of relative congruence of interest’ in this case being the flexibility of office hours and ability to choose to work from home. Thus, it should not be assumed that apparent inaction equals inaction, nor that any apparent lack of exercise of power means that the subject is unable exercise any.
6.2 Section II

6.2.1 Research Question, Aims and Objectives

The foundation for this study has been laid by a number of studies which have explored the governance of higher education and the changing nature of academic work. Findings from empirical studies overall suggest an inherent conflict between managerialist ideology and the traditional collegiality of academia, and that academic work is significantly more prescriptive, output-oriented, measured and managed than pre-1980s. Taking this as the starting point, the primary purpose of this study is to contribute to the existing body of knowledge by illuminating the current state of academic professionalism. As intimated in the introductory chapter, it is now widely accepted that academic life has changed significantly over recent decades, however the relationship between the managerialism and academic professionalism remains unclear. This study seeks to add to the extant body of knowledge by exposing how academics respond to managerialism, cognitively, affectively and behaviourally. The primary research proposition of this thesis that that a relationship exists between managerialism and academic professionalism and that the nature of that relationship may not be as unambiguous as presented in the literature. It is proposed here that academics are more resilient than much of the literature suggests and that, despite the shift to external modes of accountability and increasing prescription which curtails autonomy, professionalism may, in fact, be robust.

At this stage it is anticipated that academic professionalism may be defended in one of two distinct ways. On the one hand, taking the post-modern approach, academics must simply adjust to a new reality in a globalised world in which traditional definitions of ‘professionalism’ are no longer relevant. Following this logic, academics would be expected to become ‘reflective professionals’ (Light and Cox, 2001), actively attempting to understand and situate themselves within the wider context and thereafter to manage uncertainty by redefining their professional identity such that it remains current, valid and relevant to the world as it is, not as it was. If this is the case it is possible that, far from feeling threatened and isolated, individuals may grasp the opportunity to become part of the managerial hierarchy. In this case dissonance between professionalism and managerialism may be minimal, as both are simply reconstituted elements of post-modern society. Alternatively, as the literature on reflective professionalism suggests, despite
changes in society academics might cling to a traditional model of professionalism, striving to maintain their professional identity within, and despite, the system. Such behaviour would be consistent with 'late-modern' sociological thought (Giddens, Beck etc.) which posits that specific historical developments in the labour market have increased individualisation, self-reliance and pluralism. Academics, now less dependent upon wider social structures, may have 'reflexively constructed' their own identities. Either reaction can be related to changes in society as a whole (and it should be noted that the scenarios presented above are either/or; conceptually these lie at either end of a spectrum).

It is imperative to approach the data collection without any preconceptions, and ensure that the instrument is (as) neutral and value free (as possible.) The first objective is, therefore, to identify how academic staff define academic professionalism. Secondly, to identify whether they perceive themselves to be working within a managerialist regime, and how this manifests itself. Thirdly, whether they perceive a relationship between managerialism and their ability to maintain professionalism and if so, what is the nature of that relationship? Finally, it of interest to explore whether staff are consciously developing coping strategies and, if so, what are they, and how are they implemented?

6.2.2 Research Design

It is generally accepted that effective research design must balance relevance with rigour (Benbasat and Amud, 1999; Malhotra and Grover, 1998; DiMaggio, 1995; Weick, 1995). It is not the prerogative of the researcher to determine arbitrarily the most suitable method(s) for a topic of study. This is determined by the research question to be answered, by the philosophical perspective and by the current state of knowledge reported in the literature (Field and Morse, 1991; Morse, 1994.) The subject of the study (in this case a challenging, dynamic subject) and the nature of the players (academic staff, who are generally individualistic and critical) are also important factors to be considered. According to Easterby-Smith et al (1993), the nature of the research question and the structure of the study are influenced both by the expected outcome and the kind of data needed to answer the question.

The research philosophy, ideology and methodology in the extant literature should play a role in identifying the most appropriate methodology. If these key elements lean in one
direction, then the researcher is faced with the stark choice of continuing along an identified pathway of incremental knowledge-development (preferred by the likes of Popper or Kuhn), or departing radically from previous philosophies and methodologies. If the literature appears to encompass contingency and experimentation, then the researcher faces similar, but less prescribed choices. Much of the literature in the field of higher education is phenomenological and discursive, generally student-focused, and behaviouralist and humanist in orientation. Ideologically, generally it is democratic and idealist and to many authors the ideological foundation of managerialism appears anathematic. The key consideration in this research is that the approach and methodology are both valid and 'fit for purpose', taking into account the requirements of reliability, validity and generalisability in relation to the nature of the research problem and the degree of complexity, sensitivity and subjectivity therein.

Consideration of fitness for purpose, reliability, validity and generalisability in this case leads to a mixed methodology. It is worth noting that the majority of relevant studies have been qualitative, since they have generally probed social construction within an academic environment. This has resulted, however, in small samples and rather tentative generalisability. Bryson's (2004) study stands out as a relatively extensive piece of quantitative research (1,168 responses). Although it is recognised that as quantitative and qualitative address different elements and types of inquiry, they may co-exist and even complement each other, it is still relatively rare for both methods to be employed in educational research. In a recent paper, Foskett et al (2005) observe that research into educational leadership and management (ELM) is overwhelmingly qualitative and suffers from a lack of rigorous empirically-based, quantitative or mixed method studies. This is problematical for a number of reasons, not least because it appears to be affecting the perceived value and contribution of ELM research (by sponsors, government and so on). For these reasons, as well as reasons of personal knowledge, competence and interest and a desire to address triangulation, this research design employs mixed methods.

According to Kimber et al (1990) is it useful to conceptualise a mixed methodology as positioned on a naturalist - rationalist continuum which in themselves should not be regarded as discrete, mutually exclusive entities. Employing both qualitative and quantitative methodologies simply means that this research project is positioned somewhere between the two poles. This is not problematical in that the philosophical foundations of the naturalist and rationalist approaches need not be perceived as
conflicting. In the interviewing stage the phenomena under investigation can be studied as a whole within context, providing a more comprehensive picture of each aspect than might be achievable with quantitative methods. Following this a large, quantitative survey can then isolate and further explore variables drawn out of the interviewing and use them to explain phenomena or draw conclusions. Mintzberg (1979: 587) summarised the synergistic relationship between qualitative and quantitative methods in the following terms:

... for while systematic data create the foundation for our theories, it is the anecdotal data that enables us to do the building. Theory building seems to require rich description, the richness that comes from the anecdote. We uncover all kinds of relationships in our hard data, but it is only through the use of this soft data that we are able to explain them.

Thus, in designing the framework for the research consideration has been given to the motivation for methods selected (purpose, approach and theory base); the focus of analysis (unit of analysis); caveats for measurement (reliability of certain measures and generalisability); and perceptions of the audience (contribution, perceived value and relevance). The approach, therefore, is driven by the purpose, the research questions and theoretical basis of the study. As stated above, the primary purpose of the research is to expose the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism. Within this, the objective is to identify the impact of political discourses, heavier workloads and formal, hierarchial management upon academic professionalism, exploring in particular the effect of the intervening variables; autonomy, managerial effectiveness and coping strategies. From a base of agency and human capital theory, there is an emergent theory of a ‘new’ academic professionalism which, it may be claimed is redefined but not necessarily worse than that which went before. In addition, numerous criticisms have been taken into account (Becher, 1999; Walford, 1992; Smyth, 1995; Cuthbert, 1996; Rothblatt, 1996, in Trowler, 1998) regarding the propensity of higher education research to explore the system level, being insufficiently probing of the day to day life of actors at grass roots level. In Gidden’s view (1976: 16) ‘... to be able to describe a form of life correctly, including its tensions and ambiguities, the social analyst has to learn what it is to ‘go on’ in the activities which constitute that form of life.’ It is precisely by probing responses at the grass roots level that this study seeks to add to the body of knowledge concerning what is really occurring at ‘the front line’ – and the implications thereof.
From these aims and objectives the information needs of the study are identified. Since the ontology is inherently subjective (perceptions, opinions, views etc.), quantitative methods hold some hidden dangers, for example imposing unnecessary constraints through over-rigorous and prescriptive framing where a less structured approach might produce greater insight. On the other hand, when employing qualitative techniques one must take care not to become so engrossed with subjectivity that the findings become intensely individual, lacking an overarching theoretical framework, or prospect of generalisability. Trowler (1998: 164) identifies a need for 'imaginative, ethnographic approaches' when investigating how academics resist, reconstruct and cope with policy change, claiming that methodologies based upon individual responses (interviews and questionnaires) give insufficient account of collective strategies. Taylor (1989) emphasises the importance of 'a defining community' in the formation of identity, whilst McIntyre (1981) argues that individual actors or actions cannot be identified in isolation from context. Notwithstanding these stances, this study follows the well trodden path of interviews and questionnaires focusing upon the individual respondent rather than the immediate community (department, or group) since in the researcher's view individual responses are of necessity formed within a collective cultural context and thus the collective will be reflected in some way through the individual response. In addition, the focus group brought together academics from various disciplines; the discussion reflected the varying cultures of different disciplines and whilst each participant was there as an individual, it would be erroneous to suggest that individual views are formed, held and iterated completely independently of (the collective) context.

6.2.3 Structure

The design is ex post facto, where the researcher simply observes and measures the situation as found. There is no attempt to manipulate or experiment, thus the study is designed simply to be a "snapshot" of the current state of affairs. The body of research in the field is evolutionary and within the extant body of literature the nature of the phenomena being explored is not clearly delineated. The key reason for this appears to be an over-reliance upon qualitative methods which, though providing some valuable insights into individual's subjective perceptions, inevitably raises questions about validity and generalisability. To address this, this research employs mixed methods which fall into three distinct phases; using stratified, random sampling, firstly a focus group was convened to elicit the key issues, followed by a series of interviews at various universities.
and finally a large-scale, quantitative survey of academics employed at various universities. The design provides triangulation, combining qualitative and quantitative epistemologies and methodologies to avoid reliance on one single type of evidence. In doing so, the intention is to seek to confirm validity as well as increasing the understanding of the researcher of the subject matter. The mixed methodology employed in this research acknowledges the co-existence of both shared and unique perspectives, views, opinions and identities within the research population.

6.2.4 Research Population and Sampling Methodology

At the broadest level, the research is concerned with full-time academic staff employed in English universities. The first critical decision to be made in relation to the research design concerns sampling. It is clearly neither practicable nor necessary to sample all staff in every university in order to achieve the research objectives, thus the sampling frame must be disaggregated and ordered in some way. Unlike the USA (see the Carnegie Foundation classification of institutions 1994, updated 2000), in England there has been no systematic attempt to classify universities; neither the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the Higher Education Statistics Agency or Universities UK officially group institutions other than alphabetically, or by region or by subject specialism in their publicly available statistics. Whilst at one level this may appear unhelpful, on the other hand if the research design was to be shaped by public categorisations and ratings this may have imposed an overly positivistic and structuralist approach which suggests a rationality which may or may not exist. There are few academic studies of institutional typologies with only two during the 1990s, both of which employ institutional characteristics as the basis of distinctiveness and categorisation. A UK based study by Scott (1995) simply categorises institutions according to history, designation and nationality, whilst Tight's (1996) study outlines a typology based upon cluster analysis of descriptives. Tight found institution size, generalist/specialist, concentration upon postgraduates and research, study model, old/new universities to be significant factors in developing a typology, concluding that institutions founded at different times, in different circumstances and for different purposes tend to remain somewhat distinct in their present characteristics (1996:75). Based upon his typology, Tight concludes that there is considerable and continuing diversity within the English higher education system, and that diversity appears to be growing. In contrast Smith (2002) found a great deal of similarity in the way that
chartered and statutory universities are managed at departmental level, noting an trend
towards increased homogeneity in comparison to an earlier study (by Smith) in 1995-96.

Hermanowicz (2005) adopts a more humanistic approach to institutional categorisation,
suggesting that structuralist approaches may be misleading and that despite appearances,
people on the inside may account for life within institutions in systematically different
ways. Following Strauss’s (1978, 1993) work on the importance of social worlds,
Hermanowicz proposes a cultural approach to classification based upon academics’
conceptions of careers and of professional success and failure, suggesting that it is in the
qualitative details that one may find meaningful (italics added) similarities and
differences between institutions. Whilst it may be possible to a degree to identify and
categorise behaviours – for example, Smith’s (2002) finding that in general the role of the
Head of Department is becoming more managerial (regardless of the chartered / statutory
divide) and that in statutory universities it is simultaneously becoming more academic -
there is a danger of over-prescription and over-generalisation. The current approach
treads a fine line between structuralism and humanism, being essentially constructivist
and concerned explicitly with the social-interactive basis on which reality and meaning
are created and framed. It follows Trowler’s (1998) and Hermanowicz’s (2005)
recognition that the relationship between structure and culture is interactive and reciprocal
and, as such, what is of importance is academics’ ‘ways of knowing’, ‘that is, how they
envision and go about behaving in their departmental environments’ (Hermanowicz,
2005: 31).

As such, the current research draws upon both the institutional categorisation and
humanistic approaches above. Accepting Tight’s (1996) findings that the sector is diverse
and that institutions may be grouped in a typology according to the chronology of their
founding, as an initial step institutions were stratified according to structural
characteristics. The first distinction to be drawn was based upon the chronology of the
founding of the institution, that is to say between chartered (pre-1992) and statutory (post-
1992), as illustrated in table 6.1.
Table 6.1 List of English Universities 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-1992</th>
<th>Post-1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>Anglia Polytechnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Central England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Central Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunel</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>De Montford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Derby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>East London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keele</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Liverpool John Moores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>London Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>London South Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London:</td>
<td>Luton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkbeck</td>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmiths</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>Northumbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's College</td>
<td>Nottingham Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London School of Economics &amp;</td>
<td>Oxford Brookes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary and Westfield</td>
<td>Roehampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Holloway</td>
<td>Sheffield Hallam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>Southampton Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMIST</td>
<td>Teesside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>West of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>Plus numerous 'University Colleges'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(source: hesa.ac.uk)
Thereafter institutions were grouped broadly according to their purpose, which, following Hermanowicz (2005) attempts to include a degree of culture and value-based typography. At this stage differences are anticipated between institutions that aim for research excellence, those that have research and teaching at the core of their mission, and those that have traditionally been more teaching oriented but have relatively recently embraced research. On this basis the post / pre – 1992 stratification was further divided into the following:

- Pre-1992, chartered universities:
  
  i) The Russell Group:
  An association of the major research-intensive universities of the UK, named after the hotel in which the group was founded. The aims and objectives of the Russell Group are ‘to promote the interests of universities in which teaching and learning are undertaken within a culture of research excellence, and to identify and disseminate new thinking and ideas about the organisation and management of such institutions’ (www.russellgroup.ac.uk). Members in England: Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Imperial College, King’s College London, Leeds, Liverpool, London School of Economics & Political Science (LSE), Manchester, Newcastle, Nottingham, Oxford, Sheffield, Southampton, University College London (UCL), Warwick.

  ii) The 1994/ex-CATS Group:
  Named after the year in which it was founded, the 1994 Group comprises universities which share common aims, standards and values and which have identified research as a core aspect of their purpose. Broadly mapping onto the ex-CATS universities (that is to say, Colleges of Advanced Technology raised to university status during the 1960s), the 1994 group includes: Bath, Durham, East Anglia, Essex, Exeter, Lancaster, Leicester, London Birkbeck, London Goldsmith’s, London Royal Holloway, London LSE, London Queen Mary, London SOAS, Loughborough, Reading, Surrey, Sussex, UMIST, Warwick, York. (It may be noted that LSE and Warwick are members of both the Russell and the 1994 Group).

  Members of the 1994 Group ‘share a commitment to research excellence, to personal teaching and to the particular needs of students from abroad’ (www.1994group.ac.uk).
iii) Other, chartered universities (belonging neither to the Russell or 1994 Groups):

Aston, Bradford, Brunel, City, Hull, Keele, Kent, Leicester, Salford, and Sheffield.

- Post-1992, statutory universities committed to research:

Institutions which became universities by statute in 1992. It must be recognised however
that not all the post-1992 institutions have a research profile, with a number opting to
become essentially 'teaching institutions'. For the purposes of this study only those that
have a commitment to research are included in the research population, as it is anticipated
that the purpose and values of the teaching institutions are so removed from the remainder
of the sector that any data gathered from academics employed in these institutions would
be of little interest to the research question and potentially produce skewed results. This
group includes: Anglia, Bournemouth, Brighton, UCE, Gloucestershire, Greenwich,
Hertfordshire, Huddersfield, Kingston, Leeds Metropolitan, Liverpool John Moores,
Manchester Metropolitan, Northumbria, Nottingham Trent, Oxford Brookes, Portsmouth,
Sheffield Hallam, South Bank, Sunderland, Teeside, Westminster.

Having grouped institutions according to chronology and purpose, the next stage was to
decide how to sample the research population. It was considered to be important that at
least one university from each group was included in the sampling (though this is not to
say that the same number must be taken from each strata). The intention was to seek the
optimum allocation which takes into account variability within each stratum and cost of
taking the sample. Both variability and costs can be estimated, rather than having to be
precise measures (Snedecor and Cochran, 1972: 524.) Conceivably, some institutions may
refuse to participate, in which case another institution from the same stratum would be
approached instead. Generally, employing stratified sampling enables the researcher to
retain some degree of choice over the design, though it is important not to introduce
artificial constraints for the purposes of seeking (and possibly even appearing to achieve)
a scientific methodology and, by implication, validity.

6.2.5 Sampling Frame

The sampling frame comprised lists of academic staff employed in the selected sample
institutions. These lists were very simple to access via staff lists on institutional websites.
In order to minimise variance, the sampling was limited to full-time staff (as part-time staff were anticipated to be affected by a range of additional factors and it was felt that their inclusion in the sampling frame might introduce extraneous, confounding variables that were insufficiently mapped or understood by the researcher). As it would not be possible to differentiate full- from part-time staff from the sampling frame, respondents were asked to confirm at the initial contact stage that they were employed full-time at their institution.

It is conceivable that academic staff may experience very different working conditions at different levels within the hierarchy, for example that professorial staff may be permitted lighter teaching loads and greater autonomy than colleagues at lecturer grade. It might be argued that perceptions, motivations and orientations may vary according to seniority, for example an individual on a professorial grade, being more established within his/her discipline and possessing a high level of symbolic capital, may be less concerned about performance targets and less irritated (or threatened) by a managerialist regime than a lecturer. Equally however, the professor may feel more irritated by a managerialist regime and thus behave more instrumentally than the lecturer. In other words, the research design recognises that perceptions etc. may vary according to seniority, but makes no such assumptions about i) whether they do, or ii) the direction of any such association, as, clearly, other variables similarly may introduce variances. As such, a large degree of subjectivity and individuality is assumed, thus the design must aim to capture a cross-section of academic staff and avoid incorporating any of the researcher's tentative assumptions. Thus, respondents were sampled from 'senior', 'middle' and 'junior' ranks.

The final stage of the sampling design was to ensure that participants came from a range of disciplines, such that the nature, characteristics, ontological perspective, social construction and so on of different disciplines would be included in the study. The sampling was, therefore, purposive in design. Trowler (1998) provides an useful overview of earlier work (Becher, 1999; Clark, 1987; Lodhal and Gordon, 1972; Shinn, 1982; Ruscio, 1987; Davidson, 1994 and Gregg 1996) which, taking an epistemological essentialist position argue that academics' values, attitudes, behaviours and perceptions of the nature and purpose of their work, perceptions of change and so on are embedded in their discipline. Trowler (1998), however, identifies a number of problems with earlier studies (such as over-focusing upon elite institutions, disciplines and academics; confusing theory with reality; over-emphasis on the ideational; the absence of an account
of power relations; and, the complexity of epistemological characteristics) which in aggregate over-simplify earlier analyses of disciplinary-based differences between individuals. The current study follows Trowler (1998) in that whilst recognising that interviewees would come from a range of backgrounds, it is believed that their perspective is partly a function of the discipline to which they belong and partly personal and intensely subjective. It was anticipated that (employing Trowler’s 1998 typology) some academics would be traditionalists, others progressives, other entrepreneurial and others social reconstructivists.

The sampling design took this into account in as much as a range of disciplines were sampled, however respondents were not required to classify themselves according to Trowler’s typology as, recognising the inherent complexity of an individual’s epistemological position, it was not considered advantageous to further shape the research design to take account of these for two distinct reasons: firstly, it was not anticipated that an individual’s background would be any greater cause of bias than, say, personality or outlook; secondly, there was a danger of over-simplification and inadvertent imposition of some artificial and indefensible assumptions which might affect the validity and generalisability of the findings. Thus, the research population comprises academics in full-time employment in English universities engaged in both teaching and research. According to HESA (2006) figures, the population is 68,000.
6.2.6 Data Collection

6.2.6.1 Stage I – Focus Group
The structure and timing of the first stage of the design may be illustrated schematically as follows:

Figure 6.1 First stage of methodology

A key input was the initial focus group held at one of the institutions within the research population in which a group of academic staff was asked to discuss managerialism and professional identity. Methodologically, it was important to ensure that members of the focus group were drawn from the research population and well-positioned to have formed an opinion on the subject matter in hand. In general, focus groups allow participants to bring forward their own personal interpretations of reality and to identify issues and constructs which warrant further investigation, although it must be recognised that the output may or may not be representative of the wider population. It should be recognised too, following Sherif’s work in 1935, that group judgements tend to converge, as members use other members’ opinions to help them form their own and that opinions which do not conform to the group norm tend to be eliminated. Notwithstanding shortcomings, focus groups can produce a rich and detailed set of data about perceptions, thoughts, feelings, opinions etc., in the members’ own words, which may not be obtainable by more structured means. Focus groups are also flexible, being as general or specific as required by the research objectives, structured or unstructured, and essentially spontaneous, providing the potential for insight which may be difficult to match by other
means. As focus group design aims to increase understanding of how individuals conceptualise and categorise phenomena, it is important that the researcher is careful not to impose his (or her) own thoughts, interpretations, prejudices etc., which may distort both the methodological enquiry and the outcome of the research. It is also important to recognise that the discussion depends both upon the individuals that make up the group and the dynamics of the group as a whole, a characteristic that no other research method portrays. In this particular instance the desired outcome of the focus group is a framework which may be used in semi-structured interviewing of individual members of staff. The face-to-face dialogue with staff is intended to explore respondents' opinions specifically on the extent to which managerialism impacts upon academics' sense of professionalism and professional identity.

The first step was to obtain the agreement of the institution that a focus group could be held. The duration of the session was set to 60 minutes, however an additional twenty minutes were allowed to accommodate disruptions to the group dynamics which might occur from participants arriving late or leaving early. Cognizant of Trowler's (1998) view (drawing upon Davidson, 1994 and Gregg, 1996) that disciplines may be affected, and respond differently to managerialism because of their content and stance (ontological standpoint and related methodology), the participants were selected randomly from a sampling frame of academic staff organised by department. Firstly, five departments were selected using simple random sampling, then employing the same technique, five members of academic staff. The initial approach querying whether the member of staff would be interested and willing to participate was sent via e-mail. Once participation had been confirmed, a short outline of the purpose of the focus group, and the wider study was mailed to them, along with a consent form to be forwarded to the university Ethics Committee.

Having gained the approval of the institution's Ethics Committee, the focus group was held on-site. This had the advantage of negligible journey time for participants, and it was also anticipated that the choice of location might enhance participants' sense of security by occurring in a familiar setting. Participants were given a lot of scope to express their views and debate issues, which they did at length, with the researcher prompting discussion by means of a series of general, open-ended questions or statements, taking great care to ensure that the participants were not led in any particular direction. The key prompts are contained in appendix A. One disappointment was that, at the eleventh hour,
one of the participants could not attend, leaving only four in the group. It was decided to run with this rather than to postpone the meeting, since this initial exploration of the issues would be followed by a series of interviews with a number of academics at various institutions.

The focus group ran smoothly, participants were extremely enthusiastic and well informed. Discussion was lively with a high level of engagement and input from each member of the group and none dominating the discussion. In the first instance the output was subjected to content analysis employing Ritchie and Spencer's (1994) systematic approach. The computing software package, NVivo was utilised in this instance to facilitate the process. Time was spent becoming familiar with the data and using the software to facilitate the identification of themes, indexing and charting activities. The responses are presented in the following chapter.

From this and the literature review a number of issues emerged which formed the basis for the interview schedule (and subsequently informed the questionnaire for the online survey). Care was taken to ensure that the interview schedule and the questionnaire contained both positive and negative questions and/or statements in order not to present a 'slanted' view, and to minimise the potential for misunderstandings, misconceptions or 'skimming' on the part of the respondents (for example, by presenting respondents with a number of positive statements) and to ensure that both individual items and the constructs as a whole actually measure what they sought to.
6.2.6.2 Stage II – the Interviews

The structure and timing of the second stage of the design is illustrated schematically as follows:

Figure 6.2 Second stage of methodology

- **Phase 1:** Identification and grouping of institutions
  - July 2005
- **Phase 2:** Gaining the permission of institutions to approach staff
- **Phase 3:** Selection of participants for interviewing
- **Phase 4:** Interviewing
- **Phase 5:** Analysis of interview data
  - September 2005

In the context of the resources available to the researcher the number of interviews would clearly have to be limited, however prior to the interviews taking place it was difficult to determine how many would be required to offer insight into the perceptions, motivations and opinions of academics employed in each of the typological groups. Taking into account resources and timescales, it was decided to conduct eleven semi-structured interviews (3 Russell Group, 4 1994/ex-CATS and 4 post-1992 universities) initially in order to see whether distinct phenomena emerged. The output of these interviews could in no way considered generalisable, but common issues might emerge whatever the institutional history, mission, size, form and so on. It would then be possible to determine whether further interviews appeared desirable or whether phenomena were defined clearly enough to enable the next stage of the data collection (the quantitative survey) to be embarked upon.

Participants were recruited by a process of stratified random sampling. Firstly, institutions were listed within each of the three typological groups identified earlier. Secondly, using the random sampling feature on SPSS an institution was selected from the listing. Permission to interview staff was sought from the institution by means of a formal,
written request. Once permissions had been granted, from the selected institution's website i) a department and ii) an individual was selected at random and an e-mail sent asking whether (s)he would be willing to participate in an interview. This was followed up with a further e-mail and a telephone call until the individual either agreed or declined to participate. In cases where the individual did not wish to participate, again using a random methodology a different individual was selected and the process repeated until a willing participant was found. Participants were not offered inducements of any kind.

The semi-structured interview between researcher and post-holder provides a means of exploring the issues arising from the literature review and the focus group in a way that is discursive and immediate. Following Silverman (1993) and Prichard (2000), it is not assumed that what is said in the interview 'reflects' other situations, nor is it argued that the interview is a discrete event that can only be explained on the basis of the interaction between those involved (as Prichard observes conversational analysts and ethnomethodologists tend to so). Each interview is deemed to be a display of the particulars (Silverman, 1993), that is to say, of the vocabularies and discursive practices which are at work in a particular social terrain.

Echoing Prichard's (2000) critique of interviews, it is recognised here that the interviews themselves are part of a discursive practice, actively engaged in constituting particular subject positions, and hence subjectives. In relation to this study the post-holders are conceptualised as produced in part by discursive practice of the interview, as a particular display. At the same time they also provide discursive materials produced by and through other embedded discursive practices, such as Staff Development Reviews, Teaching Assessments, the Research Assessment Exercise, and so on. The dialogic aspects of the interview are of critical importance, as the interviews seek to explore the practices of management and the extent to which they are seen to promote or inhibit professional practice. Similarly, it is the content and practices of academic professionalism and, crucially, the way these are interpreted by the subject which are fundamental to in-depth exploration of the subject matter. As such, great care was taken to use open-ended and deliberately ambiguous questions such that the interviewee would not be led in any particular direction. Additionally, the same questions and the same approach were used in each interview. Like Prichard (2000), however, the purely positivistic, rather mechanistic approach was tempered (consciously) somewhat by the role of the researcher changing according to the characteristics of the interviewee. Prichard (2000:207) identifies four
distinct roles played by the interviewer; an accomplice – someone invited to share and invest in the heroics or problems of the interviewee; a subject – someone who shared a distance from and possible questioning of the subject position; a confidant – with whom unofficial stories could be shared; and, an outsider – someone who could be fed the ‘official line’.

Prichard (2000) notes that researchers are deeply implicated in the construction of the interview, particularly during the early moments of the interaction. Thus, the semi-structured schedule was used as a framework for the interviews, however interviewees were given scope to talk freely about the issues that they considered most important rather than being pulled ‘back on task’ in order to stick rigidly to the framework and time frame. This provided insights into, amongst other things, management styles, departmental politics, shared values, the level of cohesiveness of the department and the role of colleagues in professionalism. The interviews were audio-taped with the consent of the participants. The intention was to highlight key issues pertaining to activities and experiences within individual locales.

The objectives of this stage were to explore:
1. how participants define their professional identity (focusing upon key components, dispositions, shared values/norms/beliefs) and whether they have a strong sense of professionalism;
2. how management operates within different locales in terms of degree of control, prescription, support, consultation, and so on;
3. whether management is deemed to be constraining or facilitatory;
4. whether participants experience stress and, if so, what causes it;
5. whether participants are (consciously) developing coping strategies;
6. attitudes towards the ongoing changes in higher education.

The key prompts employed in the semi-structured interviews were general and open-ended – see appendix B.

The computing software package, NVivo was utilised for content analysis of the interviews. Phenomena were identified, within which a number of issues emerged. The outcomes of the interviews and discussion and analysis of findings are presented in the following chapter.
In analysing and making sense of the responses, the challenge for the researcher is to sift through the information provided looking for what Herbert and Higgs (2004) term ‘saturation’, which provides an indication of the adequacy of the depth and scope of exploration. For the purposes of the current study saturation is defined as enabling the identification of phenomena, themes and issues which emerge from the various stages of data collection and which are either anchored in the literature or indeed, seem to be emergent and not previously identified in the literature. The saturation phase is particularly crucial in the analysis of the qualitative data, informing the production of constructs and items for inclusion in a quantitative instrument. In Haig’s (2005) analysis, we must take care to distinguish phenomena from data, the former being relatively stable, recurrent general features of the work that we seek to explain, whilst data are essentially idiosyncratic to particular investigative contexts.

Similarly, in exploring phenomena care must be taken to avoid over-prescription and researcher-imposed bias (though, pragmatically, one must accept that bias may never be eliminated completely). Thus, adopting a critical method, this study seeks to tread a mid-path between the quasi-scientific ‘rigour’ of hypothetico-deductivism and the potential naivety of inductivism, acknowledging that both are constrained by a number of underlying assumptions that can not be ‘proven’ one way or another. The approach is serendipitous, an amalgam of systematic approaches that acknowledge the role of interpretation and inference. As such, it may be described as abductive (see Peirce’s work on pragmatism), allowing the identification and inclusion of phenomena that do not appear to emanate from the literature or earlier hypotheses, yet create a pattern of inference to the most plausible explanations. Identification of ‘the most plausible explanations’ must necessarily be the subjective decision of the researcher and it must be recognised at this point that all social science and educational research, however ‘scientific’ in design is exposed to subjective interpretation. This is simply a consequence of research being conducted by human beings, not robots, and should not necessarily be judged pejoratively. In this case the researcher, now a Lecturer, having previously been employed in a managerial (non-academic) role (as School Manager in a chartered university) is well placed to take a rounded view and have an awareness of whether the epistemology and ontology are becoming overly ‘managerialist’ or ‘academic’. This is not to claim expertise (to do so would be both presumptuous and naïve), but simply a degree of introspection and a genuine attempt to occupy the neutral ground both in terms of design, interpretation and discourse. In pursuing this, the researcher follows Ritchie
and Spencer's (1994) advocacy of a systematic approach to data analysis, encapsulated in their framework for analysis conceived in an attempt to enhance transparency and reproducibility. The key elements of the framework are as follows:

- Familiarisation with the data
- Identification of a thematic framework
- Indexing of transcripts
- Charting
- Mapping and interpretation

As with other qualitative tools, the framework approach could be criticised for distorting reality as the researcher goes through the five stages outlined above. However, taking a pragmatic approach it appears robust enough as a method of analysis (and certainly no less robust than the alternatives), offering the advantage of a systematic approach to analysis which encourages the researcher to step back from the data and reflect not only upon the content but also the process of data analysis.
6.2.6.3 Stage III – the Survey

The structure and timing of the third stage of the design is illustrated schematically as follows:

Figure 6.3 Third stage of methodology

A series of constructs and items were developed from the phenomena emerging from the literature, the focus group and interviews. Additional statements were included to elicit respondents’ views on trends. Due to the lack of data concerning the behavioural construct in the research model, ‘coping strategies’, this variable was tested using an open-ended, rather than closed questions. This follows Bernstein (1979) and Hermanowicz’s (2005) critique of overly structuralist approaches which constrain and distort the reality which they seek to expose, as well as indicating an attempt to continue the underlying pragmatism of the approach and to avoid researcher bias. All the items were measured by using a 5 point ordinal (Likert) scale (with a sixth ‘n/a’ option for new Lecturers for those items where respondents were asked to compare current activities with five years ago).

The instrument (questionnaire) was piloted on 40 members of full-time academic staff at one of the institutions in the sampling frame. After three iterations the instrument was demonstrated to be valid and reliable. The results of the Cronbach’s Alpha testing on the
final piloted instrument, having removed items that adversely affected the reliability, are shown below. As well as closed statements which participants were invited to respond to using a five point Likert scale, the instrument also contained a 'Please comment if you wish' box at the end of each section for additional views to be recorded. As we shall see in the next chapter, this facility was well used, providing some valuable insights on the issues under investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload &amp; performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (freedoms and constraints)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom in research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration as career path</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management supportiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and control</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness of academia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things getting better or worse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thereafter, requests were sent to the Vice-Chancellors of all universities in England for permission to survey staff. Whilst awaiting responses, the instrument was converted into an online survey using the software package, Panorama. The survey was put online at http://www.surveys.som.surrey.ac.uk on 8th February 2006. Permission to survey staff was given by fourteen universities, comprising eight chartered and six statutory. Drawing up the typology of institutions and the stratified sampling used above, a quota-based sampling frame was developed for collection of the quantitative data. Continuing the stratified sampling methodology employed at the interview stage, eleven were sampled - three Russell Group universities, four 1994/ex-CATS and four post-1992 universities over the period 8th February – 31st March 2006 (also due partly to an absence of e-mail addresses on the websites of the other two statutory institutions who gave permission, and a request from the one chartered university that was not sampled not to survey immediately). Individual e-mails were sent to full-time members of staff at the
sampled universities asking them to participate in the survey – see appendix C. The e-mail contained a hyperlink to the survey site.

Mindful that marketing research suggests that unsolicited mailshots have a 50% higher rate of response if they are addressed to a named individual, the e-mails addressed the recipient by name. In total, 7,000 academic staff were invited to participate in the survey (an average of 636 per institution). 1,153 of those receiving the e-mail invitation clicked the hyperlink through to the survey site. Of these, 38.59% failed to complete the survey, leaving 708 respondents who completed the survey in full (although, as we shall see later, there are a few missing responses to some statements). Thus, the response rate was just over 10%.

Figure 6.4 Drop-out analysis

Reflecting the proportion of staff employed in chartered and statutory institutions respectively, the intention was to collect responses from chartered and statutory universities in equal proportions. A decision had to be at this stage taken regarding whether to continue the data collection by surveying the three universities who had agreed but not yet been approached, or to use the current data set. The difficulty with the one remaining chartered university was that though permission had been granted, the Vice-Chancellor requested that the survey be delayed until April 2006, as, since the institution’s Human Resources Department had just finished a university-wide survey he feared his staff might suffer ‘survey fatigue’. The remaining two statutory institutions did not provide e-mail hyperlinks through to staff on their website, although e-mail addresses for some staff were listed. Because of time, energy and resource constraints, it was decided to use the current data set, since as far as the statutory universities were
concerned, with only a few e-mail addresses, even with a 10% response rate, the additional responses per institution might well only number in the region of 30. Regarding the chartered university, to prolong the data collection for the sake of another 60 or so responses seemed misplaced, since it could not be argued that the additional responses guaranteed to improve representativeness or generalisability. Taking a pragmatic approach, 10% of the population of full-time academic staff in England had been surveyed, of which 10% had participated. Thus, we are concerned in this study with only 1% of the population of full-time academics in England.

The profile of respondents at this stage indicated that they were from chartered and statutory universities in almost equal proportions. The number of respondents as a proportion of the survey group is reasonable, and in line with expectations. Respondents as a proportion of the total population of full-time academics in England is too small to claim anything other than that this is a tentative, 'big toe in the water' type of investigation of academics' perceptions, views and behaviours, which may or may not be representative. That stated, the responses should not be dismissed on the basis of unrepresentativeness or lack of generalisability – after all, the majority of studies in the field tend to be small-scale and qualitative, which does not prevent the authors from drawing general conclusions and producing something of interest to add to the existing knowledge. This research is exploratory in nature and does not set out to 'prove' or 'disprove' hypotheses, but to explore power relations, identify phenomena and draw some tentative conclusions. Relative to other studies in the field, at 700+ participants the data set is large and, it is judged, will provide a good basis for some worthwhile discussion. Taken all these considerations into account, the survey was taken offline on 31st March 2006.

The questionnaire may be found in appendix D. The results of the analysis of quantitative data can be found in the next chapter.

6.3 Assessing normality

Using descriptive statistics to assess normality of distribution of the sample according to age, post/rank and number of years employed as an academic suggest that the distribution of ages within the sample is normal; post/rank is skewed towards more senior staff; years employed as an academic is skewed slightly towards fewer years (see appendix E).
distributions are not normal and samples are small, deviations from normality can affect statistical testing; particularly where group sizes are small, it may be inappropriate to run some statistical analyses. For categorical data, Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) recommend inspecting the shape of the distribution using a histogram (whereas for continuous data, normality may be assessed by employing tests such as the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of 'goodness of fit'). Deviations from normality indicate that the sample of measurements has not been drawn from a normal population. In this particular case, with over 700 respondents, small deviations from normal distributions does not cause undue concern, as this is common in large samples. It may be seen in appendix E that here we are dealing with a relatively normal population in terms of age distribution. The population is skewed slightly towards more senior staff and very slightly towards those employed as academics for less than 15 years.

It should be noted that when employing ordinal scales as in this research, the mean may be misleading since there is no assumption of equal distribution between scale items. That stated, in this particular case the quantitative data explore associations between the constructs as the basis of building a post hoc framework for further analytical research. As such, the statistical tests are employed as indicators, or pointers, in a particular direction *rather than* as a mechanism to 'prove' or 'disprove' statistical 'truths' or 'falsehoods'. As in all social science research, the intention is to seek to identify commonalities or differences as a basis for tentative generalisations about the nature of the population based upon a limited sample. No apology is made for the employment of basic statistical tests, however the reader must be aware of the limitations resulting from the use of ordinal scales and, in some cases, some deviation from normal distributions. It is also fair to point out at this point that on *some* items initial analysis of the descriptive statistics revealed a fair amount of skewness and kurtosis; for example, in response to: 'overall, has the expansion of higher education made things better or worse for you over the last five years', skewness measured 1.379 and kurtosis 1.608, indicating asymmetry and peaking of scores to the left of a normal distribution. Skewness and kurtosis suggest that the mean may not be an appropriate measure of central tendency (in this case $\bar{X} = 2.54$, representing that things have 'generally got worse'). Whilst taking into account the comments above relating to the reliability of the mean as an indicator of central tendency, on its own the mean may be misleading, but looking at the responses in aggregate, the mean, skewness and kurtosis on this item indicate that there appears to be general agreement that conditions have worsened for academics over the last five years - with
little dissent. In the sections that follow, some justification will be provided for the use of particular tests in relation to the exploration of relationships between constructs and differences between groups. The intention is not to try to convince the reader that the researcher is 'right'; merely to provide some rationale for the employing the particular tests, given the constraints outlined above (in other words, notwithstanding the shortcomings identified above, to justify the use of the selected tests as 'the best available').

6.4 Profile of participants

Participants in the research have the following characteristics:

- Focus Group: 4 academics; 2 Lecturer and 2 Senior Lecturers from a 1994/ex-CATS university
- Interviews: 11 academics;
  3 from Russell Group universities – 1 Professor and 2 Senior Lecturers
  4 from 1994/ex-CATS: 1 Professor, 1 Senior Lecturer and 2 Lecturers
  4 from post-1992 universities: 1 Professors, 2 Senior Lecturers and 1 Lecturer
- Quantitative survey: 708 academics from 11 universities; 3 Russell Group, 4 1994/ex-CATS, 4 post-1992 universities

Table 6.3 Characteristics of academics in focus group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University type</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>2 Lecturer</td>
<td>2 Male</td>
<td>Various across Science and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>2 Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4 Characteristics of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>University type</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chartered – Russell Group</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chartered – Russell Group</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chartered – Russell Group</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.5 Characteristics of Respondents in Quantitative Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post/Rank in organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (Professor, Reader)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (SL, Lecturer B)</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (Lecturer A)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years as Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding missing responses, it is interesting to note that 450 respondents indicated institution type, whilst 200 did not to respond to this question. It is unknown whether this was because they did not wish their institution type to be identified or whether they did not understand the terminology (in the open section of the instrument, one respondent indicated that (s)he did not understand what the terms 'statutory' and 'chartered' meant).

#### 6.5 Assumptions and Limitations

The underlying objective of the methodology was to identify and develop a method which was both ‘fit for purpose’ and minimised subjectivity and bias. That stated, it is recognised that research design can only seek, not guarantee that the objective will be met. Potential shortcomings and limitations are well rehearsed. In focus group research, for example, it can not be guaranteed that an individual will actually express his or her deeply-held, personal opinions if it is at odds with the group opinion, thus it may be that the dynamics of the group actually lead to an opinion being expressed which is ‘fit for public consumption’, reflecting the shared attitude of the group rather than the genuine, privately-held view. Another limitation of the focus group is that it is not necessarily replicable, in that a focus group consisting of different people, or even the same people on a different day can not be guaranteed to produce the same, or similar results (depending upon the mood of the participants on that day, the unelected ‘group leader’ with a lot to say etc.). Additionally, there is always the potential for distortion during the process of transcription which, although undertaken by an expert in the field nevertheless may miss some of the nuances, or messages given out by body language. Finally, in relation to this particular study, the size of the focus group may be rather small – however in retrospect each member had the opportunity to ‘have their say’ and made an interesting, useful contribution without interruption. In larger groups within a given timeframe each individual will have less opportunity to contribute; some may contribute little and be left feeling that their time has been wasted.
Similarly, interviewing has a number of potential limitations. It may be that the researcher introduced bias inadvertently by his or her choice of language, syntax, tone or body language. The respondent may not be entirely truthful in his or her answers, wishing to hide issues that might not show him or her in a good light. There may be issues of unconscious misrepresentation by inadequate, incomplete answers shortened in the name of expediency, but introducing misinterpretation. There may also be a lack of knowledge, a feeling that one must say something about issues even if one does not hold a particular view, or position. There may also be confusion and incomplete understanding of what is being asked – and a reluctance to admit that this is the case.

Finally, quantitative methods also have numerous potential shortcomings. They may be prescriptive and offer limited opportunity for in-depth exploration of important variables. Quantitative research may over-simplify complex issues, inviting superficial responses or inadvertently introduce confounding variables. In quantitative research the researcher can not be sure of the respondents' truthfulness (still less if the survey is postal or Web-based and there is no eye contact).

Notwithstanding these generic, well rehearsed limitations of each research method, it is argued here that this study has been designed to maximise rigour (within constraints of resources and researcher experience). It is anticipated that the design and execution of the research will result in the creation of new knowledge to further the existing body of knowledge and current understanding of the issues.

Finally, the study assumes that the instrument used to collect the information measures the salient variables, and that respondents are:

- able to understand the issues in the focus group discussion and interviews
- able to interpret and understand the items in the questionnaire
- in a position to form an (informed) opinion
- prepared to be truthful in their responses.
6.6 Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of the methodology employed in the empirical study. The research in this thesis is grounded in critique and seeks to expose and illuminate the power relations underpinning the management of universities in England. The empirical study employs a mixed methodology, seeking to move away from the more common qualitative methods employed in the majority of studies into higher education and to achieve a broader overview of academics' perceptions, feelings and behaviours. The research design seeks to achieve triangulation by employing both qualitative and quantitative methods. The mixed methodology also may reduce researcher bias by requiring the researcher to position herself at varying distances from the participants. Table 6.6 overleaf provides a summary of the methods employed in addressing the research propositions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification and grouping of institutions</td>
<td>To enhance representativeness and generalisability</td>
<td>Draw up and stratify sampling frame</td>
<td>HEFCE, HESA listings (available from the Web)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of participants for focus group</td>
<td>To sample across a cross-section of the sector</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling</td>
<td>Institutional website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td>To explore various perspective</td>
<td>Hold focus group with participants from several disciplines</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of output from focus group</td>
<td>To identify and map issues and themes</td>
<td>Data analysis – interpretation, indexing, charting, mapping</td>
<td>Transcript of focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of participants for interviewing</td>
<td>To enhance representativeness and generalisability</td>
<td>Stratify sampling frame</td>
<td>HEFCE, HESA listings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>To explore and validate emergent issues</td>
<td>Conduct interviews with staff from various institutions</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data</td>
<td>Explore issues and identify common themes</td>
<td>Using NVivo software to interpret, index, chart and map data</td>
<td>Transcripts of semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire design</td>
<td>To explore whether the issues raised are valid and whether interim conclusions are representative and generalisable</td>
<td>Using stratified random sampling, survey staff in institutions across England</td>
<td>HEFCE and HESA listings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Create a data set</td>
<td>E-mail an electronic questionnaire to academic staff in English universities</td>
<td>HEFCE, HESA listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Deepen understanding of issues, identify commonalities and create new knowledge</td>
<td>Use SPSS to undertake quantitative analysis of the data</td>
<td>Data set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst seeking to minimise bias, it is acknowledged that all research is subject to inherent bias which cannot be eliminated fully – it is the nature of human beings to have preconceptions and prejudices which they do not even recognise. Nevertheless, the chosen research design represents a genuine attempt to approach this study with an open
mind and to use several methods of data collection to reduce and constrain any underlying, unacknowledged bias in the researcher’s lens.
Chapter 7
Presentation of Responses

7.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the responses from both qualitative and quantitative stages of data in relation to the themes identified in the literature and operationalised in the research model.

7.1 Workload

Drawing upon the research model, the first theme explored in detail is workload. The literature suggests that expansion, marketisation and commodification have resulted in heavier workloads for academic staff. Some (though by no means all) of the literature suggests that academics are suffering stress because of heavier loads. In relation to the research model, the research propositions being explored in this section are:

- Academics perceive workloads to be heavy and increasing rapidly, impacting upon their:
  - Performance (proposition 1)
  - Freedom in research (proposition 2)
  - Autonomy (proposition 3)

Participants in the focus group held a range of views about workloads, suggesting a (possibly discipline-based) range of experiences across different Schools in the same ex-CATS university;

Participant A: Lecturer, Management School, Female;

It was a big shock when I came here because coming from a statutory to a chartered university I thought there would be less teaching, more control over our career, more support, more direction really and it's the opposite – the absolute opposite. This is how I would expect a very bad polytechnic to have performed in the sense that you have, you know, loads of hours of teaching, loads of admin, very strict targets, lots of changes and instability....
Participant B: Lecturer, Law School, Male;
I think it varies from department to department because I've never had too heavy a workload, except when I was in the Management School. I've never felt my teaching hours are too high compared with other legal academics in this institution and in other institutions, particularly in the new universities where it seems to be that they have a very high number of teaching hours and a very high admin burden and a very low expectation of research....

Participant C: Senior Lecturer, Language School, Female;
I happen to be in an area which is more a growth area than some other areas and teaching hours have increased a lot, but in a sense I've had to create space for myself by taking up a kind of lateral move....

During the interviews a range of views and experiences were expressed. It is interesting to note that none of the interviewees complained about the content of the work, simply that there were great time pressures, with much to do simultaneously, leading to a feeling of frustration that tasks were not being performed to the best of their ability. Typical responses were as follows:

Interviewee 4: Senior Lecturer, post-1992 university, Female;
There are times when there is just so much to do, so many different demands...

Interviewee 3: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Female;
I think obviously the biggest single problem is workloads generally and just fitting everything in to 168 hours a week. I do think all of us or most people as academics do work incredibly hard compared with maybe ten years ago. The sheer volume of work that we have to cope with - I mean that's probably the worst thing about the job.

Interviewee 2: Professor, Russell Group university, Male;
I do quite a lot of writing, but not as much as I used to, and quite a lot of management-administration...
Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Male

I think it's becoming more and more difficult to just sit down and have some really creative, original ideas and I have to create the conditions for this process – that is much more difficult than it used to be.

Interviewee 11: Professor, 1994/ex CATS university, Male;

Marking's a real problem. It is marking that's the issue.

Interviewee 8: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS university, Male;

If I had more time, I would be able to improve my teaching – even with all he QA procedures, the bottom line is that if I had more time to spend preparing lectures then I am sure they would be better. It's as simple as that.

One respondent suggested that workload may be more of a problem for newer staff:

Interviewee 5: Professor, post-1992 university, Male;

People who start off have a terrible time because they can't say no to things - their career, internal politics, so if they're not very careful they will get desperately overloaded ....

There were feelings of increasing conflict between research and administration, of a growth in administration and of increasingly having to choose between scholarship and administration:

Interviewee 10: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS university, Male;

There is conflict between the administration and research. The teaching simply has to be done or the world will collapse. The management lead us to believe that the world will collapse if the administration isn't done and we know that our personal world would collapse if the research isn't done.

Interviewee 2: Professor, Russell Group university, Male;

Research is done at the weekend. That's what Sunday nights are for.
Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Male;

I feel a sense of having a choice — of being sucked more and more into administration or continuing as a creative academic and an original thinker. So many academics — they don't read a single book. I have colleagues here who haven't read a book for 5 years.

Interviewee 1 continued;

It's quite tempting to do that and to allow yourself to become absorbed in management possibilities and believe that you're doing something worthwhile... So, I feel quite a strong pressure on me to do something in that direction and it's not a pressure that I'm prepared to yield to.

Interviewee 2: Professor, Russell Group university, Male;

I think individuals will have to come to terms with making a choice at some point in their career between a management career and an academic career. I don't think it's going to be sustainable to do a management job AND be an active researcher at a credible level — that is not to say that it's not possible to do anything, it might be possible to maintain a certain level of activity but not necessarily one which might, if you like, allow go back to being a full-time research-active academic in the way that might have been expected of you some years ago.

In summary, and perhaps not unexpectedly given the ongoing expansion of the sector, the qualitative data suggests that workloads are increasing and that there is increasing conflict between academic work and administration, raising the prospect of two distinctly different paths; research or administration. Overall, it was suggested that if one was to choose the administrative pathway to progress one's career it would not be possible to maintain or return to a more traditional academic role involving sustained research. Whilst focus group participants had varying experiences of workload and difficulties in finding time for research, interviewees were much more expressive about administrative burdens and spoke of time pressures and outcomes being affected (such as teaching suffering because of a lack of preparation time).
7.1.1. Workload and performance

The first research proposition examined statistically is the relationship between workload and performance. Although workload and performance are measured in the quantitative instrument by an ordinal scale and from a statistician's point of view the most appropriate test would be Spearman's rank order correlation, in social science research, where data sets are large and the distribution normal, Pearson's correlation provides a more robust test of association; in other words, the ordinal data are treated as continuous, or interval. Notwithstanding the shortcoming of not being able to guarantee equal distance between the points on the five-point Likert scale, taking a pragmatic approach it is better to use the more robust alternative. Measuring differences between means, whilst from a statistician's perspective not strictly correct where data is ordinal, is in these particular circumstances more advantageous than median-based analysis resulting in a loss of precision and robustness.

In line with the above, initial exploration of the relationship between weight of workload and performance was executed using Pearson's correlation (for interest, the test was also run using Spearman's test; the differences in correlation coefficients between Pearson's and Spearman's were negligible).

Table 7.1 Correlations between workload and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance affected by workload</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of teaching load</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of marking load</td>
<td>-.445</td>
<td>-.656</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of administrative load</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-.288</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All results are statistically significant, with \( p < 0.05 \) in all cases.

Table 7.1 indicates small to medium, negative correlations between the weight of various elements of workload and overall performance. The implication is that as workload increases, performance is seen to decline. The strength of the correlation between teaching loads and marking loads respectively and performance is moderate, such that perceptions are that as teaching and marking loads increase, performance decreases. Teaching loads and marking loads are strongly related in respondents' minds, thus it is fair to say that overall respondents perceive a moderately strong relationship between
teaching and marking loads and performance, such that as teaching and marking increase, overall performance declines.

In light of the views expressed in the qualitative stages of the study it is interesting to note the relatively small correlation between administrative load and performance. One possible interpretation may be that, although academics are negative towards the growth of administration in universities, teaching and learning activities impact most upon their daily life. It may in fact be bureaucratic administration imposed from above that is perceived as burdensome, rather than the day to day academic administration of modules, programmes and so on.

Overall, table 7.1 indicates that respondents perceive a moderate relationship between teaching and marking activities and overall performance, such that as loadings increase, performance declines.

The next test examined whether there were any differences according to institutional type. The data was grouped in two categories: i) chartered and ii) statutory universities. Once again, the issue of ordinal data had to be addressed. As earlier, having weighed up the benefits and disbenefits of the parametric versus non-parametric alternatives, the parametric independent t-test was employed rather than the non-parametric alternative, Mann-Whitney (though again, as above, running Mann-Whitney as a comparison indicated the same outcomes as the t-test). The outcome of the t-test indicates statistically significant differences in relation to perceptions of teaching loads, marking loads and fairness of distribution. Differences in perceptions of teaching loads between chartered ($\bar{X} = 2.85$, $SD = .886$, where 1= very heavy) and statutory ($\bar{X} = 2.63$, $SD = .849$) were indicated by $t(479) = 2.676, p = .008$; in marking loads ($\bar{X} = 2.62$, $SD = .975$) and ($\bar{X} = 2.36$, $SD = .918$) indicated by $t(479) = 2.956, p = .003$ and fairness of distribution of teaching loads($\bar{X} = 3.47$, $SD = 1.222$) and ($\bar{X} = 3.16$, $SD = 1.252$) by $t(486) = 2.607, p = .009$. Academics in statutory universities perceive loads to be heavier and distribution less fair, possibly reflecting the different origins of the ‘old’ and ‘new’ universities. There is no significant difference, however, according to institutional type in terms of the relationship between workloads and performance.

Continuing with parametric testing, ANOVA was employed to measure differences between ranks in terms of perceived workloads between staff at different levels of
seniority; senior staff, Lecturer B and Lecturer A. As anticipated, there are significant
differences relating to both teaching and marking. In relation to teaching there is a
statistically significant difference at the $p < 0.05$ level between the three groups; $F(2,689)
= 10.624, p=.000$. Independent t-tests indicate that the significant differences lie between
senior and Lecturer B: $t(643) = 4.515, p=.000$ and senior and Lecturer A: $t(217) = 2.295,
p=.023)$. In relation to marking, ANOVA testing indicates significant differences:
$F(2,689) = 6.416, p=.002$. Independent t-tests indicate that the differences lie between
senior and Lecturer B: $t(644) = 3.484, p=.001$, and senior and Lecturer A: $t(216) =
1.892, p=.060$. These differences are perhaps unsurprising, indicating that teaching and
marking duties diminish with seniority, and possibly reflecting interviewee 5’s comment
about junior staff becoming overloaded because it is difficult for them to say no.

Next, an independent t-test was employed to identify any gender-based differences in
perceptions. The results are statistically significant ($p = <.05$) across all categories, with
female respondents judging the weight of their workload heavier than males:
administration: $t(694)= 3.341, p=.001$; teaching: $t(692) = 2.481, p=.013$; and marking
$t(693) = 3.584, p=.000$. There are no gender-based differences between perceptions of
fairness of distribution or effect of workload on performance.

To the extent that respondents feel that their performance has been affected by heavy
loads, the next step entailed using multiple regression to examine the relative contribution
of administrative, teaching and marking loads. Table 7.1 indicates that the independent
variables, ‘weight of x workload’ are correlated, and that these are also correlated with
the dependent variable, ‘overall performance’. To start with, adjusted $R^2$ was calculated to
.223. Adjusted $R^2$ provides an estimate of the proportion of the variance of the dependent
variable accounted for by regression, so is of interest when determining the potential
importance of the test. In this case, the regression model as a whole explains only of
22.3% of the variance of the dependent variable (indicating that other factors account for
the other 77.7%), therefore this test is relatively limited in terms of potential importance,
but may be of some minor interest. Overall, there is a relatively small, but statistically
significant effect, $F(3,686) = 65.517, p< 0.05$. Standardised $\beta$ coefficients, $t$ values,
degrees of freedom (df) and significance are shown in table 7.2.
Table 7.2 Regression analysis: workload and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>109.593</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.531</td>
<td>65.517</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>382.501</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>492.094</td>
<td>689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admin</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marking</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: performance affected by workload

As illustrated, marking emerges as the greatest predictor of a belief that performance has been affected by workload. This is almost certainly a function of larger cohorts and suggests that respondents have been slow to change assessment methods, which in turn suggests either that academics adapt slowly to change or that this is a conscious decision, perhaps grounded in the belief that assessment methods which accommodate large cohorts are less rigorous.

Respondents were also invited to comment generally on workload in an open-ended section of the online questionnaire. This elicited some interesting comments, the flavour of which is indicated in the following excerpts:

*Response 13*: Slight reductions in teaching load, ostensibly to serve research activity, are actually an irrelevance to the predominant workload problem, which is produced by unnecessary administrative tasks.

*Response 25*: The main difficulties are a lack of staff and increased regulation and prescription of teaching and assessment activities.

*Response 35*: Admin load is not particularly high compared to colleagues here or in other institutions, but if a role is genuinely administrative and could be performed by an
administrator I don't see why it should be performed by an academic at all - it does not seem to be a good use of resources for a person with specialist skills in research to be doing administration for 20% of their time.

Response 62: I thoroughly enjoy teaching but that enjoyment is waning because of the sheer amount of it that I have to do.

Response 74: With increasing student numbers, admin, teaching and marking loads can only increase!

Response 211: We have far more students, who have a much wider range of abilities. However, there does not seem to be any extra funding for new posts and resources. Thus, overall students get less attention but lecturers get more work.

Response 219: Assessment and marking now involves many more QA processes which add, in some cases double, the amount of work involved in marking and assessment. QA processes are well intentioned, but their resources costs often don't seem to be considered. A problem arises where QA processes main role is not in improving the quality of the organisation's activities, but in providing a data for marketing purposes.

Response 233: Last academic year, I was delivering 6,500 student-credits -- our students take 120 credits per year, and simply cannot keep up with marking, lecture preparation, hand outs, delivery, student contact plus research and a burgeoning administrative work load.

Response 240: We are now told individual feedback must be given within 3 weeks of handing -another QA dictate. This is often impossible as we now have so many students and several units to run.

Response 295: Volume of marking is about the same but the accompanying administration has increased

Response 480: I've spent less than 10% of my time teaching since starting here, and have so much admin which must be done urgently to meet deadlines that I have no time to observe colleagues teaching or find out how systems like WebCT are supposed to work. I've been here five months and haven't even had time to visit the library yet.
Response 493: The marking is the main problem because of higher student numbers but, to be fair, we are encouraged to adopt assessment methods to reduce this problem. Some of us choose not to do so because we feel we would be short-changing students or e.g. causing problems for them in later years of study if they never get any scope to write essays, etc.

Response 560: Administration is taking over universities. They are employing more and more people to invent stupid procedures for academics to follow, then employing people to audit how well the academics perform these tasks.

Response 568: Marking workload is much heavier because we have more students who require feedback on their work and there are more assignments to mark. The administrative workload is much heavier because of new quality assurance documentation processes that have been introduced, whilst, at the same time, the level of help from secretarial/admin staff has been reducing.

Response 578: The bulk of paperwork required to alter courses, let alone start new ones, has increased by easily an order of magnitude, and to very little substantive benefit except for formal compliance with QAA fetishes.

Response 593: This is a function of numbers, and comes about from a mixture of work intensification (fewer hours per student taught) and additionally much heavier burdens of marking at very specific times of the year.

Response 629: The most miserable bits of this job are when I'm enlisted to help in marking work from someone else's module - sometimes this can involve marking 60 assignments in a couple of weeks. Often the quality of work is low, and I find this the most demoralising part of my job.

Response 749: It seems that every few weeks there is yet another administrative task, another course to provide relief on, more pressure from the two institutional audits per year that we seem to get on some aspect of teaching or research - let alone the RAE. There is no let-up, and at times I feel I'm drowning - and this seems to be echoed frequently by others in offices and common rooms everywhere.
Response 750: Increasing bureaucracy - especially directives from the university and more interference by ethics committees who go way beyond their brief. makes everything much harder (and more time-consuming) to do.

Response 899: Efficiency gains in teaching and marking have been largely eaten up by administration. This increased administration is not just the administration one is meant to carry out as a part of one's normal duties (admissions, etc.) but also responding to being the object of administration (performance review, peer evaluation, QAA, etc.)

Response 1025: It's not just the load but the difficulty of each task, involving walking across the site to gain a pointless signature from a "manager" who does not add to the process commensurately.

Response 1123: The unnecessary paperwork and assessment which is never followed up in a critically analytical way to improve the provision offered to students. It is unhelpful, creates a negative ethos and engenders a lack of respect for university authorities.

Response 1126: Increased student numbers cause major assessment problems. A challenging coursework assignment set for students requires a significant amount of time to mark if it is to be read thoroughly, mistakes corrected, alternatives suggested, feedback provided, etc. etc. When student numbers were lower, say 60 per module, I could set a challenging coursework that student feedback suggested was well received, mark it (30 mins per c/w) and return it within two weeks. Now that module numbers have doubled I do not have the time to assess such challenging c/w and am instead investigating the use of computer generated and assessed 'quizzes' operated through the university VLE. The student experience will not be a very positive one but it's either that or a heart attack!

Response 1128: We have a whiteboard in our staff room where we mark down all the forms we fill in and classify as useless waste of time, dubious value and valuable. Waste of time is winning - in one month (albeit because of marking) I filled in 400 forms!

Response 1132: The admin support does not support us – we support them!

Response 1174: With a ratio of 1 lecturer to 4 support staff would seem generous, but we do not get much support at the 'chalkface' because of the large increase in ancillary services – quality audit, equality and diversity, monitoring and evaluation etc.
Overall the comments paint a picture of academics under pressure from increasing workload. Many complain of unnecessary paperwork. There is a real sense of frustration over coping with heavy marking loads and the growing burden of administration which diverts efforts away from teaching and research. In aggregate, the responses from both the qualitative and quantitative elements of data collection indicate an overall increase in total workload and a belief that performance is affected by workloads getting heavier. The impact of heavier workloads is felt most strongly by those employed in statutory universities, junior academics and females.

On a more positive note, respondents were also asked about the potential of administration to provide an alternative career path. Opinions do not vary significantly according to institutional type or gender. It was generally agreed that taking on a heavy administrative load can lead to prestige and status in the university ($\bar{x} = 3.80$, S.D. = 1.464) and offer an alternative route to promotion and career development ($\bar{x} = 3.90$, S.D. = 1.461). Rank-base differences emerge; $F(2,658)=6.513$, $p=.002$, with junior lecturers in particular regarding administration as a route to prestige and status; difference between senior and Lecturer A: $t(211) = -3.730$, $p=.000$; and between Lecturer B and Lecturer A: $t(493) = -3.256$, $p=.000$. There are also differences between the junior staff and other ranks regarding administration as a route to promotion; $F(2,656)=4.408$, $p = .013$; differences between senior and junior (Lecturer A): $t(209) = -3.122$, $p=.000$; between Lecturer B and Lecturer A: $t(492) = -2.675$, $p=.008$.

When respondents were asked whether they personally would choose this path, regardless of rank or institutional type, they indicated that they would be unlikely to do so ($\bar{x} = 2.30$, SD=1.085). Table 7.3 illustrates the correlations between perceptions of administration as a career route and whether one would personally choose this path.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and career path</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige and status</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally choose this path</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All results are statistically significant, with $p<0.05$ in all cases.
The responses indicate a strong relationship between perceptions of administration as a route to prestige and status and a route to promotion. Correlations between these variables and whether respondents personally would choose this path are weak, however. The results reflect the nature of academic work and the pre-eminence of scholarship within the academic domain, regardless of institutional type or rank. Echoing earlier results, this result again suggests that as a group academics are not particularly instrumental and in addition are not exclusively driven by a desire for promotion or high status within the university.

7.1.2 Workload and finding time for research

The next research proposition under investigation concerns the relationship between workload and research time. Descriptive statistics (where 1 = 'very heavy') indicate that academics consider their workload to be heavy, with administrative loads being the heaviest, followed by marking and teaching loads respectively.

Table 7.4 Descriptive statistics: weight of workloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight of teaching load</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of marking load</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of administrative load</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the same independent variables as above, these were correlated with the dependent variable 'easy or difficult to find time for research', producing the following results:

Table 7.5 Correlations between workload and research time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy or difficult to find time for research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of teaching load</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of marking load</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of administrative load</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All results are statistically significant, with $p<0.05$ in all cases.

The results indicate reasonably strong relationships between weight of workload and finding time for research – in other words, heavy workloads are seen to impact upon
research time. Means for ‘finding time for research’ are noticeably low, with $\bar{X} = 2.10$, SD=.960 for those in chartered universities and $\bar{X} = 1.84$, SD=.897 for those in statutory (where 1= ‘very difficult’). From this it is apparent that academics feel strongly that research time is being squeezed quite significantly. There is little difference in the strength of the relationships between research time and weight of loads, although relationships are strongest concerning administrative, teaching and marking loads respectively.

Looking at differences between institutions, a t-test indicated that the difference in perceptions was relatively small, but significant; $t(484)=3.058$, $p=.002$, with staff in statutory universities experiencing greater difficulties in finding time for research. ANOVA testing revealed rank-based differences; $F(2, 690)=10.922$, $p=.000$. Independent t-tests indicated significant differences between senior staff and other ranks, with senior staff being in a relatively advantageous position: differences between senior and Lecturer B: $t(643) = 4.527$, $p=.000$; and between senior and Lecturer A: $t(217) = 2.573$, $p=.011$. There were no significant differences between Lecturer B and Lecturer A. Finally, a further t-test revealed a gender-based difference in perceptions, with females perceiving greater difficulty in finding time for research; $t(694) = 5.268$, $p=.000$.

The relative contribution of administrative, teaching and marking loads to academics’ difficulty in finding time for research can be investigated using multiple regression. Table 7.5 above indicates the strength of the correlations between the independent variables, ‘weight of x workload’, and between the independents and dependent variable, ‘easy or difficult to find time for research’. Adjusted $R^2 = .320$, indicating that the model as a whole explains of 32% of the overall variance of the dependent variable. Though this is relatively limited in terms of potential significance, $R^2$ values of this size are common in studies examining perceptions, attitudes and beliefs. Reflecting the initial correlations, the regression analysis reveals a significant workload effect - in 7.6 below:

Table 7.6 Regression analysis: workloads and research time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>187.713</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62.571</td>
<td>107.629</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>398.229</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>585.942</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The results confirm that administrative loading is the greatest predictor of difficulties in finding time for research.

Looking at workload trends, the correlation coefficients in table 7.7 below indicate strong associations between workloads becoming heavier and increasing difficulty in finding time for research compared to five years ago. An independent t-test suggests small, statistically non-significant differences between chartered and statutory universities.

Table 7.7 Correlations between heavier workloads and less time for research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More difficult to find time for research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavier administrative load</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavier teaching load</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavier marking load</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All results are statistically significant, with $p<0.05$ in all cases.

Using regression analysis to measure the relative impact of the three items, adjusted $R^2 = .661$ (which is relatively high for studies of this nature) and thus the results are of interest. Overall, the impact of increasing weight of workload is significant, as illustrated in table 7.8.
Table 7.8 Regression analysis: heavier workloads and more difficult to find time for research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1158.127</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>386.042</td>
<td>443.566</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>592.685</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1759.812</td>
<td>684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admin heavier</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching heavier</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marking heavier</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: easy or difficult to find time for research

The growing burden of administration increasing over time emerges as the factor which accounts most for increasing difficulty in finding time for research. This may provide some useful pointers for academic-managers; if academics are to increase their research output (either in terms of quality or quantity), then offloading administration may have the greatest impact. The results also suggest that universities need to consider how to avoid overloading more junior staff and review whether female staff are allocated a heavier share of administration than men. Overall the results in this section suggest that universities should try to find innovative ways of managing loads (and administration in particular) in order to facilitate research. This may be particularly relevant for statutory institutions.

7.1.3 Workload and Autonomy

The third research proposition being examined concerns the relationship between workload and autonomy. Participants in the focus group held convergent views on autonomy which were closely related to their views on management in that it was felt
generally that, provided staff performed their role satisfactorily they would be granted left alone to find and create spaces in which they could pursue their own goals (provided these ran in parallel with School/Department objectives). There was a general appreciation of the level of autonomy that exists in higher education relative to other occupations.

Suggesting that the nature of academia is changing with the imposition of business principles, impacting directly upon academics’ autonomy:

Participant C: Senior Lecturer, Language School, Female;

Certainly, the reason I became an academic was because it seemed to me to be one of the few domains where you would have a large degree of autonomy ...It seems to me that the problem is that a lot of commercial values are being imposed on the educational world so we’re talking about the business of education and in a sense I think academics are now squeezed.... Traditionally you’d have a certain amount of flexibility and a great deal of autonomy and I think those parameters are now being squeezed and yet we’re under the same kinds of pressures, if not yet to the same extent as people, for example, in the business world or working in industry. So I think this is quite a critical time. I know many older colleagues who are just so grateful to be at retirement age and have absolutely no regrets about leaving at this point.

Proposing that individuals are granted a relatively high degree of autonomy (relative to outside the academy) only as long as they are generating income:

Participant C: Senior Lecturer, Language School, Female;

I’m very conscious of the fact, having worked in other institutions as well and having taken some time out of academia that there are lots of tensions and pressures on academics. I think what X said was quite interesting because he reflects what I would see as increasing the economics bias of universities. In other words as long as you’re generating income or revenue whether that be from research or because you’re teaching popular courses then at that point you have a little bit more freedom and flexibility. It’s only when either you’re not generating a research income and/or you’re also in areas which are under threat, for example, modern foreign languages, that these pressures actually start to bear in on people.
Suggesting that academics may employ subterfuge to construct a position in which they may be seen to be compliant but at the same time grant themselves the freedom to pursue their own objectives;

Participant A: Lecturer, Management School, Female;

So I think there’s a lot of negotiation has to take place but, at the same time, as individuals we probably have to camouflage what we do and present it in a language that allows us essentially to do what we want, while keeping management onboard so they see what we’re doing as being something desirable and income-generating. So I think to a certain extent I would say academics if they’re going to survive have to disguise what they’re doing and talk a different kind of language.

In contrast, arguing that autonomy is in many cases alive and well in academia:

Participant B: Lecturer, Law School, Male;

There are recesses in the academic world, niches where you get Professor Bloggs who’s been here 34 years, has got an international reputation. He works in a niche area but it’s a highly respected area and it’s good for us because it’s five star research department. Professor Bloggs, he’s the worst teacher in the world, leave him to do his thing. He’s not really fitting in with our set of goals and objectives but you know OK forget it, you know, he’s doing research so there’s that element to it. And there are lots of old Bloggses in departments of schools up and down the universities across the land.

Noting the importance of autonomy for creativity and success in research:

Participant A: Lecturer, Management School, Female;

You need your own sort of drive to identify those things which you feel are worthwhile pursuing and you need autonomy for that. If you don’t have that, forget it, your research is not going to be effective. So to be effective you need to be motivated and to be motivated you need to have freedom.

Thus, participants overall regard autonomy not as a bonus or a benefit, but as an essential component of academic life intertwined with motivation and professionalism, without which their work would be neither enjoyable nor effective.
From the interviews it was apparent that views on autonomy appear to vary with context:

Interviewee 3: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Female;
With research I think there’s a huge amount of autonomy. That’s the biggest plus with this job. I can do research in whatever I like, although obviously I’m encouraged to apply for Research Council funding because that’s going to make some target and it’s also good for me personally.

Interviewee 9: Senior Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
I think there is quite a good amount of autonomy. Apart from the targets that are set up for your research in terms of publications.... I work a lot from home. I live in Sheffield by the way, so I have a small flat here and I stay here three days and then I work at home.

Interviewee 8: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
I would say there’s a fair amount of autonomy and I have a fair amount of ability to steer things in the direction I want and to do what I want, but that’s only if I’ve managed to create that time in which to do that.

Emphasising the importance of autonomy to one’s sense of professionalism:

Interviewee 10: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
I need autonomy both to feel as if I’m alive and to feel as if I’m doing a professional job. I feel as if I should be respected and trusted to do a professional job.

However, concerning the freedom to make professional judgements about research:

Interviewee 8: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
I think that ethics committees are increasingly saying we don’t trust you to make the correct judgements about ethical research and you must show that you thought about these things and you must set out your working out and justify the approach you’re taking – and that is causing some fur to fly amongst colleagues who think this is a threat to academic freedom.
University systems were cited as having a detrimental effect upon one's sense of autonomy:

Interviewee 2: Professor, Russell Group university, Male;
I don’t think that we or many other universities are particularly good at making sure that a number of things that are dealt with by different parts of the university are joined up in a way that is relatively costless. …I think that would create an environment in which people would be much more likely to do that in the first place because they would expect the other things to fall into place. At the moment I think a number of things just aren’t done because people see the difficulties of making it happen.

Interviewee 4: Senior Lecturer, post-1992, Female;
There isn’t enough facilitation of asking people what they need to do their job rather than telling people how they should do their job to fit in with the systems that are being put in place.

Respondents clearly value their autonomy. One interviewee commented that if there were less:

Interviewee 10: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
I wouldn’t do it - I can work in industry and probably earn twice as much as I am earning here. I believe I have sacrificed financially and in many other aspects family-wise. These sorts of jobs require a lot of sacrifices. You have to give up a lot of time in order to be successful and you’re not getting paid for it. So financially there is no reward. The only reward that you can have within such an environment is the autonomy that you’ve got.

It was hinted that there might be too much autonomy:

Interviewee 5: Professor, post-1992, Male;
Some academics don’t like students; they don’t want to be bothered with students. Some of them pretend that they’re doing research and it’s a complete waste of time and of course in a totally unmanaged environment people … They’re very
bright people, and they work out how to run their lives in a way that suits them and I must say it's a fantastic environment for them.

Regarding the relationship between accountability and autonomy, views varied:

Interviewee 3: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Female;

One is a consequence of the other really. I mean I don't think I would have the autonomy if I felt I could do what I like and hang the consequences.

In contrast:

Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Male;

I think they are at odds because professional autonomy would suggest that a person would conduct themselves properly because of commitment to a set of values and a set of ideas and principles that are very important.

The quantitative survey examined increasing workload in terms of the extent to which academics feel that prescription is increasing and autonomy decreasing. The means and standard deviations in table 7.9 indicate that (as explored earlier in relation to workload) academics generally find it difficult to find time for research (where 1 = 'very difficult') and are not able to plan and execute research according to their own priorities (where 1 = 'with great difficulty').

Table 7.9 Descriptives: autonomy in research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy or difficult to find time for research</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier or more difficult than 5 years ago</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to plan and execute research according to own priorities</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the relationship between constraints and time for research, as table 7.10 indicates, there appears to be a strong relationship between the two. The result is statistically significant: $p < 0.05$. 
Table 7.10 Correlation: increasing constraints and research time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More constrained than 5 yrs ago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy or difficult to find time for research</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result is statistically significant (p<.05)

Overall responses suggest that academic work is becoming more constrained and that it is becoming increasingly difficult to find time for research.

Looking specifically at autonomy in research and time pressures, table 7.11 indicates a reasonably strong relationship between the two, such that where academics have difficulty finding time for research, they also perceive difficulties in planning and executing research according to their own priorities. This relationship is statistically significant: p < 0.05.

Table 7.11 Correlation: autonomy in research and research time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Execute research according to own priorities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to find time for research</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result is statistically significant (p<.05)

An independent t-test was conducted to expose any differences according to institutional type. The results indicate that it is more difficult to find time for research in statutory universities; t(484)=3.058, p=.002, and staff in statutory universities have less freedom to plan an execute research without interference; t(484) = 3.214, p = .001.

ANOVA testing reveals significant rank-based differences. Finding time for research; F(2.690) = 10.922, p=.000, and freedom in research; F(2.688) = 6.359, p=.002. Independent t-tests on ‘finding time for research’ reveal differences between senior staff and Lecturer B: t (643) = 4.527, p=.000; between senior and Lecturer A: t (217) = 2.503, p=.011. There were no significant differences between Lecturer B and Lecturer A. In relation to freedom in research, independent t-tests indicate significant differences between senior staff and Lecturer B: t (641) = 3.517, p=.000, but not between other combinations of groupings (senior / Lecturer A or Lecturer B/Lecturer A). A further independent t-test indicated a gender-based difference in being able to execute research.
without interference; \(t(692) = 4.483, p=.000\), with females indicating greater difficulty than males. Taken in aggregate, the results indicate that respondents feel that autonomy is declining. There are now many more constraints on both teaching and research activities than in the past. Examining the cause of difficulty in finding time for research and the constraints upon research through open-ended questions exposed: i) pressure to bring in research funding; ii) pressure to perform well in the RAE; iii) the introduction of a number of bureaucratic processes designed to ensure professional accountability; iv) finding ways of coping with large groups. Interestingly, the 'comments' box attracted not only comments about autonomy, but many that continued the theme of insufficient time and the increasing workload. Other constraints specified by respondents include: the effect of the RAE not only in terms of pressure to publish, but to publish within accepted RAE categories thus limiting free choice; pressure to bid for funds which again imposed constraints through prescribed themes; and 'other' constraints, including lack of management support and a poor research culture within the department. The following excerpts convey the general tone of respondents' comments:

**Respondent 135:** There is pressure to do funded research which can detract from basic research.

**Response 175:** Autonomy is diminishing, particularly with regard to the content and process of teaching. This is a major problem and source of alienation and discontent, sometimes even of demoralisation and depression. While expectations for quality teaching are rightly going up, I find that my ability to be innovative and rigorous, and to develop personal and intellectual relationships with students, is very constrained. On the one hand, academic management seems to pass down irrational regulations that limit the number and kind of assessments we can use, and which are in direct contradiction to research which shows that students benefit from more formative feedback. At the same time, however, some of my colleagues are opposed to what I consider good practice because it increases their workload and they won't be allocated time to do it. The micromanagement of academic work is an increasing problem, as is the greater emphasis on 'marketability' combined with greater restrictions and in some cases repression.

**Respondent 234:** Readers here used to have 50% of managed time for research, but that is now being eroded and the principle denied. Development time (contractual) gets eaten up with other work. We are clearly measured over teaching and admin (attendance at
meetings; providing reports) while research is effectively unmeasured, and so drops out of sight, except for RAE type exhortations, and at annual appraisal.

**Respondent 308:** More block time needed to conduct "proper research".

**Respondent 365:** It is not just a matter of time. One has to get funding.

**Respondent 381:** Research priorities are heavily skewed by the RAE.

**Respondent 404:** The main constraint is the imperative to try to gain external funding for research, which results in even those who, like me, are more included to scholarship and theory, having to get involved in the very time-consuming and administrative business of bidding for, and, if successful, executing funded team research. This is something of a reduction in academic freedom, but which, for the sake of our departments, we generally accept, if not exactly happily.

**Respondent 503:** Research in an institution where teaching and admin take up a large amount of academics' time can only be executed in a timely manner with the aid of research assistants and PhD students which many departments and universities are unwilling to support. This is particularly important when the number of successful alpha graded grant applications being funded is going down year on year. In my university promotion is awarded for research achievement in the main and therefore promotion is dictated by external factors, ie external funding of research. This also leads to academics neglecting teaching and admin duties in order to achieve promotion to the detriment of students and staff who have to pick up the pieces after them.

**Respondent 561:** There is a constant pressure to publish and submit grant proposals. This impacts on the quality of research and the type of research undertaken.

**Respondent 629:** The single best thing about my job is the amount of autonomy. I don't like having a boss - I used to work in industry and I could do the work but I didn't like being told what to do. As an academic, you're your own boss at least some of the time.

**Respondent 671:** The difficulties stem from teaching and administration loads increasing.
Respondent 692: Managers do not have any idea any more of what it means to do research, to try to get a grant or a contract, to supervise today's graduates. Paper pushing and gin and tonic drinking are very different things from doing research.

Respondent 714: Time taken to write grants for likely outcome is just not practical. Don't have time to write them well therefore even less chance of success.

Respondent 809: RAE places impossible institutional and subject constraints; perpetuates a corrupt peer review system and internationally is discredited as over-bureaucratic and dysfunctional in terms of making and impact, and disseminating ideas and outcomes.

Respondent 820: There is considerable pressure to apply for funding bids which generates certain constraints and priorities.

Respondent 822: Freedoms are certainly under attack. There is vastly more bureaucracy around than when I first started as a lecturer in 1992. Within this there is still considerable freedom to determine the content of modules etc and to pursue personal research agendas, though, of course, if you want research council funding you have to dance to their fashionable tunes.

Respondent 867: High quality research invariably requires long periods of time to do fieldwork, read, think and write. We are now output-driven. As an ethnographer the idea of spending time in the field with communities is all but impossible.

Respondent 875: Many of the negatives only count if the academic actually thinks institutionally. Many of the structures are in conflict with professionalism and autonomy, but true autonomy is having the strength to ignore them.

Respondent 903: The choice in research is determined only by the possible outcome in terms of RAE rating, nothing to do with the interest of the academic, area of expertise or long-term development prospects. Administration loads are becoming unbearable, as a result of the accountability culture taking over higher education, but also the heavy managerialism developing within the university.

Response 983: There is less autonomy for younger staff. Research is now frequently a 'managed process' because of the RAE and creeping bureaucratisation.
Respondent 1167: Much more formal accountability now for research activities and outputs.

Respondent 1128: Slowly but surely the stranglehold is tightening with more and more bureaucracy under the name of quality assurance that does little in my view to ensure a more quality experience for student or academic.

Respondent 1149: Too many hoops to jump through (short-termism) is not good for free thought and risk-taking in research. Also, far too many internal ‘mini-RAE’ type evaluations. We are constantly being hassled for evidence of this and that, and it interferes with making faster progress on research. Bureaucracy has got out of hand. We need sensible levels of administration for accountability.

In sum, there is evidence of a good deal of frustration in the responses. Finding time for research creates the greatest concern, and fitting research in around teaching and administration was cited as a significant problem. Overall, research time seems to be extremely constrained, autonomy appears to be declining and the pressure to produce in line with management expectations appears to be increasing. It is clear from the responses that autonomy is considered an absolutely crucial element of academic life, such that if it were removed or reduced substantially, the essence of academia would be diminished significantly.

7.2 Managerialism

Drawing again upon the research model, the next issue being examined is academics’ perceptions of managerialism. The research propositions being explored in this section are as follows:

Academics’ perceptions of managerialism are constructed in terms of:

- Accountability and control
- Management supportiveness

It is proposed that managerialism has a significant impact upon academics’ daily working lives, in that mechanisms of accountability are perceived as invasive (proposition 4) and manager-academics are perceived as unsupportive (proposition 5).
7.2.1 Accountability and control

Turning first the focus group, when asked about the level of management control over their daily working lives, participants commented:

Participant B: Lecturer in Law School, Male;

In my department it is all top-down management. X is a very top-down bloke. He is Head of School and tells the Heads of Departments what to do and they tell us what to do, so it's top-down management all the way

Suggesting some freedoms and hinting that this may in some circumstances be rooted in marginalisation:

Participant D: Senior Lecturer in Biomedical School, Male;

Our new Head is basically very much that he has made a matrix in which we all seem to fit. I happen to know that, so to some extent I can ignore it because I can't fit in with what he actually says. I'm much more of an environmental person and he wants basically a medically-orientated school, so to some extent I have the freedom and he gives me the freedom as well. He is saying, as long as you do your teaching duties and do your admissions - that's what I do- as long as you do that well I have no complaints.

Participant D, further, reflecting marginalisation;

Management is very much that they employ people who fit in. People who don't fit are sort of left outside it and have to fend for themselves.

Participants' views on accountability were conceptualised and expressed in relation control and the associated issue of autonomy;

Firstly, noting how accountability is increasing;

Participant C, Senior Lecturer, Language School, Female;

We, as academics, are becoming much more accountable in terms of what we do and what we give back to the society at large so there is much more of a kind of accounting mentality in place in universities today. So, if you like, the sort of old
humanistic ideal which X was picking up on was that you are self-regulatory and that you are accountable in a broad sense to a set of humanistic values such as integrity, honesty and so on but you're not accountable in the more narrow sense of productivity, efficiency, quantifiable outcomes and targets.

Commenting on accountability as a construction of management;

Participant A: Lecturer in Management School, Female;

Accountability is something narrower to my eyes. It’s very much as a managerial concept, a top-down management.

Yet, there was also a view that accountability is not primarily to the institution, but externally, to peers, research councils and so on:

Participant D: Senior Lecturer in Biomedical School, Male;

I find that you need accountability within the University is actually very low. You have to be accountable externally. So if you publish, your publication is reviewed externally, not within the university. So what I submit or how I perform is all valued outside. So external valuation is actually the key.

Expressing a sadness that accountability and performativity may strangle originality;

Participant B: Lecturer in Law School, Male;

Going back to the notion of creativity and development, you actually need the space which is a qualitative space and it's a space that is freed to a certain extent of time constraints and now that we're accountable for every half hour of what we do. I think that's a completely different mentality which is likely to quash those sort of creative impulses particularly in certain areas. I mean I think in certain subject areas like Humanities, English, the Creative Arts really, that's the sort of mentality that's actually going to encourage homogeneity and lack of any originality whatsoever, and the kind of ticking the boxes mentality. So that's, I think it's going to... if it's a way of getting rid of mavericks, it's going to do it but the result will be an impoverished system.
The interviews produced a number of interesting observations about accountability.

Firstly, recognising that accountability has its place in academia:

Interviewee 3: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Female;
Well, I think we would expect all those involved in teaching to be accountable to those whom they teach – fairly directly – not through QA procedures, but directly to the audiences.

Interviewee 7: Lecturer, Statutory university, Male;
Some of them (lecturers) have no sympathy whatsoever in being accountable and having their performance managed at all. Somehow, and – strangely enough – the more left wing they are the worse they are and they write it up in language, quite often, that nobody else can understand and it’s a disgrace. Quite often these are from these traditional universities who somehow set up as an example of the way we ought to be, everybody ought to be following, and that’s why they should be somehow, cut down to size. But you’ve got to accept the basic principle that public money should be accountable.

Interviewee 7, continues;
Freedom to do what you want may mean having an extremely nice life at public expense and how can you be sure that what some people mean by academic professionalism is not the right to continue an extremely pleasant lifestyle with someone else paying?

Interviewee 8: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
The most visible aspect of accountability is to the Research Council to whom we have to report every two years. As far as accountability of my teaching is concerned, I don’t feel that I’m strongly accountable. We have a system where external examiners come in and look at your courses and make a few comments and that seems to be set up so that any really harsh comments are suppressed...

There was a widely held view that quality assurance systems were increasing monitoring, but without necessarily improving quality:
Interviewee 11: Professor, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;

I suppose that there is a perception in the academic community in general that the amount of QAA stuff has increased over the last decade of 20 years or so and a lot of that is sort of not necessarily effective. It’s sort of window dressing covering your back because the government says you have to do all this documentation, and there’s not a great deal of evidence that it actually leads to a change in process that enriches the process does it just add to the admin or does it actually enrich the process and make it a better process

Interviewee 8: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;

Quite frankly, I don’t want to sound negative, but I think we do a pretty good job and I have a pretty good idea of the areas where we can improve. I don’t believe that particular periodic review identified those.

Further:

The QAA teaching assessment.... I don’t know, I think the whole thing was somehow constructed to make it so that if you tick all the boxes you would get a high number and other than that there was just a tiny degree of randomness.

There was clearly a diversity of practice and varying degrees of formality accorded the processes of accountability:

Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Male;

There are regular reports on publications, regular assessments of outputs, regular assessments of teaching quality and student evaluations, regular financial indicators on how much research money is coming in and who has brought it in – so a lot of very, very direct managerialism. Quite formalised and quite open.

Another commented:

Interviewee 5: Professor, post-1992 university, Male;

We go through appraisals – we did appraisals last year because there was the panic of a QAA visit – and everybody had to say we were doing it but you can choose who can appraise, there’s no follow-up, all sort of ... because the issue of appraisals is a contentious issue with the unit. You don’t get appraised by your line manager. You get allocated an appraiser.
Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Male;

Now only do we accept appraisal, we also accept appraisal as serious attempt to develop the individual, which of course it isn’t. You know, I have no delusions about it - pure and simple it is a kind of control and quite coercive system.

Interviewee 10: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;

The targets are meant to be goals. They’re meant to appear reasonable and achievable, the aim being to put down something that is worthwhile so that the following year it can be said to have been achieved and anything else you achieve on top of that is then seen as a bonus.

Some saw it as no different to what went before, but perhaps only more obvious:

Interviewee 2: Professor, Russell Group university, Male;

...most academics don’t have a particular interest to or interest in management principles, I think what we’re trying to do is simply from an input to an output based activity. I don’t think that threatens professionalism as an academic at all. Actually I think, certainly in my career as an academic, output measures have always been important to things like promotion, to getting other jobs – and whilst people didn’t necessarily feel managed in relation to their outputs on a month by month, year by year basis, certainly in relation to their career they were – they just didn’t notice it. Now they notice it rather more, but that has quite positive outcomes in many senses because that could help them to manage and build their own careers.

Participants in the qualitative stages of data collection spoke of hierarchical management, commercialisation, output measures and audit mechanisms – a plethora of measures aimed at utility and performance maximisation. Formalised strategic planning, workload modelling, targets and performance measurements appear to be the norm. Interviewees appear to accept performativity, accountability and management by targets as integral and necessary elements of the sector. This may be indicative of becoming conditioned to management over the years or possibly simply of being citizens of a performance-driven society. Yet this is not to suggest that academics accept the implied change in norms and values that accompany it.
The quantitative survey provided some further interesting insights about accountability and control. Respondents were asked initially about how free or constrained they feel overall. $\bar{x} = 3.01$, $SD = 1.064$ indicates that they feel neither free nor constrained (which is surprising in light of some of the comments about workload), and in relation to five years ago $\bar{x} = 3.27$, $SD = 1.488$, again indicating neither particularly free nor constrained. These initial responses suggest that feelings are not as strong nor as negative as suggested in some of the literature. Regarding fairness and transparency of management decision-making and level of managerial control, $\bar{x}$ lay between 3.03 and 3.75 (SDs between 1.25 and 1.41), indicating that respondents are reasonably comfortable with the current level of managerial control, transparency and fairness of decisions. Regarding the level constraints on teaching, research, and on the ability to network and deal with professional duties outside universities, $\bar{x}$ ranged from 3.27 to 3.99 (interestingly, the latter indicating relative freedom to decide what to research). In aggregate, with all means for these items lying between 3.03 and 3.99, the responses suggest a relatively ambivalent attitude towards issues of accountability and managerial control.

Multiple regression was employed to examine the relative contribution of perceived constraints or freedoms regarding teaching, administration, research and opportunities for networking to overall feelings of constraints or freedoms. Adjusted $R^2 = .333$, indicating that the model as a whole explains 33.3% of the variance of the dependent variable, so may be of some limited interest. Overall, there was a relatively small, but statistically significant effect, $F(4,680) = 86.352, p = 0.00$. Standardised $\beta$ coefficients, $t$ values and significance are shown in table 7.12.

Table 7.12 Regression analysis: perceived constraints/freedoms and overall constraints/freedom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>260.719</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65.180</td>
<td>86.35</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>513.275</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>773.994</td>
<td>684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Unstandardized and Standardized Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admin</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networking</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: constrained or free overall

These results are interesting, indicating that perceptions of freedom to network and attend to professional duties outside the university is the best predictor of overall perceptions of freedom/lack of constraint (i.e. autonomy). Interestingly, administration appears to be a good predictor of feelings of autonomy, whilst research makes a much smaller contribution. These results suggest that perceptions of administration are relatively important to overall feelings of autonomy. They may also suggest that intervening variables mitigate the effect of prescription and control – we shall return to this later.

Turning next to examine perceptions of mechanisms of accountability and performance management, the literature indicates that there has been a long-standing debate around whether professionals should be trusted to employ internal mechanisms of accountability (peer review, and so on) or whether external mechanisms should be employed (such as formal performance appraisal). The response of academic staff to the question of whether performance management actually improves the professional performance of academics (as a whole) was generally negative ($\bar{x} = 2.06$, S.D. = .879), indicating general agreement that it does not. However, when asked whether performance management improves their own, individual performance, academics were rather more positive ($\bar{x} = 3.52$, S.D. = 1.111). This suggests that individuals see some limited merit in using formal performance review at a personal level, but at a more abstract level are less convinced. It also suggests that respondents are using different frameworks for evaluating their own circumstances and making overall, sector-wide evaluations.

The ‘comments’ section elicited some interesting observations about constraints and freedoms. Interestingly, there are few which cite management as the primary constraint – perspectives appear broader and related more generally to policy decisions, such as the
funding regime, and pressures resulting from sector expansion, the RAE, and increasing bureaucracy in the name of ‘quality assurance’. The following excerpts provide a sense of the general ‘flavour’ of the comments:

Response 14: The constraints are time and budget constraints: larger class sizes due to poor funding; time spent on pointless administration; the pressure to publish regardless of whether or not the research is ready for dissemination.

Response 96: Constraint is not a management issue - it's a financial one - you can only research areas where funding can be had....

Response 105: In teaching, I feel constrained in terms of what course I teach, but less constrained in how I teach it. Research constraints come from peer reviewed grant awards, not university management.

Response 123: Constraints in the administrative sphere are increasing. Otherwise not much change

Response 133: They pay lip service to research, but do not allow sufficient time. The students are short-changed by the huge numbers, inadequate teaching facilities and the failure to subdivide them into small enough groups for seminars/classes.

Response 138: Re: 10d, I am very free to choose which conferences I would like to attend. The constraint comes in the form of lack of funds to support this, not from the strictures of any management system.

Response 175: Decreasing autonomy, particularly with regard to the content and process of teaching, is a major problem and source of alienation and discontent, sometimes even of demoralisation and depression. While expectations for quality teaching are rightly going up, I find that my ability to be innovative and rigorous, and to develop personal and intellectual relationships with students, is very constrained. On the one hand, academic management seems to pass down irrational regulations that limit the number and kind of assessments we can use, and which are in direct contradiction to research which shows that students benefit from more formative feedback. At the same time, however, even some of my colleagues are opposed to what I consider good practice because it increases their workload and they won't be allocated time to do it. The micromanagement of
academic work is an increasing problem, as is the greater emphasis on 'marketability' combined with greater restrictions and in some cases repression.

Response 320: Since students are now having to pay for HE, I feel that issues of accountability re what is taught and how it is taught are very important. The issue of 'best practice' in teaching and learning in HE is long overdue.

Response 248: Although there are constraints that are based on availability of funds, other constraints arise from prejudices of those in authority. Thus, petty jealousies are often allowed to colour decision making about the distribution and access to conferences, travel, external contacts etc.. Having said that, if one has ones own funds, few obstacles actually prevent these activities. It is just a general suspicion or resentment of those who participate in these activities. Research is a particular target for this kind of behaviour.

Response 419: The problem is finding the time to research, therefore any research is often linked to teaching areas. Again the culture of this type of department (cannot say for rest of university) is that research has not been a significant area you can do it if you wish but it has to fit round teaching and bringing in money from new sources.

Response 493: Although there are no official constraints to conference attendance, etc, in practice teaching and admin demands and timetables mean that one can't attend many of the things one would like to.

Response 578: The administrative burden has increased. Much of it appears to lack meaning to me as an academic. The bulk of paperwork required to alter courses, let alone start new ones, has increased by easily an order of magnitude, and to very little substantive benefit except for formal compliance with QAA fetishes.

Response 586: All these things can be negotiated by discussion with the Head of Department. There is more emphasis on annual staff review nowadays, so these issues do get discussed.

Response 733: RAE means that if you aren't excellent at research (very difficult if not in a big group) you are just lumbered with teaching and admin. It then becomes impossible to do research at all.
Response 820: Teaching content has to be appropriate for the course, department, and students in question. It is not appropriate for academics to only teach what they want to teach; a balance should be struck between a lecturer's expertise and the students' needs wherever possible. Research is the area of greatest autonomy although very restricted funding for conferences and trips does create implicit constraints. Administration is the area of least choice. However, it is interesting that one's capacity to negotiate administrative workloads improves with experience and seniority. In this respect, new and junior staff are the most constrained in the area of administration. Gender may also play a role. When there are fewer women, those women who are present may be called upon more than their male counterparts in terms of administrative work - e.g. in pastoral situations, to provide a female member of staff on field trips or for invigilation, and to act on interview panels and committees. Email is a particularly problematic area as the workload and the expectations it generates are very difficult to manage.

Response 822: Freedom is closely linked to an individual (or group) ability to bring in money (usually through funded research). It seems you can now buy freedom and avoid constraints. I am in an in-between position...neither too constrained but not exactly free either. There is also more pressure and more monitoring to do specific things, e.g. we are now being pressurised to bring in '3rd strand' money...ie consultancy, commercial type activities...what a sellout!!!

Response 824: Freedoms are certainly under attack. There is vastly more bureaucracy around than when I started as a lecturer in 1992. Within this there is still considerable freedom to determine the content of modules etc and to pursue personal research agendas, though, of course, if you want research council funding you have to dance to their fashionable tunes.

Response 893: Administration is now viewed as a load that has to be shared evenly amongst academic staff. There is no consultation or discussion as to how administrative loads could be lightened through better management, economies of scales, etc. Decisions are taken behind closed doors whereas before, things were discussed in an open forum of peers.

Response 900: Teaching: we are more and more constrained to offer vocational courses that will attract large numbers of students, institutional profit and students' careers are more important than learning/knowledge per se. So it is very hard to link teaching to own
research, as we are required to try to do. Research: though I have been free to research what I want so far, I was not made officially research active until this year and so have had to do research on top of huge amounts of teaching and admin. Now that I am research active, I expect to come under gentle pressure to steer my research in the direction of the School's research themes. Admin: we are invited to volunteer for admin jobs at the start of each year, so are free in that sense; however, I am frequently expected to handle admin for which I have no job title and for which I am given no workload allocation, simply because I am perceived to be the person best placed to do it/most knowledgeable in that area.

Respondent 1128: Slowly but surely the stranglehold is tightening with more and more bureaucracy under the name of quality assurance that does little in my view to ensure a more quality experience for student or academic.

Overall respondents demonstrate awareness – and are critical – of current conditions in universities. They perceive managerialism as imposing accountability defined narrowly in terms of measurable outcomes and performance monitoring. There is, however, a reasonably strong view that managerialism is manifested not by manager-academics at departmental level, but externally via policy decisions affecting the entire sector. The responses also suggest that academics are struggling to retain freedoms within a framework which essentially constrains autonomy.

Accepting the Kantian perspective that autonomy accords responsibilities and constraints as well as privileges, some of those interviewed perceive little conflict between the two, since they consider it 'right and proper' to have formalised systems of accountability embedded in HE governance. In contrast, those who accept the Foucauldian notion of accountability and autonomy in terms of agency-driven power relations, perceive the relationship between the two as a struggle between the governors and the governed. It is worth noting, however, that this latter group may distinguish insufficiently between management and accountability and may simply be expressing opinions about the management of their department rather than accountability, per se. On paper, university systems of accountability feature agency, in which a principal becomes a commissioning party to an agent, determining workloads, allocating duties, devising performance targets and so on. In practice, however, participants’ experiences of accountability vary quite markedly from a very strict, performative regime with minimal freedoms and regular
reporting to a relatively laissez-faire monitoring, including sporadic, informal performance appraisals.

7.2.2. Management Supportiveness

Drawing again upon the research model, the next issue under examination is managerialism – in particular, the way in which it is being practiced within universities. From a Foucauldian perspective managerialism is concerned not only with technologies, but practices which shape and characterise discourses and realities. This section investigates proposition 5, which is concerned with staff perceptions of managerial supportiveness.

Participants in the focus group suggested that manager-academics (in this case School Heads) are quite directive, and marginalise those who do not ‘fit in’:

Participant D: Senior Lecturer, Biomedical School, Male;
    I do find my Head of School very, very supportive in giving directional advice. That’s another level where I think there’s a clear culture within the School that if you don’t fit into that culture you really are an outsider so in that sense there are jobs for the boys and they’re given perks, so it’s kind of a patriarchal kind of patronising system to a certain extent as well.

Participant C: Senior Lecturer, Language School, Female;
    I think in terms of managerial support, I think as long as your goals are consonant with the goals of the department and/or school and/or university, you’re likely to be given all the support you need. I think from the moment that your interests are seen to be let’s say very ‘blue sky research’ not bringing in income and not apparently leading to an efficient, productive, timetabled outcome, and unless you’re in the privileged position of having an excellent reputation outside and an international reputation, I think that’s the point at which you’re going to find it actually quite difficult to achieve your own professional and personal goals.

Noting the structuration effect and the importance of mutually recognised inter-dependence:
Participant B: Lecturer in Law School, Male;

If you really want to get things done you have to be respected and liked by your colleagues and if you're the Head of School who wants to get the School going in a certain direction, he actually needs your support otherwise it doesn't work. If he doesn't have it, he can sing and do what he likes, he doesn't get anywhere.

Turning to the interviews, here responses were much more varied, indicating a wide spectrum of experiences which may reflect either the management style of the department, managers’ ability to manage or possibly respondents’ position within the department, their feelings of stress, or ability to adapt and cope within a rapidly changing environment. The following illustrates the range of reflections about departmental management/leadership:

Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Male;

There are a lot of direct initiatives that reinforce and turn this ethos into a performative something that is acted out.

Interviewee 2: Professor, Russell Group university, Male;

I think as we’ve got through 2003 to now we’ve been emphasising a much more managed approach ... I think what we had previously...a lot of universities had previously was the...the language of collegiality and the fact of bureaucracy. We’ve tried to get away from that a little bit — especially bureaucracy, - to substitute that with some actual management, but trying to keep the academic integrity going at the same time.

Interviewee 8: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;

Our current head of department is very open to discussion. I think everyone in the department finds him a surprisingly good guy. He's on our team, so to speak.... He decides who does what and my impression is that he does that in a reasonably fair way. He also I think protects us from a lot of admin that he does himself which, erm, is very nice of him.

A number of the departments to which the interviewees belonged had recently had a change of Head and in many instances noticeable changes in style were welcomed by the respondents:
Interviewee 3: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Female;

Now we’ve got a very strong Head of School with a very definite brief of where he’s going to take the School and with very strong ideas. The whole committee structure and the organisational structure’s changed since he’s been here. Personally I think it’s very exciting and a step in the right direction, but there have been problems...

Interviewee 4: Senior Lecturer, post-1992 university, Female;

Since X took over as Head of Department, the stress is lifting off us because under the previous regime it was horrendously rigid. ... Our previous Head was so dictatorial and so... he couldn’t have an argument with you. He didn’t ask your opinion. He didn’t want to hear your opinion. He was one of those people who was really proud of his ability to make up his mind really fast – he didn’t take things into account...

Interviewee 7: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;

X is very firm, very fair and gives people a very clear idea of what their working space is, what expectations are made of them.

Interviewee 9: Senior Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;

With the new Head it is promising to be much, much better. There’s a certain amount of consistency. I think there is some level of democratic attitude.

Interviewee 10: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;

Well, now we’re not forced to go to lots of pointless meetings where the old Head of Department would basically just give us a sermon..... In the old meetings the way everybody had a say was that the Head of Department went round everybody like this with a finger sort of giving them a chance to say something, and you felt you had to say something otherwise you’d look as if you weren’t taking part, but then if hadn’t anything to say you know you just said some rubbish.

There was some frustration at being undervalued – that managers were reluctant to acknowledge achievements:
Interviewee 2: Professor, Russell Group university, Male;

I think traditionally universities have been very bad at recognising the achievements of their staff - even just saying nice things about them would be a start.

And, echoing the focus group, a hint that if individuals do not ‘fit’ they will simply be marginalised. Commenting on one’s ability to negotiate a reduced workload in one area it was noted:

Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Male;

Quite likely that I would be extremely marginalised’ ..........'It’s one of those things – you never feel confident enough to undertake this type of manoeuvre, to be honest.’

Interviewees’ ideas of what made managers successful highlighted well established ideas of:

a) consultation:

Interviewee 4: Senior Lecturer, post-1992 university, Female;

He wants to consult; he talks to staff; he worries about people; he’s fantastic.... When he asks us to do thing they’re entirely reasonable and he doesn’t spend ages explaining things but we have staff meetings and he says, this needs to be done because... and he’ll set the context and you do things because you know why they’ve got to be done.

b) transparency:

Interviewee 7: Lecturer, post-1992 university, Male;

One thing he did was to put together a way of planning what people’s workload should be in future so that everybody could see clearly not just what was asked of them but also what was being asked of everybody else in the department.
c) academic reputation / credibility:

Interviewee 2: Professor, Russell Group university, Male;

So I think it’s very important in an institution like this to ensure that everybody in those academic positions…sorry management positions has a strong academic background and has the academic respect of the people they manage.

There was a view that in a people-centred organisation top-down management is generally inappropriate:

Interviewee 2: Professor, Russell Group university, Male;

I don’t think top-down management can succeed in something as complicated and difficult to describe as a university – it’s great for producing projects, but it doesn’t work in human capital intensive industries… so I think a more directive style of management would be counter-productive.

Interviewee 4: Senior Lecturer, post-1992 university, Female;

They’re treating you like manual workers in a factory turning out piecework as though we were totally extrinsically motivated and bullying people into trying to get them to do things the way that they know isn’t right...

In turn, some interviewees had a low opinion of management:

Interviewee 9: Senior Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;

In the place that I was in the past there were a large number of managerial members. To me they were just parasites. They were not doing anything. They were consuming the work we were doing – the people on the shop floor were doing. They were taking the credit for the work that we were doing.

The personal characteristics and style of the Head, including approachability, a consultative style, the ability to (and interest in) nurture and encourage colleagues. There was also some suggestion of perceptions being coloured by an individual’s position in the department and relationship with the Head. Generally, the conviction that the Head is ‘on our side’ also appears to be important. Some of these features may be learned and may form an element of leadership courses for departmental Heads, however many elements are inherent in personality – it may simply be impossible, for example, to learn to become
'likeable', 'approachable' and 'nurturing'. Interviewees were overwhelmingly negative about managers who appeared overly focused upon the 'hard' aspects of management, for example, upon performance targets, rigid processes and an unapproachable, dictatorial style. There was also some indication that some participants were part of an 'inner circle' and these people praised the Head whilst, conversely, a number felt marginalised and unrepresented. Unsurprisingly, those in the latter group were much more critical of the regime and more consciously preoccupied with developing coping strategies. Finally, the interviews highlighted a sense of recognition of the futility of trying to apply generic management techniques, ignoring the special nature of academia. In addition, the necessity of the Head having a credible record as an academic was also commented upon.

Turning to the quantitative survey, participants were asked about perceived management supportiveness across all aspects of academic work. Independent t-tests and ANOVA testing indicated no significant differences in perceptions across all items according to institution type, gender or rank. As table 7.13 illustrates, respondents do not rate the management of their department particularly well across most items (where 1 = not very supportive).

Table 7.13 Descriptives: management supportiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring your workload is reasonable</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating autonomy in teaching and research</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting you to get on with your work</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring intangible as well as tangible outcomes</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating opportunities for networking and conferences</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting you about decisions that affect you</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making you feel that your views matter</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluations of the supportiveness of management was explored initially by measuring correlations between numerous independent variables and the dependent variable 'feeling supported in achieving your objectives'. This produced the following correlation coefficients:
Table 7.14 Correlations: managerial actions and evaluations of supportiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload reasonable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating autonomy</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting you</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring intangibles too</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate networking opportunities</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting you</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views matter</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling supported in achieving your objectives</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results are statistically significant in all cases, with $p<0.05$.

Overall the results indicate strong relationships between the variables; the strongest being between feeling supported and i) being made to feel that one's views matter, and ii) being allocated a reasonable workload.

Regression analysis was then employed to measure the relative contribution of each of the independent variables above to the dependent variable, 'feeling supported'. $R^2 = .669$, suggests that the model is of interest.

Table 7.15 Regression analysis: management actions and feeling supported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>649.791</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>92.827</td>
<td>184.183</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>327.597</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>977.388</td>
<td>657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Unstandardized coefficients</td>
<td>Standardised coefficients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>1.938</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable load</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>10.844</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate autonomy</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>2.746</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust you</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure intangible</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>1.741</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate netwking.</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>3.212</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult decisions</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views matter</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>8.022</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: performance affected by workload

The results in table 7.15 are of considerable interest, confirming what the correlations suggest, namely that workload allocation and making individuals feel that their views matter make a strong contribution to feeling supported. This is of potential importance to academic managers if their interest is to make staff feel supported (which in turn may well have implications for staff motivation, and performance). The results suggest that there is an intervening attribution variable related to perceived management supportiveness; namely ‘workload allocation’.

In the ‘comments’ box of the questionnaire a small number (43) respondents provided comments on issues affecting management support: 17 (35.4%) opined that, in fact, many of the problems experienced in their departments were symptoms of mismanagement by the senior management of the university or the result of government policy; 12 (25%) were of the view that their Heads had no idea how to run a department, with an additional 7 (14.6%) commenting that the Head’s priorities were all wrong; 6 (12.5%) mentioned that equity of workload was important; and 6 (12.5%) cited other reasons, such as the effect of management structure, the need for personal accountability and the importance of maintaining standards.

Response 16: In relation to (b), my departmental leadership is excellent at ensuring that my workload is reasonable in relation to the size of the department and the equity of
distribution. In relation to other departments, my workload might be considered to be very heavy; this is not a matter that can be resolved by the departmental leadership system.

Response 42: HoD very good at trying to be supportive - but he too is hugely constrained by resources and the culture of the university generally.

Response 123: The leadership of my Department is fine. I am less happy with the University administration, which fails to mount a defence against useless bureaucracy.

Response 133: Teaching is not regarded as being important, in the sense that we should be giving our students the individual attention they need. It is education provided as though it were the equivalent of factory farming.

Response 211: Departmental leaders are in general as overburdened with useless paperwork as the rest of us, and do their best to minimise it. The real problems originate with senior managers who have often lost touch with what it means to be a researcher, and government policy.

Response 234: Departmental leaders are often pawns in a larger game, and it's the larger game, at institution level(s) that can be more important - i.e. limiting department head's freedom to vary or change things. Re performance management - it's not managing performance that's the issue so much as academic's jobs having grown like Topsy, and no rational look is being taken at them. Some institutions do appear to have a clearer separation of routine admin and teaching/research roles than at mine.

Response 246: By marginalising the influence of successful staff, the School loses the benefit of bringing their skills and judgements to issues of critical importance to the university. Unfortunately, talented staff often have different perspectives. This can be part of what leads to their success. However, unlike those who do not participate in the processes outside the university, their accreditation by colleagues outside is more demanding and rigorous than that applied internally. They therefore do not fit into a particular mould and may be thought to be rather risky in how they wish to proceed. The largest returns are usually delivered as a result of taking manageable risks, not by playing safe.

Response 248: Although there are constraints that are based on availability of funds, other constraints arise from prejudices of those in authority. Thus, petty jealousies are often
allowed to colour decision making about the distribution and access to conferences, travel, external contacts etc.

Response 264: The management system has not yet caught up with the HE environment we know work in.

Response 276: Management are only interested in their own promotion (response 276)

Response 629: Recent management changes have made me start to worry we could be heading the direction of industry and the draconian, highly-controlling management style that caused me to leave it!

Response 733: I have no idea what ‘performance management' means. I guess impersonal sticks and carrots. They will achieve nothing but resentment. Personal leadership and recognition is what makes a difference.

Response 781: Management in an academic setting needs to ensure that essential tasks are managed rigorously (such as the teaching and learning tasks of the University). Research on the other hand benefits most from a hands off approach by giving individuals enough freedom, resources and time to pursue their goals. It is up to the research group leaders to motivate and inspire students and staff within his/her research group.

Response 824: God forbid that we should ever have hierarchical line-management in universities, although there are plenty who seem to like that model. The old collegiate approach does seem to be losing ground and there isn't much democracy around. We are generally told what is going to happen. The information flows tend to be all one way.

Response 852: I am generally very happy with my working environment and how it's managed. What I strongly resent is inept political attempts at control via monitoring mechanisms. Given that most academics are highly educated, highly motivated, constructive people, I propose a new principle: trust us. Moreover, attempts at management and actual behaviour are different things: I tick the boxes, and then do the real work of teaching and research.

Response 914: I get on very well personally with my Head of School although institutionally the system is geared towards tick-box approaches to 'quality management' and is woefully target driven and orientated uncritically towards regarding students as
'consumers' and us as 'purveyors of knowledge products'. I am an educator and there is a fundamental clash of cultures here.

Response 979: My immediate departmental leader is retiring at the end of this semester and, frankly, doesn't care at all. So whilst I have autonomy, he doesn't have leadership.

Response 933: Our current head of department has no interest in anyone or anything other than himself. He is rude and lazy and incompetent but senior management do absolutely NOTHING to change this. He is retiring this year (Thank god) and hopefully things will change although I want to remain autonomous.

One interesting proposal emerging from the qualitative stage of the research is the apparent absence of any strong perceptions of conflict between manager-academics and academic staff. Whilst there is certainly negativity about the impact of directive managers upon motivation and morale, this is matched by a sense of academics retaining control over their working environment and managers having to cajole and work alongside academics in order to get them to co-operate.

7.3 Coping Strategies

Drawing upon the research model, the next issue explored concerns coping strategies, defined in the research model as a behavioural outcome. The research proposition being explored concerns the conscious development of coping strategies and an instrumental approach to preserving autonomous spaces. Participants appear to have common approaches to sensemaking and coping.

Suggesting tension between personal and departmental goals, and feelings of stress caused by wishing to pursue personal ambitions:

Participant D: Senior Lecturer, Biomedical School, Male;

I think OK I have to do this, I have to do that and you do it because you’ve got to keep your job, you’ve got to fulfil that criteria but then there are so many dreams and goals and bits of research and things that I really want to fulfil and I find those falling behind because I'm meeting other people’s goals.
Presenting an image of compliance, but disengagement:

Participant B: Lecturer, Law School, Male;

I think it's like a mouse in a wheel, an exercise wheel. All this stuff, we all pay lip service to it, we're all going along with it because that's what you're expected to do, you know, like if you're in management school you've got to be suited and booted, you know, that's what you're expected to do, you're going along like this mouse in a wheel saying yes, learning outcomes, teaching objectives, quality assurance, .... and on the other hand your disengaging your mind saying oh, I'm going through all this because I have to, but actually it's a bit of a bore. There's nothing new under the sun; as many academics think; this is a different way of chopping up things. OK if that's the way you want to chop it up, I'll go along with it; it's a nice day isn't it, or whatever...You're thinking about something else even though you're going through the motions, paying lip service to and treading the steps.

Suggesting resistance and attempts to assert one's right as a professional to make decisions:

Participant C: Senior Lecturer, Languages School, Female;

I think what I would do, or what I do or try to do, is try to shift the boundaries and so I try to set my own parameters in a sense and obviously I'm aware of outside regulations and conventions, but to pick up on what X said about dress code, I suppose I wear dungarees or jeans with a nice jacket. So on the one hand I'm saying yes I know that there's a rule about conformity but on the other hand we're all adults here and it's not going to affect my teaching if I wear jeans and I can get away with it, can't I - and I do.

On the balance between finding autonomous niches whilst fulfilling the requirements of the Department:

Participant C: Senior Lecturer, Languages School, Female;

So it's a question of yes to paying a certain amount of lip service but at the same time doing what you what and perhaps that's a rather strange image to use because ultimately I think it's the freedom in the mind that is the most important. You can
look on the surface as if you are conforming but it's what you're actually able to do within the confines of those spaces. So yes I think for myself it's definitely about pushing boundaries, but I'm not going to push the boundaries further than I think I can get away with at any particular time.

Demonstrating an awareness of the need to be seen to be conforming and delivering relative to expectations, whilst retaining a sense of the professional self:

Participant B: Lecturer, Law School, Male;

So yes it's. I mean it's quite post-modern, it's kind of reinventing yourself, about using discourses that are available and either subverting them or using them for your own purposes. It's kind of masquerade. You're performing really.

Participants also displayed a high level of self-belief and a strong need and drive towards self-actualisation and independence of thought and action:

Participant C: Senior Lecturer, Language School, Female;

I think I'm much more in tune now with X's idea that you create your own values and as long as you have a purpose to serve in a sense which is generated internally rather than externally... this may sound rather pompous but I think ultimately I'm less concerned by express constraints than I've ever been so I think that would not bother me at all. So if there came a point in the future where, if you like, there had to be a parting of the ways, I wouldn't have a problem doing that.

There was little sign of individuals feeling quashed or cowed by the constraints of managerialism:

Participant A: Lecturer, Management School, Female;

It's one of the interesting things, that actually we can survive outside of academia, we can survive doing lots of different things and I suppose one of the challenges is to be able to be flexible enough to move around and to pick up and learn really along the way and take with you what you have.
Interviewees appeared to be coping reasonably well with the increasing pressures put upon them. However, there was some small indication of a few having consciously developed strategies to help them cope with increasing workloads:

On developing a strategy based upon ‘must do’:

Interviewee 10: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
   For instance, there are some things that people say you have to do which actually you don’t. That’s the most difficult thing of all. That sometimes the thing that someone’s asked you to do – if you don’t do it, it just dies.

Collaborating with colleagues to get work done:

Interviewee 1, Male, Senior Lecturer, Russell Group:
   A colleague did it (the task) for me. This is exactly the sort of collegiate favours we do for each other. We trade favours – she did something for me, I will do something for her.

As with the focus group, interviewees did not seem particularly aware of the need to develop a coping strategy proactively. Rather, echoing the focus group participants, they appeared to be more concerned with rationalising and making sense of their situation.

On job satisfaction:

Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group, Male;
   I think that it’s a very, very difficult question, but in truth I’m less satisfied with my job than I have ever been – and I think that, you know, it could be age and it could be the wear and tear of academic life and it could be a lot of other factors, but yes, I would say that I’m less satisfied now

Interviewee 3: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group, Female;
   Um...well, satisfied suggests complacency. Um...no, well I think as I said right at the beginning I think people... are increasingly having to face decisions about whether to go one way or another... and so I have to make that sort of decision.
On dissatisfaction but a sense of entrapment – although feeling under pressure it was not a simple matter of packing up and leaving:

Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group, Male;

Moving here for this job- both my wife and my children made certain sacrifices. And having made them it makes you reluctant to move.

On recommending a career in academia to a close friend, or children, there was general agreement that, for a certain type of person, they would recommend it. A typical response was:

Interviewee 10: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;

It depends on what qualities they have and how they feel about education. I think it’s wrong to be an academic unless you think education is important. It’s wrong to be an academic if you don’t have high standards and it’s wrong to be an academic if you’re not good at working autonomously.

Of the 708 respondents to the quantitative survey, 383 state that they consciously do so: 143 (37.3 %) work longer hours; 44 (11.5%) ‘keep their head down’, or ‘say no’ to requests; 48 (12.5%) consciously manage their time; 46 (12%) prioritise more than previously; 8 (2.1%) work more from home; 9 (2.3%) spend less time with students; 62 (16.2) skim, or perform tasks less assiduously than before; 23 (6 %) spend less time on research.

Typical comments which give a flavour of the overall tone of responses include:

Respondent 36: ‘Work longer hours! Put up-front effort into making repetitive teaching and administrative tasks easier and quicker in the long term’

Respondent 45: ‘Better time management, and give up more of my time’.

Respondent 51: ‘Worry less about deadlines. Accept that some deadlines will not be met. Cut corners on keeping up with the discipline, reading for teaching, etc.’
**Respondent 73:** Improve my time management, keep meetings as short as possible (especially those I chair), be more ruthless about what I focus on, re-negotiate my job description, delegate as much as possible, spend less time with each individual student.

**Respondent 127:** 'More student-centred learning (i.e. through pre-prepared student work on Intranet, for instance).'</p>

**Respondent 164:** 'Prioritise... be more selective with feedback ... use less time-consuming assessment techniques etc.'

**Respondent 167:** 'Ignoring useless meetings, improved use of ICT for teaching support, priorities.'

**Respondent 194:** 'I don't volunteer much; I keep my head down; I work more at home; I do tasks very swiftly. I also know where the holes in the roads and, and which cupboards have skeletons in them'.

**Respondent 211:** 'I just ignore anything that looks like management gobblydegook. But mostly, I have to had to give up reading books during term time, which is not very good for an English lecturer'.

**Response 219:** 'I believe that I may spend less time on the quality of the work I do, and more at optimising the various measurements used'.

**Response 223:** 'I do things less carefully, I put less effort into updating materials, I spend less time preparing lectures, I find I am doing less writing and publishing, and cutting back on research. I am not happy with this, and it is less a strategy than a series of accidents!'

**Respondent 264:** 'I tend to streamline assessments: either cut them down or make them more 'tick box' exercises'.

**Respondent 355:** 'A cardboard box under my desk for paper that I can hope not to have to react to, and an e-mail folder for corresponding e-mails. If I get any reminder, stuff is easy to find. When the box or folder gets too full, I junk the oldest 1/4 of the stuff in them'.
Respondent 419: ‘Prioritise, and hope that some will go away, otherwise do it at weekends and evenings’.

Respondent 452: ‘I spend less time with my family. I try to spend less time on teaching and try to limit the amount of time that I am available to students’.

Respondent 472: ‘Strategy is to do the job less well. Cut corners, reduce marking, reduce assignments, use more PhD students to run labs etc. A definite drop in quality. What I say to my boss when he asks me to do more is, ‘I have infinite capacity to do more work provided you don’t mind that the quality approaches zero!’

Respondent 513: ‘I once had an open door policy for my tutees. If I was around and not too busy I was willing to see them without an appointment. Now they must have an appointment’.

Respondent 572: ‘Try to avoid being in my office picking up queries from students who happen to be passing because I am one of the few members of staff at work when not teaching. Changing assessments to reduce marking. Little I can change on the administration side, which is the growth area particularly with quality assurance processes’.

Respondent 630: ‘Try not to take on unnecessary work. Avoid pointless meetings. Work from home where I can control the number of interruptions’.

Respondent 657: ‘It’s not the workload as such, it’s more the emphasis on admin tasks, quality control and marking that takes up more time than face to face contract with students. Just get on with it and complain amongst ourselves’.

Respondent 714: ‘Work ridiculous hours – only manageable because I don’t have family commitments outside – have to work weekends and evenings to keep up.’

Respondent 733: ‘Research was first to go. Now I just don’t do things.’

Respondent 864: ‘Reduce research time’.
Respondent 871: ‘Some things don’t get done’.

Respondent 882: ‘I sleep less and do not see my family. Really. That is how I cope’.

Respondent 909: ‘Selective diligence’

Respondent 912: ‘Resist’

Respondent 932: ‘Do everything 80% instead of 100%; however real job satisfaction is only achieved if you are given the chance to give 100, but we are not. This is why there is so much frustration, because we are not given the chance to give our best but our academic talents and skills are wasted on administration’.

Respondent 1123: ‘Elbow grease, grit and determination. There is nothing for it but to knuckle down. Putting things off just increases stress and leads to loss of confidence’.

[Note that respondent i.d. goes up to 1,153, this being the total number of ‘click-throughs’; 708 completed the survey].

Overall, respondents cope by increasing their working hours and self-managing, by utilising time management strategies, prioritising tasks and reducing the number of interruptions by working from home. An element of instrumentalism is discernible in the responses by ‘keeping one’s head down’ and saying no to requests, reducing the time spent with students and doing tasks less assiduously than in the past. Only a small number of respondents consciously have reduced the time devoted to research, indicating that although (as earlier results suggest) the burden of administration is growing and squeezing the amount of time available for research, academics are reluctant to sacrifice research in order to cope with increased workloads. The responses are consistent across respondents, with no statistically significant differences according to institutional type or rank. Overall the approach seems to be to work longer hours and employ self-management techniques such as time management and active prioritisation.
7.4 Professionalism

The final research proposition being explored is as follows:

By consciously adopting coping strategies, academics manage to maintain their professionalism (proposition 8)

Participants' views on professionalism are interesting, embracing traditional notions of shared beliefs, values, standards of conduct and so on whilst also conceptualising professionalism as a social construction, hinting at inter-dependency with management, as illustrated:

Taking a traditional view of professionalism as adhering to a shared code of conduct:

Participant A: Lecturer, Management School, Female;
Professionalism involves adhering to some set of rules - rules of conduct which is one of the characteristic features of professionalism that it abides by a certain code of conduct, rules imposed from above by some regulatory body.

Defining professionalism in terms of shared standards and values:

Participant B: Lecturer, Law School, Male;
Well, I think professionalism is one of these terms that can have both positive and negative connotations insofar as we, as academics, have access to a certain body of expertise which we try to transmit to a certain extent to our students and are part of a kind of disciplinary community, I think it's not unfair to say that we are professionals. So we're kind of upholding our particular standards and we're transmitting a set of values.
Hinting at professionalism as a social construct, encompassing constraints as well as privilege:

Participant D: Senior Lecturer, Biomedical School, Male;

I suppose I have an ambivalent attitude about professionalism because I think it can be constraining rather than simply being a kind of impetus towards qualitative work and existence.

Continuing this theme:

Participant C: Senior Lecturer, Language School, Female;

I think professionalism can be more narrowly construed and rigidly construed as actually an imposition and I suppose from a sort of managerial perspective, then there's an attempt to really concretise standards and values which perhaps in the past remained somewhat nebulous. But I don't think vagueness and nebulosity are in themselves something negative or to be decried.

Reflecting the growing recognition that notions of professionalism and what it means to be a professional are changing:

Participant C, further;

I'm not sure about this idea of being an expert in the field is as true today as it was twenty years ago and obviously there are lots of reasons why that is the case. Not least because we're educating rightly, in my view, a larger number of students now than in the past, but again there's this sort of tension between the sort of research end where if you like you are developing a niche, a research niche, and you're looking at something in more detail and the impetus to teach generally across a range of areas. So I think this idea of the expert perhaps is... I mean maybe that relates also to notions of professionalism because, in the past, people really were experts in the field. I'm not so sure they are to the same extent today.

There is a consensus that academic professionalism was an important concept, and could be defined as being a member of a body of people who share similar values:
Interviewee 3: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group, Female;
I think the pursuit of knowledge and not particularly wanting to achieve material things.... I suppose also to do with ones self-esteem and one's view of one's position in society, how you view yourself, how successful you are in your role of work and all that sort of thing.

Interviewee 7: Lecturer, post-1992, Male;
I think if universities stand for anything at all they really should be prepared to die in a ditch about the search for truth or something like that; about intellectual integrity, even if most of what we believe now turns out to be wrong in a hundred years time.

Interviewee 9: Senior Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
I look at the academic world as a sacred world. I think it has to be respected. It is, I believe, one of the fundamental building blocks of every society and being a member of that world is an honourable position. With teaching, the students learn from you. Doing research, you might come up with something that will be interesting. All of that – there's no way of quantifying it.

Interviewee 7: Lecturer, post-1992, Male;
Professionalism to me is very complicated. There is no proper, well established definition for that, for academics. We are a self-disciplined bunch of people. It's the discipline we put in – the organisation we put in. I think it's down to individuals really: preparing lectures on time, giving students feedback, making sure I'm available for the time that I would be available to them, attending meetings for the school and so on.

Interviewee 4: Senior Lecturer, post-1992, Female;
I think it's a case of knowing. I think even people who have become jaded, I suppose, even they would admit that it's about rigour. It's about being able to argue, it's about evidence-based. I think that sometimes the higher echelons of management lose sight of the fact that it's about rigour, it's about pushing the boundaries forward, it's about equipping young people, the next generation of maintainers of a community...I don't like to use the word society really. We have a responsibility I think to inculcate values that go beyond materialism.
Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group, Male;

I would say that in academia there is that set of common values, that shared value, that way of going about things, that way of doing things which isn't always very pleasant. It can be very political and very unpleasant indeed...

Academic professionalism was recognised as a social construct:

Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group, Male;

I think that professionalism is being constructed and performed in a position relative to managerialism. So it's not that we've always been professionals and suddenly we're faced with managerialism and we don't like it. It is that in response to managerialism one strategy of coping or defending both identities and material interests has been the adoption of a professional ethos and a professional identity.

Interviewee 5: Professor, post-1992, Male;

If you're talking about an academic education or an academic career, I think half of the academic input should be taken over by people from outside because by and large they relate better to students. They're better communicators and the strange thing about PhDs, who are supposed to be consummate academics, is that — generally speaking — they're bloody awful communicators and yet were trying to say the essence of good lecturing and good relationships with students is to be a good communicator.

Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group, Male;

I'm a member of huge professional networks. For example, from journals I have edited or societies that I'm a member of.. there is a huge network... all sorts of favours that are being traded by academics, including referees, references letters and so on. So, I would say, to the extent that I have a professional identity, it is equally shaped by external associations as by internal commitments.

Interviewee 8: Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;

Of course, at least as far as I'm concerned, it did make some noises when it started: oh we must get you involved in some of the strategic thinking of the
university but there’s no real sense in which the management of the university wants to engage with the professionalism that there is.

Interviewee 2: Professor, Russell Group, Male;
I think, certainly in my career as an academic, output measures have always been important to things like promotion, to getting other jobs — and whilst people didn’t necessarily feel managed in relation to their outputs on a month by month, year by year basis, certainly in relation to their career they were — they just didn’t notice it. Now they notice it rather more, but that has quite positive outcomes in many senses because that could help them to manage and build their own careers.

Interviewee 1: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group, Male;
I have to say I am impressed by how timid as a professional group we are in our engagements with the managers. Compared to other groups we are far too acquiescent and cooperative. In terms of values, I think that although we moan and groan a lot and gripe, we tow the line incredibly uncritically, for example the way that we have been sheparded into the RAE and now we embrace it — we run it...

When asked about the Higher Education Academy (which, it will be recalled, was established to ‘professionalise’ teaching and learning activities in higher education) respondents were, without exception, dismissive. One replied:

Interviewee 9, Senior Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
Sorry, what do you mean?

Another:

Interviewee 11, Professor, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
What is it? I don’t know.

Of those who had heard of it, the following was typical:

Interviewee 8, Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
I think I’m a member. Is it the thing that used to be the Institute of Learning and something or another? So, alright, I’ll give my two cents on that. I was told that
being a member would be coupled to promotion so I'd better join. So I did and er... I find it's a scam. I found it to be a completely useless organisation.

The quantitative survey investigated whether academics feel generally that there is a relationship between managerialism and professionalism, performance and autonomy. Correlations are moderately strong between commitment to continuing professional development (CPD) and involvement in decision-making and making a contribution respectively; and less strong between involvement in decision-making and making a contribution. All results are statistically significant, with $p < 0.05$.

Table 7.16 Correlations: elements of professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to CPD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in decisions</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a contribution to the field</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results are statistically significant in all cases, with $p<0.05$.

Feeling a sense of involvement and that one is making a contribution therefore, appear to be related to be committed to ongoing professional development, providing some indicators for academic-managers about staff management.

The next set of items explored perceptions of the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism:

Table 7.17 Descriptives: managerialism and professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academics are valued as much today as 5 yrs ago</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line management models enhance professionalism</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal management replaces trust</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New forms of accountability enhance professional status</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal performance management enhances performance</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite line management, academics have autonomy</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability &amp; autonomy go hand in hand</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statistics suggest that academics feel less valued today than in the past, and that there is little support for the proposition that formal line management models enhance academic professionalism. Overall there appears to be little enthusiasm for managerialism, supporting the proposition that it replaces trust in manager-academic relations. The view is shared across chartered and statutory institutions, with no significant differences in outlook.

ANOVA testing produced only one significant difference in opinions: rank-based differences concerning the relationship between accountability and professional status: $F(2,680) = 5.259, p = .005$. Independent t-tests indicate differences between all levels of staff; between senior staff and Lecturer B: $t(632) = -2.265, p = .024$; between senior staff and Lecturer A: $t(212) = -2.977, p = .003$; and between Lecturer B and Lecturer A: $t(512) = -1.966, p = .050$. Repeating the ANOVA test based upon number of years served as an academic revealed differences between groups on all items except 'academics have a lot of autonomy in their work' and 'mechanisms of accountability and autonomy go hand in hand' – there was agreement across groups on these items. A series of independent t-test across all other items revealed that, generally, those employed for fewer than 5 years are much more optimistic than those employed for 10 years or more. Those employed over 20 years appear to hold the most negative views about the items in table 7.17.

Exploring associations between variables, Pearson’s correlations produced the following:

Table 7.18 Correlations between components of managerialism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valued as much as in past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance professionalism</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line management replaces trust</td>
<td>-.363</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforces status</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances performance</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy retained</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability enhances autonomy</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results are statistically significant in all cases, with $p < 0.05$. 
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Table 7.18 indicates strong correlations between perceptions that line management mechanisms enhance the professionalism, the professional status and the professional performance of academic staff. Performance management, similarly, is perceived as related to reinforcing the professional status of academics. This is of some interest, as hitherto, the impression has been that academics are not particularly favourably on formal mechanisms of management.

In order to explore this further, the next obvious step is to employ regression analysis. In this case, however, $R^2$ emerged as $0.200$, indicating that the model accounts for only 20% of the overall variance, thus regression would be of little interest. This suggested that the issues under investigation were complex and that factor analysis would be a better tool to use to investigate what may be rather complex, inter-related issues of managerialism and academic professionalism.

Initial visual assessment of the correlation matrices indicated a reasonable degree of inter-item correlation. In addition, from the correlation matrices, the Bartlett test of Sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy index confirmed the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis. Given that the aim was to identify the minimum number of factors that would account for the maximum portion of the variance of the original items, principle component analysis was used (Nunnally, 1978) to reduce the number of factors where Eigenvalue $> 1$, and a cumulative percentage of variance explained $> 50\%$, were the criteria used in determining the number of factors to be extracted. Exploratory analysis was employed using principal components analysis involving three stages: production of matrices of correlation coefficients; extraction of factors from the matrices using the principle factor method; rotation of factors using the varimax method (in order to maintain independence among the mathematical factors). In relation to the correlation coefficient matrices, the intention was to link variables together into factors, hence for analysis and results to be meaningful variables must be related to each other. The first stage of analysis, therefore, was to eliminate from further analysis variables showing no substantial correlation with any others, i.e. with coefficients measuring $< 0.3$. Thereafter, results were checked for multicollinearity and singularity, since the former would indicate a condition where variables are very highly related and thus potentially measuring the same thing, whilst the latter would indicate (the unlikely event of) some variables being exact linear functions of others.
Factors were then extracted one at a time in order to generate good approximations to the correlations in the original correlation matrices. In relation to each matrix, at this stage the test indicates how many factors are necessary to achieve a reconstruction of the original matrix that is sufficiently good to account satisfactorily for the correlations that the matrix contains. Thereafter the factors were rotated, during which process the factor axes are rotated around the fixed origin until the loadings meet certain criteria, producing a 'rotated factor matrix'. This matrix aims to display a configuration of loadings in which most tests are loaded onto a minimum number of factors. There are various methods for doing this, however in aggregate the pursuit of a simple structure through statistical methods has been criticised for being rather vague and self-contradictory, statistical realities but psychological fictions. Mindful of these implied limitations, this study employs principal components analysis as an exploratory tool and as one of a battery of tests.

The summative table overleaf indicates the overall results of the factor analysis, showing the factor label, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (ideally above 0.6), the component labels, Eigenvalues and percentage of total variance explained by each component.
### Table 7.19 Factor analysis: managerialism and professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>K-M-O value</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Rotated Eigen-value</th>
<th>% of total variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>1: Active professionalism</td>
<td>Commitment to CPD</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>3.082</td>
<td>30.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution to knowledge</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active involvement in decisions</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: Accountability</td>
<td>Member of HEA</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>16.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Held accountable</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External validation</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerialism</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>1: Enhancing status</td>
<td>Reinforce prof status</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>40.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance performance</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance professionalism</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: Societal issues</td>
<td>Replace trust Academics valued</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>20.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results appear to confirm in part the results of the earlier, descriptive analysis as well as exposing some new issues. Regarding the professional identity of academics, the results indicate that respondents believe that 'active professionalism' is important, including involvement in ongoing professional development, making a contribution to knowledge and being actively involved in decisions that affect them. External accountability also emerges as an influential factor (although accounting for a relatively small, 16%, element of variance) – reflecting the proposition in the literature that accountability is an inherent element of professionalism.
Regarding managerialism, it is interesting to note that, despite some negativity expressed in the interviews and the quantitative survey, the factor analysis suggests it may play a role in maintaining academics' professional status. At a more personal level perhaps, the factor analysis also suggests that managerialism replaces trust between managers and staff. In aggregate, despite the less attractive aspects of managerialism identified in the literature (such as prescription and performance monitoring), academics appear not to feel unduly threatened.

The next step was to identify any differences between academics in chartered and statutory universities. Repeating the factor analysis initially only with respondents in chartered universities produced slightly different priorities; in relation to professionalism academics in statutory universities appear more concerned with pro-active involvement and networking than those in chartered – the latter being more oriented towards knowledge-building and sharing. In relation to managerialism staff in statutory universities appear generally more positive. They feel that they have a lot of autonomy, that academics are valued just as much now as five years ago, and that autonomy and accountability go hand in hand. It is likely that this outlook may be attributed, at least in part, to familiarity with line management models and no tradition of tenure. An independent samples t-test ascertained that the differences in perceptions according to institutional type are not statistically significant at a 95% confidence interval, with the exception of one item, 'being a member of the Higher Education Academy' where $t(475)=-3.404$, $p=.001$, with academics at statutory institutions being more positive towards it. With this exception, the results may be interpreted as sector-wide. Turning to rank, the only small, but statistically significant difference relate to making a contribution to knowledge, rated higher by senior staff [$F(2.684) = 4.083$, $p=.017$]. Independent t-tests indicate difference in perceptions between senior staff and Lecturer B: $t(637) = 2.895$. Rank-based factor analysis reveals few differences in perceptions, opinions or outlook. This is mildly surprising in light of the earlier finding relating to work being cascaded down and junior ranks being seen as carrying a heavy administrative burden and in a relatively weak bargaining position.

7.5 Higher Education Policy

Interviewees generally held negative views on government policy on higher education and whilst they appear to be willing to subject themselves to a new era of performativity
and measurement, it would be wrong to interpret this as implied agreement or approval of
the way the sector is evolving. The following are illustrative of the general view:

Interviewee 3: Senior Lecturer, Russell Group university, Female;
· I don’t like the trend towards open access and letting everybody have it and half
the population should go to university. I think it should be special. People are
different and different people need different kinds of education. When we see
students coming in here and really struggling I think whose interest it that in
really?

Interviewee 3, further;
I’m uncomfortable with the ‘one size fits all’ approach.

Interviewee 2, Professor, Russell Group university, Male;
I’m dubious about participation rate targets ... I think the funding of education
and the funding of research is moving towards a better basis than it was – it will
encourage universities to think about their activities on a sustainable basis. ...So
the basis is improving but there is no ability to expand or do more.

Interviewee 8, Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
I’m a bit worried actually. I don’t like this trend at all towards concentrating the
research in a few big sectors of excellence. I think that’s a big mistake – the
consequence would be that if you wanted to do, say, Physics, you would just have
to go to one of the half a dozen places in the country that would have a Physics
programme. ... It would certainly go against widening participation and more
than that it would decrease the number of people who could take an active role in
the field.

Interviewee 9, Senior Lecturer, 1994/ex-CATS, Male;
I look at the academic world as a sacred world.... I believe the academic world is
one of the fundamental building blocks of every society and being a member of
that world is an honourable position. ....... What I see, however, is it being
attacked politically to looking at it as a commercial entity, which I totally disagree
with.
In general there was little enthusiasm for the government’s policies of expansion, marketisation and commodification of higher education, as these were seen to be in conflict with intrinsic academic values of the search for truth, the pursuit of knowledge, education for its own sake and for the sake of advancing the human condition.

In sum, respondents display a high level of awareness and introspection about their professionalism. There appears to be a shared view of professionalism in cultural terms as being a member of a community, sharing beliefs, values and a code of conduct. Making a contribution to knowledge for the greater good appears to be important - one respondent even spoke of academia being ‘spiritual – but not in a religious sense’. There is a general feeling that the current move towards measured outcomes in some way devalue the profession by replacing intrinsic and intangible outcomes with those that could be defined and measured, echoing Nicholls’ (2001) view that intrinsic goods do not necessarily square with extrinsic goals and targets of the institutions. Additionally, there is an understanding of professionalism as a social construct, being brought into focus by the introduction of managerialism to universities, but certainly not exclusively defined in relative terms. On the other hand, there is a recognition that mechanisms of external accountability may be important in maintaining society’s trust in academics, enabling them to retain a relatively high level of autonomy. Finally, it is worth noting that the government’s attempt to ‘professionalise’ teaching and learning in the form of the Academy of Higher Education appears to have little impact. The HEA has negligible status as a professional institute - some participants have never heard of it, whilst those that have hold it in low esteem.

7.6 Attractiveness of Academia

Respondents agree generally that conditions in higher education are worsening (where 1 = ‘much worse’) for students ($\bar{x} = 2.44$, SD=1.338), staff ($\bar{x} = 2.55$, SD=1.302) and for society at large ($\bar{x} = 2.54$, SD = 1.381) over the last five year, again with no significant differences between institutions, gender or rank (where junior academics were in a position to answer). The results indicate that overall respondents still find an academic career reasonably attractive ($\bar{x} = 3.34$, SD=1.034), but less attractive (where 1 = ‘much less attractive’) than five years ago ($\bar{x} = 2.60$, SD=1.362), and there were no significant differences according to institutional type, gender or rank. One respondent commented:
Response 133: Teaching is a really important profession, so I would recommend it to my children, because of the satisfaction it can bring. My main objection resides in the conditions of service: far too many students per module; lousy facilities; no back up; the pretence that we keep up with research; the failure to provide adequate support; the reliance on our commitment to students to ensure that we do the work.

Response 138: In some sense it is very attractive - the autonomy, in particular. In the sense of feeling that your work is of value to society, I don't think it is very attractive at all.

Response 399: Despite being in academia for 14 years, I am still enjoying it. My belief is that the last five years has seen an invasion of pseudo-educationalists who think that education comes down to paperwork and procedures rather than the enthusiasm of staff.

Perhaps the following comment summarises the general view better than any other:

Response 25: The best experience all round is when academics are left to get on with it: the pay is not great, the status poor, the workload large, and the majority of academics are in a university to do a good job, and should be allowed to do so: this is the test of whether people are being treated as 'professionals'.

7.7 Conclusion

Overall, the responses indicate that participants in this empirical research consider themselves to have been affected adversely by the expansion of higher education and the introduction of managerial discourses to universities. The adverse effects are experienced in terms of heavy workloads, diminishing autonomy and increased prescription. There is pressure to produce high quality research within favoured areas which attract funding, teaching is more prescribed than in the past, and the burden of administration has mushroomed. Workload is perceived as heavy and increasing, with the effect felt most keenly in statutory universities. Administration is increasing most of all. Although it is acknowledged that administration might offer prestige, status and an alternative career path, in general the participants in this study express little interest in following this route. As such, administration is viewed in the main simply as an additional burden. One very noticeable outcome of the increased administrative load is a reduction in time available for research. This suggests that universities generally are not very adept at ensuring that
administration is done by administrators, leaving academics to their pedagogy (this despite the forthcoming RAE, which has focused many minds upon research, and the proliferation of new, non-academic management posts, designed to make universities more 'efficient'). As such, current developments appear to be following the route taken by the NHS.

Despite the increased administration, the participants in this research do not appear to feel that they are sinking under the weight. As proposed earlier in this thesis, they seem to react by rationalising the growing burden and developing coping strategies which allow them to find space in which to pursue research, protect their autonomy and remain optimistic about the future. There is little sense of allowing oneself to feel cowed. What appears to be important to participants is the ability to share knowledge with students, to continue to develop professionally and to have opportunities to network with peers. What emerges from this study is a generally negative view of expansion, commodification and managerialism. Simultaneously however, there is a recognition that the demands for accountability both in terms of quality and financial outturns are part of a broader trend that also affects other professions and occupations. A strong sense of independence is suggested, along with a sense of having retained autonomy (albeit in a somewhat diminished form) and an acceptance that some aspects of line management might have something positive to contribute to performance, both at the personal level and across the sector as a whole. Whilst recognising that managerialism replaces trust-based relations between management and staff with formal lines of accountability, participants seem generally non-plussed about the impact on their daily working lives. The impact of management is felt most strongly with regard to allocating workload and making staff feel that their views matter (or not, as the case may be).

In addition, the responses suggest some recognition that managerialism in universities might actually reassure the public about the accountability of staff, serving to enhance the professional status of academics in society. This supports the initial proposition in this thesis that academic staff, far from becoming stressed and disenchanted by the impact of management upon their daily life, are making sense of and adapting to the changing environment and that, notwithstanding formal line management, academics retain a strong sense of professional identity. Another initial proposition was that the definition of academic professionalism may well be evolving, and, although this study did not explore in depth the characteristics of this evolution, it is interesting to note that one of the
fundamental characteristics of academic professionalism identified by academics themselves was a commitment to ongoing professional development. We must conclude, therefore, that academic staff are highly reflective, have a need to self-actualise and high levels of intrinsic motivation. Despite the constraints that accompany formal management, participants are relatively unconcerned about its impact on their daily lives. Their professional interest lies in sharing knowledge with students, networking with peers and making a contribution to the body of knowledge in their chosen field.

In general, participants seem to be adapting to changing conditions. Given the level of cultural capital within academia this may not be particularly surprising, but contrasts with some of the literature. Overall, there is little sign that individuals consciously develop strategies to enable them to cope better with heavy workloads or conflicting priorities. This suggests in turn that the process of rationalisation and sensemaking may in itself be a type of coping strategy.

The responses indicate that manager-academics are not rated particularly well; the perception is that they are not particularly effective or supportive. The allocation of work seems to influence perceptions of management supportiveness, followed by being made to feel that one's views matter. Overall, there is evidence that the process of rationalisation occurs in relation to trends in society as a whole, rather than just in the academy. Increased accountability is seen as 'a sign of the times' and regarded as possibly even playing a role in reassuring the public of the probity of the academic profession and maintaining the status of academics in society. Perceptions and opinions vary only slightly according to institutional type, suggesting a growing consensus across the sector concerning the phenomena under investigation. In addition, the responses suggest a strong sense of altruism and an ongoing commitment to students – signs that professionalism is alive and well in academia, despite an increasingly challenging working environment.

The next chapter examines the responses in detail in relation to each of the research propositions, and provides a discussion and analysis of both the responses and the literature.
Chapter 8
Discussion and Analysis

8.0 Introduction

This research set out to investigate the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism. Clearly, as the literature review indicates, managerialism is an outcome of neoliberal discourses which promote a market and commodity-driven approach to higher education. In reviewing the literature the difficulty of disentangling and isolating managerialism from other neoliberal effects such as sector expansion, funding cuts, and quasi-market conditions became apparent. Since managerialism is ideological as well as technical, it is a diffuse and difficult concept to measure accurately. The challenge was to isolate managerialism as an independent variable, and it is therefore essential to specify exactly how managerialism is operationalised in this research. In order to distinguish managerialism from other influences, drawing upon the literature, a variable was composed consisting of two constructs; 'accountability and control' and 'management supportiveness'. These constructs are concerned strictly with the operation of managerial discourses in universities and make it possible to distinguish managerialism from other variables.

In analysing the data the starting point was to refer back to the research question. Looking at the literature, the outcome of the focus group, interviews and online questionnaire there is a strong sense that, despite increasingly intrusive mechanisms of accountability and heavier workloads, academics remain committed to the concept of academic professionalism. One interpretation of this could be that the academic profession is powerful enough to maintain its position in relation to its employers (universities and the State) and society. Conversely, it may be interpreted as symptomatic of a profession that lacks the wherewithal to evolve and so weakened by turmoil that it is simply clinging tenaciously to the last vestiges of autonomy and self-determination. Alternatively, professionalism may be regarded as a form of contemporary governance in which there is an individual internalisation of the functions and responsibilities previously ascribed to professional communities. In relation to the latter, a Foucauldian interpretation would be that what has been described hitherto as ‘coping strategy’ is in reality a process of continuous learning and rationalisation which leads the individual to employ in relation
to him(her)self a range of techniques related to risk management and self-motivation – in other words, bringing the ‘disciplined self’ into being. Following Bourdieu, one might interpret this self-regulation as a manifestation of a state of domination in which academics have to come to terms with a radically reshaped habitus dominated increasingly pervasively by external forces. Yet, such an interpretation implies a level of subjugation that is not supported by the findings of this empirical study (this would not trouble Bourdieu, of course, who would argue that an inability to recognise the degree of dominance is one of the features of being in such a state). From a pluralist, Foucauldian perspective, academics are not necessarily in a state of domination at all – rather, what we are witnessing is a reconstitution of relations between the State, universities and academics that the last-named are having to come to terms with. For Foucault, this is simply a movement from governance to governmentality, where the latter stresses self-regulation and self-management, developing in conjunction with regulatory mechanisms that govern at a distance through explicit standards that individuals are supposed to attain (Fournier, 1999; Amoore, 2004).

Interpretation is clearly all-important and, as such, must not simply be left to subjective ‘gut feeling’ on the part of the researcher, but contained within the ontological framework of the study – in this case grounded in Argyris and Schön’s (1974) ‘theory in use’, encompassing individuals’ espoused theory of action. The interpretation will be shaped by the opinions, views, feelings and beliefs expressed by the participants in this research, whether this be as a member of the focus group, an interviewee or a respondent to the online survey. One of the key purposes of this chapter is to shed light on how individuals preserve their professional identity as they negotiate and make their way through the complex systems of governmentality in the modern university. In the remainder of the chapter the research propositions will be discussed in turn. This will be followed by a general discussion of the responses and an analysis of their significance and implications.
8.1 Research Propositions

This section discusses the responses in the empirical study in relation to the research propositions explored in the research model.

Propositions 1, 2 and 3:

Academics perceive workloads to be heavy and increasing rapidly, impacting upon their:

- Performance (proposition 1)
- Freedom in research (proposition 2)
- Autonomy (proposition 3)

The results of the empirical study indicate that, as the literature suggests (Nixon, 2001a, 2001b; Trowler, 1998; Ramsden, 1998), workloads have risen dramatically. This is a function of the expansion of higher education combined with the drive for greater productivity (doing more for less) introduced in the 1980s which saw year-on-year productivity gains built into the funding mechanism. Staff-student ratios (SSRs) increased rapidly during this decade and have continued to do so. The initial saturation of the qualitative data indicates strong feelings about workload, particularly the perceived growth in administration and consequent difficulties in finding time for research. These views reflect the Dearing Report No. 3 (1997), but in contrast to Dearing individuals at all ranks expressed these views – in fact, the data suggest that those of more senior rank experience less difficulty than others in finding time for research. Analysis of the quantitative data further reflected these views. It is interesting that the Dearing Report No. 3 (1997) also indicated a squeeze on research time and ten years on little appears to have changed - despite the upbeat annual report from the HERRG (2006) stating that bureaucracy has decreased by 35% compared to 1 year ago. Frustration over workload may well be related to feelings of proletarianisation in that the primary task of intellectual enquiry is felt to be restricted by secondary tasks which are considered less stimulating, more standardised and, in some cases, repetitive and mundane.

The quantitative data indicate that academics working in statutory universities perceive their loads to be heavier than those in chartered institutions. Whilst this may well simply be a matter of perception, it is not unthinkable that it may also be due to the tradition of
relatively large classes and heavy loads in what used to be the polytechnics. It may be that class sizes in statutory universities have generally been larger than chartered such that as the sector continues to expand the former are now reaching breaking point. It is interesting that this echoes the Dearing Report No. 3 (1997) which noted that academics in statutory universities were more likely to comment unfavourably on SSRs than their colleagues in chartered universities. This hints that academics in statutory universities may be affected by the spectre of proletarianisation more than their colleagues in chartered. Heavy loads mean less time for intellectual enquiry, less research and theory-building and more utilitarian technical practice, resulting in what might be described as semi-professional conditions. At the same time, it should be noted that in the interviews all participants complained of heavy workloads and conflicting priorities, whether from chartered or statutory universities,

Whilst workloads are perceived to have increased to the point of being difficult to deal with, two main effects are identified that suggest that two different frameworks are being used; teaching and marking is seen to impact most at the day to day level, affecting overall performance whilst administration is seen to squeeze research. Regarding teaching and learning, respondents feel that these have increased to such a level that overall performance is now being affected. The interviews reveal great frustration over administration but little negativity regarding teaching and learning, once again indicating that increased workload is tolerated if it relates to primary functions, but less so if it concerns secondary. Increasing bureaucracy is considered secondary and as such threatens to increase proletarianisation and diminish professionalism. Both the qualitative and quantitative data indicate that administration has increased to such a level that it is difficult to find time for research. It is interesting to note that in 1997 the Dearing Report No. 3 also indicated that academics would like to spend less time on administration and more time on research, indicating once again that there has been little improvement and no change of view during the last ten years. In academics’ minds administration seems to be related to research time. Overall, in relation to research proposition 1 the empirical study suggests that academics do indeed perceive workloads to be heavy and increasing and that perceived impacts upon performance and research time are moderately strong.

In relation to proposition 2, freedom in research, heavy and increasing workload is seen to take its toll. Within this, again echoing the Dearing Report No. 3 (1997), it is the increasing weight of administration that is cited as most burdensome. Increasing
administration is related to demands for greater accountability in the form of a requirement to keep records of decisions and actions. The Carnegie Foundation Report (1994) noted that relationships between faculty and administration are only fair or poor and that this seemed to be related to perceptions of being asked to do more for less. Again, it is likely that academics see this as a form of proletarianisation in the form of demands for increased productivity. It may also be that academics are reacting to the switch to external, bureaucratic modes of control which parallels the growing lack of respect for those claiming to have knowledge and expertise and an increasing propensity to challenge experts. For Barnett (1997: 152) in the modern world, 'to claim epistemological superiority just because one knows something is to exhibit hubris of the most embarrassing kind.' Nowadays, students are more likely than in the past to query the expertise of their lecturers, challenge their results and blame the institution or lecturers rather than themselves for failure. Externally-driven accountability might be a good thing from the government’s perspective in terms of control and from a consumerist perspective in terms of ensuring value for money, however it does seem to be adding to the administrative burden of academic staff. Overall, respondents complain of less time for pedagogy and research, less time with students, lower student satisfaction, and less flexibility in the system. These views echo those expressed by academics who participated in the Carnegie Foundation study (1992-93), so again there seems to have been little improvement over the years. Ironically, despite an ambition to improve quality and the efforts of the HERRG to reduce bureaucracy whilst increasing accountability, universities’ bureaucratic administrative processes are perceived by many respondents to be so cumbersome as to have little effect on quality. For participants in this research, the main impact of heavier administrative loads is less time for research. It is of some interest that the impact of heavier workload is described in terms of stifling research rather than impacting markedly upon overall performance. This suggests that faculty could be working longer or harder to find time for research rather than allowing performance to deteriorate under heavy workloads.

It is, of course, interesting to contemplate the underpinnings of this position. In relation to theories of mental mapping and sensemaking, what we may be witnessing here is committed interpretation in which the sensemaker binds him or herself to his or her behaviour. The majority of respondents feel pressurised, have heavier workloads and work longer hours than in the past. The belief that their overall performance has not declined significantly may be symptomatic of making sense of a situation by committing
oneself to maintaining the belief that one is coping – a necessary step in actually coping with a deteriorating situation. Similar responses were recorded in the Carnegie Foundation Report (1994), where participants claimed that their performance was affected only slightly by workload.

In addition, Barnett’s (1997) text, *Higher Education: A Critical Business*, explores the role of the academic in modern society arguing, amongst other things, that nowadays the academic secures his or her living through being able to demonstrate a societal value. Academics have to produce value – and be seen to be producing it. It may be that, in asserting that heavier workloads affect performance only moderately respondents are subconsciously justifying their value; to their subject, the university, society and to themselves. Alternatively, or possibly additionally, they may also (again, perhaps subconsciously) be protecting their self-identity as professionals in an intensely individualistic environment in which one’s personal reputation and prestige are all-important. Regardless of which of these possible interpretations is most accurate, from a Foucauldian perspective what we have here is symptomatic of a ‘practice of the self’ in which the individual employs a particular strategy to self-manage, consciously selecting a position from the range of subject positions available which enables him or her to manage the changing relationship between themselves and the structures and rules which govern their working environment. Believing that one is continuing to perform well may be an essential element of this. It may also be symptomatic of what Henkel (2000) describes as a process of accommodation, which may either be a form of accommodating change within existing frameworks or being accommodating to it.

As intimated earlier, the growth in administration is understandable, given government demands for increased accountability. However, it is of some concern that bureaucracy is increasing as a result of a discourse aimed at its reduction in the name of improved flexibility and responsiveness. Somewhat ironically, running universities along the lines of businesses seems to increase the burden of administration, since many universities have emulated the NHS and ‘professionalised’ administration - that is to say have recruited professional administrators to newly created posts to provide support for academic functions. In theory, this offers two key benefits; it allows academics to concentrate on pedagogy, and improves the efficacy and quality of administration. The current findings suggest, however, that despite universities now employing a larger complement of administrators, with expenditure on administration typically running at
some 30% of that allocated to academic activities (Casu and Thanassoulis, 2006), the off-loading effect is negligible. (It may even hint that as the complement of administrators grows, so does the volume of administration).

In addition, there is some indication that simultaneous demands for more and better research and pressure on staff to secure research funding appear to be creating further tension. Stemming from the government's desire to maintain a competitive process of evaluation, distribute research monies selectively, preserve research excellence, encourage research talent (see Tapper, 2003) academic staff are under constant pressure to perform. In 1997 the Dearing Report No. 3 recorded that lack of time was the greatest obstacle to research. (Incredibly) over half of those interviewed always conducted research in their own time – and this was especially true for those employed in statutory universities. The current research indicates that academics employed in statutory universities have more difficulty than those in chartered institutions in finding time for research, although there is no suggestion that participants in this research always conduct research in their own time.

Another noticeable pattern in the responses is the cascading of teaching and administration down through the ranks to junior staff. In this study junior staff express greater concern about workloads than their more senior colleagues. Finally, female academics also perceive greater difficulties in finding time for research than males. This may interpreted in two ways; there may well be some inequality of treatment (see West and Lyon, 1995), or it may be that females, tending to have the greater share of household and family duties, have less opportunity than their male colleagues to conduct research in their own time. Both interpretations assume that perceptions accurately reflect reality whilst, of course, it may simply be that there exist perceptual differences between males and females. It is important to recall that right at the beginning of this thesis we noted that what is being measured here are 'theories in use', thus we can only note here that females perceive greater difficulties in finding time for research than males. Further illumination and analysis of these perceptual differences requires further research. At this juncture it may be noted that there is evidence of stress and frustration resulting from high workloads and pressure to attract research funding. In respondents' minds this relates directly to increasing difficulties not only in finding time for research, but in being able to conduct research projects according to their priorities. Overall, research proposition 2 is supported by the empirical study.
In sum, the responses being explored in propositions 1 and 2 far suggest four things: firstly, that the total weight of workload is problematic. Increased teaching and marking is seen to affect overall performance, whilst administration in particular is seen to affect research. This suggests that academics are using two different frameworks to evaluate workloads; perhaps (and this is speculation) one relates to the immediacy of their everyday work (classes have to be taught at certain times) and the other relates to less immediate tasks (administration tends to be fitted in around more immediate teaching and learning activities) – there is, after all, no obvious reason why the outcome of larger classes should be perceived in terms of a decline in overall performance whilst more administration is seen to squeeze research time, rather than vice versa. Secondly, that there has been no wholesale change of assessment methods despite ever-larger cohorts. This in turn suggests either intransigence or a conscious decision to stick to established methods of assessment – the latter may be a sign of normative professionalism, since both the literature and the data from this study indicate a strong sense of duty and accountability towards students. Academics appear to be working longer hours now than in the past – and these extra hours appear to be devoted to research. Thirdly, research time is being squeezed by increasing administration, leading to a sense of frustration. There appears to be a great deal of mental mapping and sensemaking going on, with individuals employing practices of the self in order to make sense of the ongoing changes and to rationalise their own responses and positioning. Fourthly, and finally, despite the introduction of managerialism to universities, workloads are not being managed well. Academics are feeling the pressure of with increased workloads, suggesting poor departmental management and further, that manager-academics need to be much more proactive in finding ways of coping with the increasing administration and the larger cohorts. The strength of feeling regarding a worsening of conditions over the last five years supports this conclusion.

Turning to proposition 3, again echoing the Dearing Report No. 3 (1997), respondents indicate that autonomy is affected by heavy workloads, worsening SSRs, and increasingly heavy administrative burdens. They complain also of increased prescription in teaching and research, inequitable distribution of teaching loads, and pressure to apply for funding. Academic work is seen to be more constrained than in the past, making it difficult to retain autonomy. The focus group, interviews and quantitative survey all suggest that respondents consider it important to retain autonomy and control over work. Respondents complain that teaching is now more prescribed than in the past as a result of QA
procedures, evolution of e-learning and organisational decisions based more on coping with large cohorts than with pedagogy. Prescription is perceived as more irritating and impacting more on professional identity than formal line management.

Naidoo (in Barnett, 2005) explores this in her analysis of the outcomes of marketisation, observing that universities are now more market-led than ever before, and that the result of this is a shift (using Power's 1999 terminology) from 'first-order' to 'second order' functions – that is to say, away from the development of innovative, high-quality academic programmes to a preoccupation with documentation, measurement and accounting for academic activities in order to comply with consumerist narratives. There is evidence, both in the current study and in the Carnegie Foundation Report (1994) of increasing prescription and feelings of losing control. (The Carnegie Foundation Report noted that female faculty in particular are unhappy about their lack of control). The literature (Lyotard, 1984; Barnett, 1997; Marginson, 1997; Codd, 1999; Peters and Olsson, 2005) also indicates increasing prescription under a broad umbrella of 'improvement' relating to academic standards, teaching quality and the use value of academic research. In Marginson's (1997) view, there is a 're-norming' and 're-grounding' afoot in which intrinsic, intangible values are jettisoned in favour of entrepreneurial frameworks, grounded in market and consumerist ideologies. This is symptomatic of a broader trend, observable across other public and professional domains, which in Clark and Newman's (1997) analysis, in essence is concerned with the co-option of professional terrains by the state. Managerialism is employed as the instrument of intervention; having started with a relatively narrow focus of efficiency, under the broader and more nebulous 'quality' label, it has now pervaded areas previously controlled by 'closed' groups (such as professions and bureaucrats), producing 'new focal points of resistance, compromise and accommodation' (1997:76), constraining autonomy and introducing prescription across both the curriculum and research.

That stated, it is important here not to over-emphasise the negatives and present a one-sided, doom-laden view. Throughout the empirical research there is a view that, although autonomy may be diminishing, it is still relatively high in academia. Echoing Henkel's (2000) study, it is interesting that 84% of respondents cite autonomy as 'important' or 'very important' to their professional identity; and, despite the argument presented above that much of the additional work imposes constraints, 56% agree or strongly agree that academics have a lot of autonomy in their work (whilst 20.5% disagree or strongly
disagree). In terms of sense-making the findings of this empirical study suggest that provided staff feel that they have a reasonable level of autonomy, heavy workloads may be accommodated.

In sum, participants in this research acknowledge that workloads are increasing and that heavier workloads and greater prescription threaten both autonomy and research time. Perhaps this is tolerated because conditions for academics are perceived as no worse (and in many ways better) than for other professional groups, and certainly better than many other occupations. Administration may, of course, be perceived to be burdensome because it is seen as an essential, but not particularly enjoyable or creative part of academia — certainly not one of the key reasons for deciding to become an academic. Academics, quite naturally, want to teach and research so perhaps it is natural that they resent spending time on administration. That stated, the responses indicate that administration is seen to provide an alternative career track to the more traditional scholarship (first identified by Deem, 1998). Respondents intimate that taking on administrative tasks could offer status and promotion within the university. They do not appear particularly interested in this route however; on the contrary the data indicate a strong commitment to scholarship. It appears that the old values of higher education (identified by Henkel, 2000; Trowler, 2001; Jary and Parker, 1999; Deem, 1998; Kogan, 2000, and others) are still strongly held by academics.

In aggregate, heavier workloads are seen to threaten autonomy because the nature of the additional load reduces flexibility; administrative and marking tasks have deadlines whilst teaching has to be delivered when and where timetabled. This reduces the ability of individuals to prioritise their work or work from home. In Foucauldian terms the scenario might be interpreted as one of subjectivization in which autonomy is constrained not directly by coercion, but indirectly due to heavier workloads. An individual’s attendance and work patterns can be influenced, for example, through the allocation of teaching and administrative duties and timetabling classes over consecutive days. Similarly, the nature of some administrative tasks may require specific outputs such that certain tasks must be prioritised. By employing indirect mechanisms of compliance, managers can effectively (and relatively non-controversially) constrain academic autonomy. In this sense heavy workloads may constrain the spaces in which freedoms and autonomy can be exercised, essentially reshaping power relations between managers and staff — ‘governing without governing’ (Olssen, 2001: 16). Overall, respondents do feel that autonomy is threatened,
but acknowledge that they still have a reasonable level, albeit slightly diminished in comparison to the past and other professions. The feeling that autonomy is alive and well, despite increasing prescription and didactic managerialism echoes Gidden’s theory of structuration in that as well as complying with dominant discourses participants are instrumental in shaping and maintaining them – managerialism is sustained because actors sustain it. Overall, proposition 3 is largely supported by the empirical study, however there are signs that academics feel that they may in some way defend their autonomy by finding (and protecting) ‘autonomous niches’.

Propositions 4 and 5:

Academics’ perceptions of managerialism are constructed in terms of:

• Accountability and control
• Management supportiveness

It is proposed that managerialism has a significant impact upon academics’ daily working lives, in that mechanisms of accountability are perceived as invasive (proposition 4) and manager-academics are perceived as unsupportive (proposition 5).

In relation to proposition 4, respondents certainly recognise that managerialism invokes new ways of ‘acting out’ the academic role. There is little direct conflict however; respondents who perceive conflict appear to react not only cognitively but behaviourally, pushing boundaries to retain autonomy and thereby echoing Marginson and Considine’s (2000) observation that overly prescriptive systems of accountability somewhat paradoxically may actually reinforce collegial conservatism. Generally, respondents are negatively disposed towards managerialism. It is seen to have introduced new modes of accountability which have increased bureaucracy in universities. To many of the participants in this research, QA processes with their ‘tick box’ mentality eat into research time but appear to have little impact on quality.

At the same time, in the current research external accountability is seen as positive in terms of maintaining academics’ position in society. According to the Carnegie Foundation Report (1994) academics in England did not think that academics were influential in society and felt that respect for academics was declining. If this still the case then the positive attitude towards external accountability becomes more understandable. Overall, the current study suggests that, provided managerialism does not impose
bureaucratic burdens which are impossible to bear, academics are prepared to accommodate a shift from internal to external modes of accountability. There is some suggestion in the responses that academics may have become rational actors, aware that calls for greater accountability are endemic across society, but not yet reformed sufficiently to 'follow new initiatives directly and unambiguously' (Clarke and Newman, 1997: 85). From a Foucauldian perspective this is of some interest since it suggests that academic staff willingly contribute to managerialist discourses and in doing so not only sustain, but reinforce them. This highlights (once again) the fluidity of relations between the state, universities, academics, students and society at large. Much of the literature approaches accountability in academia in terms of principals and agents, winners and losers. In contrast, pursuing a Foucauldian epistemology accountability may be conceptualised as a component of governmentality, the latter being a dynamic concept that changes over time in response to evolving political discourses. From this perspective, accountability is something inherently more subtle and complex than much of the extant literature suggests. Henkel's (2000) study suggests that senior academics recognise that external political agendas 'professionalise' academia by formalising the development of the specialist knowledge and skills required by recruits to the academy. Mechanisms of accountability may be viewed as part of this formal structuring of relations within professional groups and between the professions and society. The empirical research reported here supports this approach, as the factor analysis illustrates.

There is a growing body of literature that recognises the complexity of inter-relations between the state, universities and academics. Barnett's 1990 text, The Idea of Higher Education, provides a detailed exploration of the position of universities in society and their relations with the state, students and society at large. In Barnett's (1990) view, much of the analysis of higher education is overly dichotomous, and the commonly-utilised 'us' and 'them' approach is simply not up to the task. For Barnett, modern narratives which question the very foundations of the traditional university (such as knowledge, authority and expertise) mean that higher education now needs to be conceptualised as something 'in the world' and 'of the world', something emancipatory – for students and staff alike. Seen in this light, perhaps the participants in this current research already look beyond the immediacy of their own, narrow environment to the discourses at large in society. They appear frustrated about externally-imposed mechanisms of accountability, however frustration seems directed more at the mindlessness of the 'tick-box' mentality rather than the idea of being called to account; in other words, it is not being called to account, per
se, that causes frustration, but the way in which accountability is operationalised in universities. What we should be concerned with are the techniques which bring to life external accountability, and how these are acted out in context. Quality assurance processes may be, for example, ‘practices in which participants engage freely as part of the process of producing themselves as subjects of a certain kind’ (Peters, 2001: 78).

Similarly, external systems of accountability are part of the process of acting out a certain type of free market governance – after all, it is not only academics who are being called to account. In this empirical study, respondents do appear to recognise that the boundaries of accountability go beyond the university. As such, whilst being relatively supportive of the concept of accountability, they do appear to consider overly-bureaucratic implementation an anathema to ‘traditional’ academic life (whatever that may be), and in some cases express great frustration over some of the apparently heavily bureaucratic and self-serving QA processes introduced to universities in recent years.

In Olssen’s (2001: 17) words ‘agency is concerned with how to extract compliance from a voluntary exchange relationship based upon dependency’, thus the general acceptance of mechanisms of accountability may spring from a recognition of mutuality – echoing Shumar’s (1995) view that academics are implicated in the systematic working out of managerialism - it works because academics make it work. In addition, the nature of agency provides an incentive for the agent to exploit the situation to his advantage, which may be, for example, achieved by masking actions or withholding information. Thus, it may be that participants are simply adept at such exploitation, to the extent that mechanisms of accountability are not considered intolerably intrusive. Alternatively it may be that in the Foucauldian tradition, they have assumed responsibility for the constraints to which they are subjected. Foucault’s view is that those subjected to a field of visibility, and who know it, assume responsibility for the constraints of power and become the principal of their own subjection – in a way internalising the mechanisms of accountability to such a degree that they are unaware that they are doing so. That stated, however, this study elicited a fair number of negative comments about the effectiveness of audit, with a number of interviewees expressing doubt about whether quality assurance, as implemented, was more concerned with ticking boxes than assuring quality. One is left with the feeling – unsubstantiated at this stage- that if academic staff appear compliant in the face of marketisation, massification and ever-greater workloads, this may be more to do with self-awareness, self-actualisation and a hunger to make a worthwhile contribution to their field than an effort to please managers.
At the same time, it is important to recognise that academics' compliance and willingness to go along with mechanisms of accountability may ultimately harm the quality of their output if such mechanisms continue to expand. Governments tend to conceptualise universities in organisational rather than institutional terms, possibly underplaying obvious dualities of purpose as well as the unique nature of the 'product'. This can easily lead to over-simplified conceptualisation of the issues and a failure to accommodate the complexity of academia which could in turn lead to a diminished community in which academic values are squeezed under the increasing burden of 'hard' managerialism. Echoing Henkel (2000), it is proposed here that academics need to exercise their influence and create substantial long-term change in the way that they are regulated.

Overall it may be concluded that whilst research proposition 4 is supported (in that respondents perceive systems of accountability as invasive), there is an acceptance of the principle of accountability. The factor analysis suggest that respondents recognise the role played by mechanisms of public accountability in maintaining their status within society. They appear to appreciate that externally-driven systems of accountability and audit, though tiresome, may be antecedents of retaining a relatively high level of autonomy. Consequently, there is little sign of any uprising, or refusal to participate in QAA audits, or other mechanisms of performance monitoring within the university.

Turning to proposition 5, in general, academics seem relatively relaxed about the introduction of line management models to universities. Whilst there is a widely-held perception that collegiality is being replaced by more overt line-management, and the response to this is vaguely negative, respondents are generally ambivalent about their departmental managers across a spectrum of measures. There is general disagreement with the principle of applying managerial discourses to universities, but, in contrast to Bottery’s (1992) and Ramsden’s (1998) prediction of inevitable conflict, this does not necessarily manifest itself in animosity towards manager-academics (at least at departmental level). The lack of outright animosity is possibly due to strong feelings about heavy workloads and government policy - it is these rather than departmental managers that appear to threaten autonomy. Additionally, feeling trusted by manager-academics may also be influential (although the apparent trust may be a function of manager-academics taking a 'hands-off' approach due to a lack of confidence in socially-based management skills, or a preoccupation with strategy development and audit, and so
The academic profession shares with other professions a lack of direct, day to day management, and this appears to be reflected in academics’ responses to manager-academics. In aggregate, respondents’ opinions about manager-academics suggest a high level of intrinsic motivation and self-direction.

Only 45% of respondents rate their departmental managers as ‘supportive’ or ‘very supportive’ in facilitating autonomy and the responses reflect a wide variety of experience. Two managerial tasks emerge as important to academics; equity of work allocation, and the extent to which managers made staff feel that their views matter. In relation to the former, experiences are mixed. Statistical analysis indicates a strong relationship between being allocated a reasonable workload and feeling supported. Some staff speak highly of their departmental managers, indicating an appreciation where attempts were made to allocate work fairly and transparently, whilst others suggest that managers lack the necessary skills to manage a department appropriately. Regarding the ability to make staff feel that their views matter, experiences are generally rather less positive – in the majority of cases staff do not feel that manager-academics are interested in their views.

Whilst transparency and equity are covered extensively in the trust literature (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003; 2004; Tyler, 2003) these issues are not highlighted extensively in the growing body of literature on academic leadership. In relation to equity this may perhaps be due to the nature of academics, their intense individualism and natural tendency to argue and engage in debate – within any one department it may simply be impossible reach consensus on whether workloads are equitable or not. Yet, as Trow (1994) points out, business mechanisms may create alienation – it would thus appear imperative to ensure that those that exist are designed and applied openly and fairly. Possessing a high level of cultural capital, academics are not to be fooled by mechanisms of apparent equity that mask patronage and prejudice. Failing to create transparent and equitable mechanisms risks not only alienation but an upsurge in self-interest. It is posited here that the values, beliefs and norms of academia could not survive under these conditions, grounded as they in community, collegiality, the trading of favours and goodwill.

Overall, there is a sense that managerial discourses have been introduced to universities to make individuals and departments more accountable to the university and society at large, rather than to make individuals more accountable to departmental manager-academics.
Focusing upon organisational structure and line management, managerialism injects an apparent rationality into what is inherently complex and in many ways irrational. It is noticeable, however, that bureaucracy dilutes accountability — the system can always be blamed. Respondents comment that managers and administrators seem very busy, but they (academics) are affected directly only when work is passed on to them without warning or with unrealistic deadlines (to fit in with administrative deadline, for example). Manager-academics are not regarded as supportive, but this does not seem to engender any strong feelings of animosity, indicating self-reliance and relative autonomy. Poor manager-academics seem to be tolerated, provide academics are left alone. They are willing to give an account of their actions, but this may be a way of protecting autonomous niches — this may not be regarded as exactly subversive, but certainly protectionist — what Henkel (2000) terms ‘constructive ambiguity’. The empirical study does not, therefore, support proposition 5.

Propositions 6 and 7:

Research propositions 6 and 7 state:

As a result, academics perceive a gradual worsening of performance, loss of freedom in research, diminishing accountability, increasing autonomy and low management supportiveness. In response, they are consciously developing coping strategies to enable them to protect their ‘private, autonomous space’ (proposition 6). It is proposed further that these coping strategies include a high degree of instrumentality (proposition 7).

The responses throw up some interesting issues relating to cognition, affective responses and behaviours. Respondents appear to have little trouble in rationalising their situation, relating it to the external environment in terms of government policy and to their own working conditions. Affective responses are consistent with this rationalisation, that is to say, where attributions are generally negative, so are the affective responses, and vice versa. Of interest to this research is the extent to which the process of rationalisation is in itself a type of coping strategy. The research instrument was designed to elicit information about behavioural responses, but in analysing the responses it has become apparent that this is somewhat naïve — the majority of respondents admit to the relatively unsophisticated coping strategy of working harder or longer hours than before. This is the behavioural response, however before this stage is reached they have possibly managed to
rationalise their situation not only in terms of their position within the department, faculty or university, but also in relation to the changing role and position of both universities and the professions in society. As an outcome of this line of analysis, it is proposed here that the research model be modified such that 'coping strategies' are labelled not simply as 'behavioural', but as 'cognitive or behavioural'. Since academics rely too heavily upon cognition in their daily work (and lives), it would be rather simplistic to look only at coping strategies which can be measured in terms of behaviour.

Overall, there is a real sense of frustration, however little sign of feeling cowed. At the same time, the current study suggest that some faculty experience high levels of stress. It is of interest that the Dearing Report No. 3 (1997) found that over a quarter of academics expected to leave higher education before retirement age. This was particularly true of younger staff and research staff. Reasons cited were high stress levels, poor pay, job insecurity and the lack of a promising career path (or possibly a combination of factors). In contrast, the current research suggests that although academics may be feeling stressed, the focus of the stress revolves around larger cohorts, administrative bureaucracy and insufficient time for research. At the same time, it is likely that having an internal locus of control and a high level of self-preservation enables academics to remain relatively upbeat and committed to their profession. In this, the current findings echo the Carnegie Foundation Report (1994) in which faculty were said to be resilient and determined, focusing on the core functions of higher education. Despite worsening conditions, they were not found to be demoralised. A good atmosphere, good relationships with colleagues and confidence in the intrinsic value of what they do means that overall participants in the Carnegie Foundation study were generally satisfied and did not regret their career choice. It is encouraging that the findings of the current study indicate similar resilience.

There is some suggestion that respondents do adopt coping strategies, however these may either be cognitive or behavioural. Echoing Olssen (2002) and Trowler (1998), there is a suggestion of coping strategies enabling roles to be acted out in order to please management whilst subversively protecting reflective spaces within which to engage in disinterested academic enquiry. The approach is pragmatic, supporting Barry et al's (2001) position that if managerialist values are considered disingenuous or inappropriate, they will simply be ameliorated and worked around with a high degree of pragmatism. Weick's (2001) theory of sensemaking is apparent, with participants rationalising and justifying their working environment. It may be that Gabriel's (1999) suggestion that
organisational controls are not only restricting individuals’ movements but also moulding his/her sense of identity is overly pessimistic — on the contrary, the views expressed here suggest that, in the Foucauldian tradition (1980; 1982), actors are engaged in various forms of resistance, perpetuated by the discourse itself — a resistance that is implicitly accommodated within the organisation itself. It is of interest that, although the focus group was invited to discuss coping strategies, it actually became pre-occupied with sensemaking and rationalisation. Participants appeared to use the discussion to reassure themselves and each other that although conditions were changing, they are able to retain autonomy whilst appearing to confirm. This may well be a reasonable way of preserving one’s self-image as a free-thinking professional operating within a hierarchical, bureaucratic environment.

In relation to research proposition 7, the findings do not indicate much instrumentality. On the contrary, respondents express an ongoing commitment to students and professionalism, even if the consequences are longer hours and doing research in their own time. A minority speak of taking shortcuts in an attempt to alleviate workload, but the majority resist doing so even where this clearly causes additional stress. It may be envisaged that from the government’s perspective such an outcome is positive as it suggests a more intensive exploitation of the academic human resources of universities. Certainly, there is evidence of a greater productivity, as staff-student ratios (SSRs) increase and unit costs decrease. On the other hand, such a narrow perspective takes no account of the intrinsic good of higher education or opportunity costs. Research proposition no. 7 predicted a higher level of instrumentalism than the responses suggest and whilst this may be good news for students, it raises questions about how much longer staff can carry on absorbing additional workload by simply working harder. Academics may possess a strong armoury which they can employ as a defence, such as a strong internal drive, an internal locus of control, an ability to rationalise and make sense of changing conditions. The desire not to short-change students seems to be strongly held amongst respondents, and where short-cuts are taken this is commonly a source of frustration. If student populations continue to expand however, it is unlikely that academics will be able to continue to absorb the additional load. Overall, the empirical study suggests only limited support for research proposition 7.
Proposition 8:
Research proposition 8 states:

By consciously adopting coping strategies, academics manage to maintain their professionalism (proposition 8)

In contrast to this research proposition, the literature suggests by and large that increased workload and managerialism is causing feelings of proletarianisation and deprofessionalisation amongst academics (Halsey 1992; Ainley, 1994; Marginson and Considine, 2000; Delanty, 2001). The empirical research in this thesis attempts to test the salience of this view. Participants in the research indicate that being actively involved in decision-making, making a worthwhile contribution to the field and being committed to continuing professional development are all important to feelings of professionalism.

Analysis of both the qualitative and quantitative data indicates that academics have strong feelings about academic professionalism, defined in terms of continuing to build up subject knowledge and expertise through research and sharing knowledge with students.

The research indicates general feelings of proletarianisation, manifested in terms of manager-academics making demands without understanding the nature of the work required or allowing sufficient time for tasks to be completed to a high standard. This may be interpreted as an attempt to deskill staff by being prescriptive, either in terms of content or deadlines. The participants in this study ruminated about conflicting priorities and engaged in rationalisation and sensemaking, leading in the majority of cases to working longer hours and in a minority of cases to cutting corners. Jaros's study (2001) which found that as manager-academics increasingly concentrate on strategy, so there is a higher level of standardisation and addition of new activities for academics to perform. That stated, the current research suggests that academics resist attempts to standardise and prescribe their work, such that proletarianisation is resisted and professionalism maintained. Whilst increasingly invasive external controls may be redefining academia as a 'semi-profession', the participants in this research retain a robust sense of intellectual integrity. This may be party altruistic in terms of wishing to educate others to make the world a better place, but may also be a way of protecting one’s self-image as free-thinking professionals in an increasingly directive environment.

The way that academics deal with increasing workloads varies; some work longer hours, others prioritise tasks and engaging consciously in time management (62% [rounded] of
the responses); a minority (18%) admitted to performing tasks less assiduously than previously or spending less time with students. The current findings contrast with the Dearing Report No. 3 (1997) in this regard. In the Dearing study, the second most mentioned issue was deprofessionalisation, felt more acutely by older staff and those in the post-1992 universities. The general feeling was that staff were being put under unnecessary pressure and not treated particularly well; resources were considered inadequate; administrative loads were considered heavy; career structure was seen to be poor and pay levels a source of irritation. Interestingly, the Carnegie Foundation Report (1994) raised many of the same issues however, in contrast to Dearing and in common with the current research, academics in the Carnegie Foundation study had not lost sight of the positive aspects of academic life and remained committed to the concept of an academic profession. For Carnegie Foundation academics, the orientation was worldwide and cosmopolitan; academics cared more about their professional activities than about parochial matters. The current study appears more in tune with the Carnegie Foundation study (1994) than the Dearing Report No. 3 (1997).

The literature proposes that professional identity and professional practice (and power) are embodied in the person of the professional and can not be detached from it. As such, pride in the job cannot be detached from the practitioner, reflected in willingness amongst participants in the research to work longer hours rather than short-change students by using ‘lecturer-friendly’ assessment strategies. The defence of professionalism also reflects a sense of accountability. In the literature accountability of academics is generally conceived in terms of accountability to society or contractual accountability between the individual and the institution. The outcome of this research indicates, however, that academics themselves feel strongly accountable to two key stakeholders; students and their profession. There seems to be a genuine desire to support students and a need to feel that students have learned something. Concurrently, the responses suggest that academics recognise the role of external validation in maintaining their professional status in society. This does not appear to pose any threat, since they see themselves as accountable anyway as members of a community of experts in their specialist field and, as intimated, appear to rationalise recent changes in terms of modern discourses and narratives at large in society. Overall, there is not a particularly strong sense of accountability to the institution or manager-academics.
In aggregate, the views expressed in the empirical study are in line with Eraut’s (1994) definition of professionals as individuals who belong to a discrete group with a shared sense of responsibility and common values and Stilwell’s (2003) conceptualisation of professionalism as comprising both tools (such as expert knowledge) and values (integrity, respect for truth and so on). They suggest also that academics recognise the social construction of professionalism and the notion of ‘responsible autonomy’ rooted in inter-dependence between the profession and others (for example, academic-managers and society at large), highlighting the importance of the contingencies of the process of professionalism in Friedson’s (1999) model. In addition, the outcomes echo Nixon (2001), Exworthy and Halford (1999) in recognising professionalism as an evolutionary concept subjected to dominant political discourses and Shumar’s (1995) belief that managerialist discourses are sustained in universities because academics sustain them. In addition, respondents indicate an obvious commitment to ongoing professional development, considering it important to contribute to knowledge in their field, as well as educate students in their discipline. The desire to push forward the boundaries of knowledge and enhance expertise is one of the key characteristics of the professions.

Overall, the empirical study suggests that reality may be rather complex than much of the literature and some of the research propositions imply – it is not a clear ‘either/or’ situation, but more a combination of sector expansion and an increasingly performative and measured regime that appears to cause additional work and pressure. Notwithstanding additional pressures, however, the responses suggest a robustness - a willingness to accept that conditions are worsening, but that performance and standards are to be maintained. It is true to say that respondents cite heavy workload as the primary stressor, however there is also a fair amount of negativity towards managerialism as a system of university governance – it is this, rather than the day-to-day management of departments that appears to frustrate academics.

The views expressed in this study support Nicholls’s (2001) observation that, despite attempts to reconstruct and reposition the professions within society, in the interests of their own profession practitioners will back the values implicit in practice. Nicholls (2001:77) observes with some insight that ‘when push comes to shove, practitioners must, in the interests of their own professionalism, back the values implicit in practice.’ The interviews in particular certainly indicate a commitment to academic values, whilst
opinions on managerialism varied according to position and closeness to the seat of power. Contrary to Zipin and Brennan’s (2003) position that as a result of neo-liberal changes many educators have been pushed to the edge of a psycho-emotive identity crisis, participants in this research appear to have rationalised the current environment and be in the process of making adjustments in order to protect their professional identity. This appears to gainsay Gabriel’s (1999) view that organisational controls are effective not only in restricting individuals’ movements, but also moulding their identity. Overall, proposition 8 is by and large supported by the findings.

8.2 Attractiveness of academia

The empirical study suggests that respondents still find higher education a relatively attractive sector to work in. The enthusiasm was not overwhelming, however, and perceived attractiveness only moderate. This outcome should be viewed in relation to respondents’ agreement that conditions in higher education are now worse for them, for students and for society as a whole than five years ago. There is a sense of some aspects being attractive, and others not (as with any occupation, perhaps).

8.3 Conclusion

The empirical research in this thesis indicates that workloads have increased significantly in the face of sector expansion and increased demands for accountability. This should be viewed in relation to societal changes such as increasingly egalitarian and inclusive political discourses, an increasingly open society and a political desire to call the professions to account. There is a growing expectation in society at large, and the corporate world in particular, that perpetual change is inevitable and that individuals have to be prepared to accept and respond flexibly. This research suggests that in the main academics are willing to embrace change, but not at the expense of their professionalism. The responses suggest that academics are not particularly instrumental: behavioural responses to heavy workloads and managerialism are mixed; most folk are ploughing on as before and simply increasing working hours as workload increases. That stated, a minority appears to be consciously developing self-management strategies, for example, prioritising some tasks over others and employing time management techniques. A smaller minority admits to coping strategies involves a degree of withdrawal, such as making themselves less available than previously, turning down requests, not attending
meetings, and spending less time with students. There is also some suggestion that in a minority of cases some tasks were being performed less assiduously than previously, that module assessment was being redesigned to reduce marking, that scripts were being skimmed, and so on. The key issue seems to be a commitment to maintaining standards and values and continuing to retain occupational control of work. Professionalism is seen to be related to having an exclusive area of expertise and to be able to control work from within — what Shattock (2006) terms the ‘inside-out’ approach.

At the outset of this research it was anticipated that staff would display a high degree of rationality, constructing meanings to interpret their environment and using these constructions to develop coping strategies. This they appear to have done, however the degree of instrumentality is not as high as anticipated, suggesting a high level of altruism and countering Horobin’s (1983) claim that experts pursue their own self-interest and that when conflicts arise, can be relied upon to prioritise self-interest. Within an academic context this might manifest itself by staff spending more time on research (with the RAE and career progression in mind) and less on teaching and learning activities. The findings indicate the contrary however; that research is being squeezed as more time is spent on administration and teaching activities. This seems to be symptomatic of tasks being imposed from above and being unavoidable, rather than any preference to prioritise teaching and administration. Simultaneously, there appears to be a willingness to ‘go the extra mile’ in the interests of the students — and it may possibly be that this is important in terms of maintaining a robust of professionalism.

Returning to the research question posed at the start of this thesis, overall the responses suggest that the expansion of higher education and the introduction of managerialism has impacted significantly upon academic work in terms of calling academics to account, increasing workload, increasing prescription in research and auditing performance. Interestingly, academics appear to be relatively unconcerned with the effects of managerialism upon their everyday lives, despite being negatively disposed towards government policy and both senior and middle management of their universities. There are several possible explanations for this: firstly, that academics have an internal locus of control and, provided their autonomy is relatively high (compared to other occupational groups), they seem relatively content. They continue to express job satisfaction, despite feeling that management is not particularly supportive, that academics are no longer valued as before, that workloads are excessive, that it is difficult to find time for research
and that working conditions have deteriorated. They accept being reviewed and audited and being expected to perform to target, although they feel that mechanisms of accountability replace trust between manager-academics and themselves. Faced with so many constraints and pressures, at first glance it seems remarkable that academics remain upbeat.

If we consider this from the point of view of academic professionalism, however, then the responses are more understandable. Autonomy and self-determination are clearly important factors for respondents, both in terms of their ability to cope with increased demands and protecting their professional identity. Echoing Bellamy et al (2003), the current findings also suggest that academics seem able to isolate themselves to some extent from the structural and political changes occurring at more senior levels in the system. Whilst professionals operate within a context, extrinsic factors may be less important to them than to other occupational groups, hence they do not appear to be particularly troubled by being held to account through monitoring mechanisms and performance review. This goes beyond simple reflective professionalism advocated by Schön (1983) and Nixon et al (1997) to a creative reconstruction of the self within a context. According to Quicke (2000), the individual is a creative constructor of society and an agent of social and psychological change in his or her own right. The self is thoroughly reflexive, in that all existing roles in institutions, structures and practices can be reflected upon by the individuals that inhabit them, and thereby acted upon by the self in accordance with its socially constituted interests and concerns. This reflexivity is identifiable in academics’ responses to change; possibly ascribable to familiarity with a tradition of accountability within the professional domain. For academics, whilst the locus of control may be shifting from internal to external, provided their day to day activities are not affected adversely, they are relatively ambivalent about the positioning of the locus of control and accept the requirement to practice self-governance, backed by the threat of external intervention if necessary.

In contrast to the literature (Enders and Teichler, 1997; McInnis, 2000a; Exworthy and Halford, 1999), it is notable that the findings threw up few differences between institutions, between genders or between ranks, indicating a homogeneity of responses across the sector and raising some doubt about the legitimacy of assumptions of heterogeneity between academics of different backgrounds, disciplines, institutions and so on. Whilst there are some differences in views based upon institutional type, gender and
rank, overall these are few. The current findings echo Blackburn et al, (1991) and Bellamy et al (2003) in finding few gender-based differences in opinions, orientation or behaviour. In relation to rank, the findings reflect the traditional academic career in which research increases and teaching loads decrease with seniority. More surprisingly perhaps, was the convergence of views regardless of institutional type; the only difference being that academics in chartered universities felt the weight of their teaching and marking loads more than those in statutory. As intimated previously, this is probably a relative effect. Overall, the findings indicate a (surprisingly) strong convergence of views, flying in the face of predictions that on-going government reforms will lead to greater diversity. It is of some interest that the Carnegie Foundation Report (1994) also recorded an unexpected unanimity of views, and more recent observation of increasing similarity between the management of chartered and statutory universities at departmental level (Smith, 2002). Smith noted, further, that the similarity had increased since an earlier study in 1995 – 96.

The findings of this research are of some interest therefore as, far from supporting the ‘received wisdom’ of managerialism adversely affecting autonomy and professionalism, it is suggested that although workloads and pressures have increased significantly, professional identity remains relatively intact. Government policy, rather than formal line management models, appears to impact directly in terms of workload and additional administration. By implication, therefore, university management has not been particularly successful in managing additional loads, if success is defined in terms of ensuring that administration is done by administrators leaving academics to get on with teaching and research. Following the example of the NHS, universities have increasingly employed ‘professional’ administrators on the basis that as they are more skilled at administration than academics they will be able to offload academics, leaving them to concentrate on their academic pursuits. This study suggests, however, that the burden of academic administration has grown in parallel with the growth in administrators. This suggests one of two things; either that there has been/is insufficient mapping and understanding of work processes and an unwillingness to transfer administration from academics to administrative staff, or simply that more administrators means more administration (after all, having been appointed, they need to do something).

Generally, academics do not rate their departmental managers very well; perhaps this is to be expected. Academics want to feel supported by their managers, but this research
suggests that managers are not particularly skilful at achieving this. This is not unique to academia, but is a generic dilemma of management. What is disappointing, however, is that unlike many other organisations and in common with other professions, universities are managed by members of the academic profession and it should be relatively simple, therefore, to empathise, support, nurture and motivate staff. Commonly difficulties arise (in other types of organisations) where ‘professional managers’ occupy management posts, but university departments are led by academics. Essentially, the role of the middle manager in universities (departmental Head and his/her team) is to develop strategy, devise and implement policy, guide operations and ensure that staff are performing well – to be successful in this the manager must have the support of the staff. In return, the manager must support his/her staff, otherwise the foundation of good management/staff relations – mutual respect and trust – breaks down. In an academic environment, didactic management styles simply do not work (other than in the short term), thus academic managers must develop practices that allow them to steer their departments and simultaneously be seen to support their staff. Equity of treatment and transparency appear to be important, as well as making staff feel that their views matter. In this, the current findings build upon Hancock and Hellawell’s (2003) observation that middle managers tend to act covertly, driven by the need to act as entrepreneurs in a competitive environment, whilst supporting transparency in principle.

It is interesting to note that academics demonstrate ambivalence towards their managers rather than outright hostility. The literature suggests conflict between managers and academics, however this did not emerge to any significant degree in this study. Friedson’s (1999) observations on the relationship between management and professions are relevant here. In Friedson’s (1999) analysis, professionals have a high level of autonomy and discretion in their work. Unlike industrially organised workers who are employed as a means to achieving some managerial goal, professionals establish and control the substance of their work as well as who can do it. Knowledge-based work is not amenable to the mechanisation and rationalisation of industrial production and commerce, therefore management can not rationalise and organise it, but at best can only maintain an administrative framework around it. It is clearly possible to conceptualise even ‘invasive’ bureaucratic audit such as QAA teaching assessments and the RAE as part of this administrative framework rather than as the stringent controls portrayed in the literature. After all, such audit measures only output.
The following chapter draws general conclusions about the research and discusses what this thesis may contribute to the growing body of knowledge about managerialism and academic professionalism.
Chapter 9
Conclusion

9.0 Introduction

This thesis set out to explore the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism. Whilst the literature by and large supports the deprofessionalisation and proletarianisation theses, the outcomes of this study indicate some support for the latter and less so for the former. This chapter presents the implications of the empirical research contained in this thesis, before outlining the limitations of the study and providing some suggestions for further research.

9.1 Implications and further development of theory about managerial discourses and academic professionalism

Higher education has changed significantly in scale, style and substance over the last fifty years or so, and particularly rapidly since the 1980s. The governance of universities has become managerialist in ethos, structure and practices and those working in them are encouraged to embrace discourses more commonly associated with private sector enterprise. The 'new style' of governance encourages individuals to be flexible, to embrace risk and delight in change as an 'opportunity' rather than a threat. Universities have to justify their value to society and, similarly, academics must justify their value to the institution which employs them. This entails a requirement to accept the concept of accountability, manifested by output measures, annual targets, ongoing audit, performance management and one's contribution being evaluated in relation to 'the bottom line'. This inevitably leads to an individual positioning him or herself in relation to a complex set of relations: peers; manager-academics; administrators; students; and society at large, and an acceptance of the requirement for self-governance. External regulatory mechanisms essentially 'govern at a distance', specifying specific standards of achievement and behaviours that individuals are expected to realise. How they do so is up to them - they themselves shape and practise technologies to ensure that they come up to the mark. According to the literature, this process of self-governance in relation to external benchmarks is promoting individualization, breaking down traditional hierarchies and collegiums and resulting in a proletarianisation of academic labour, deprofessionalisation of academic work and demoralisation of academic staff. It is also
asserted that the value placed upon academic leadership is waning, leading to still greater individualization and isolation – at precisely the time when the sector needs strong, effective, motivating leadership. Against this background, this research is timely and of potential significance.

The literature portrays a gloomy picture of highly pressurised, demotivated, down-trodden staff, struggling to cope with workloads. Participants in this research certainly indicate that workload has increased dramatically over recent years and many admit to working longer hours, or performing tasks less assiduously than in the past. Overall, however, whilst there are many expressions of stress and frustration, it would be premature to conclude that demoralisation is rife. Rather encouragingly, respondents appear somewhat ambivalent about the impact of managerialism upon their daily lives. Whilst there is a general view that performance monitoring, mechanisms of accountability and demands for high quality teaching and research cause additional pressure, in the minds of the participants these developments are not linked to managerialism as operationalised at the departmental level, but to broader, politically-driven demands for accountability, target regimes, the demands of the funding mechanism and so on. This research suggests that academics do not seem to be suffering a rapid decline in morale or levels of satisfaction, and far from being ‘a profession in crisis’, this research paints a picture of a profession under pressure, but unbowed. There is certainly evidence of work intensification and some evidence of work degradation and deskilling, however the current study also suggests that managerialism does not seem to be strongly related to a sense of diminishing professionalism. It is suggested here that this may be explained by the state of power relations between manager-academics and academic staff, and that the polarity between managerialism and academic professionalism is not as intense as implied in much of the literature.

Power in universities comes in a number of forms; bureaucratic, professional, coercive and personal. Whereas the depprofessionalisation literature claims that professional control is threatened by managerialism, in fact the changing conditions might be analysed simply in terms of power shifts. The depprofessionalisation thesis presupposes power relations to be built around a principal-agent model in which relationships are hierarchical, with the principal being the commissioning party who delegates work to the agent to perform in return for some reward (or sanction). As such, the relationship is assumed to be one of dependency, rather than inter-dependency. The principal-agent model, though logical
enough if viewing an organisational chart, actually over-simplifies the rather more informal, 'hidden' relations which can exist between those in elevated / those in lower positions in the organisational hierarchy. Whilst, on paper, manager-academics can exploit new forms of university management to attain a new career route based on position in the hierarchy and (the potential to employ what appears to be) coercive power rather than the more traditional personal, reputation-based power, we need also to consider what form of power academic staff have access to, and how that power might be exercised to maintain their personal and professional positions. It is by no means clear that managerialism threatens either personal or professional forms of power, although there is some evidence that bureaucracy, performance monitoring and increasing prescription in teaching and research may threaten personal (but not necessarily professional) autonomy. Power which emanates from professional and personal status is relatively easy to defend; after all, the reputation of a university is related to the individual and collective reputations of the academics working within it. The complexities of university life, the existence of multiple goals, unclear reporting lines and managing semi-autonomous professionals make it very difficult for manager-academics to exercise coercive power – a fact not missed by academic staff.

The responses support the view that although changes can be significant, people can adapt, resist or circumvent them as they arise. The Habermasian concept of 'cognitive-instrumental rationality' suggests that individuals consciously employ a means-end approach to identify action oriented towards success within a particular domain (for example, where an academic might replace individual assignments with group work to reduce marking load). To be successful in employing such an approach individuals must have some degree of autonomy. According to Habermas, cognitive-instrumental rationality dominates modern discourses; in addition, in a profession where levels of autonomy are relatively high. In contrast to the Habermasian view, however, this research suggest that cognitive-instrumental rationality is relatively low. Certainly, there appears to be a high level of cognition, mental mapping and sense-making going on, however there is relatively little evidence of instrumentality. Rather, one is left with a sense of a group of people committed to continuing to accommodate change and engage with prevailing discourses. The response appears to be one of constructive ambiguity – playing along, in the knowledge that if one is seen to 'buy into' the discourse, one will be left alone. It is apparent from the comments by those who are making behavioural
changes that even where the response is behavioural and instrumental they have the autonomy to do make such changes.

At the same time, the propensity of manager-academics to take a "hands off" approach further enables academics to employ this approach. There a number of possible explanations for manager-academics being "hands off"; it may be that due to an increasing emphasis on the university as part of the knowledge economy and upon strategic planning, they are increasingly focused upon responding to external audit and accountability exercises, or possibly that they doubt their own ability to manage face-to-face and to exercise more personal forms of leadership, or even that they are possibly simply not very good at management. Managers may be reluctant to shift from bureaucratic organisational modes of control because the introduction of flexible procedures would require them to be immersed more psychologically in their jobs. The outcome of this is the superimposition of 'new management' practices on top of the old, established processes and practices. It may be that by introducing new forms of management to universities, instead of establishing a new set of social relations the old, existing, dysfunctional tendencies are merely reinforced.

In this study, manager-academics are not judged to be particularly good, or supportive, although it is interesting to note that, although not rating manager-academics well in relation to; consultation, making staff feel that their views matter, using 'soft' metrics to measure performance, facilitating opportunities for networking or facilitating autonomy, respondents feel that, generally speaking, manager-academics do trust staff to get on with their work. Of particular importance to academics is the issue of workload allocation – where workloads are perceived to be uneven, or iniquitous, manager-academics are not rated well in terms of supporting staff. There is a general perception that manager-academics tend to fall back upon a didactic, non-consultative style, possibly reflecting lack of confidence, lack of interest and/or inadequate skill in daily, face-to-face management. Despite these apparent shortcomings, overall appears to be no great animosity towards manager-academics. Thus, although much of the literature is couched in terms of a managerial-professional dichotomy, the reality appears to be more complex and less polarised.

It is interesting that manager-academics' "hands off" approach is interpreted by respondents in the current study as being trusted to get on with their work, despite the
concomitant rise in administrative bureaucracy. The findings suggest that manager-academics may use the apparent rationality of managerialism to reinforce established work practices, as well as existing social relations that sustain their position. Managerialism affects relationships between professionals and the State, but for the majority of academics, provided performance monitoring is intermittent and their daily work is not micro-managed, the managerial regime may be relatively comfortable. Thus, whilst the literature suggests that the expansion of higher education and the introduction of managerial discourses has led to the deprofessionalisation, the primary research proposition of this thesis is that the changing context has impacted only marginally upon academic professionalism. This is because of the distinctive characteristics of the professions and the assumption that, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, academics will strive to protect their professionalism for both instrumental and altruistic reasons.

From a socially constructivist standpoint one might argue that being relatively well educated, intelligent, rational beings engaged in philosophising and theorising, academics are extremely well placed to construct mental frameworks to rationalise their situation and resourceful enough to find ways of protecting the core characteristics and values of their profession. The results of this empirical study suggest that academics are undoubtedly under increasing pressure, but that they view this primarily in terms of workload rather than managerialism, *per se*. It is the marked increase in bureaucratic administration that is causing the greatest frustration, rather than bigger cohorts and more teaching and marking. The findings suggest further that workload allocation influences evaluations of manager supportiveness. It is of note, therefore, that this research suggests that manager-academics are not managing staff workloads particularly well. There appears to be a tendency just to stick to tried and tested procedures and as the volume of work increases, to pass this on to those at the 'chalkface' rather than systematically reviewing processes with a view to streamlining, reducing bureaucracy and keeping workloads manageable.

The current findings suggest that hierarchical line management may not be best suited to cope with the often complex power relations within universities. In addition, the findings expose the ability of academics to resist constraints and remain reasonably autonomous. Their ability to do so should come as no surprise - in terms of power relations managerialism is not 'new' since academics have always been subjected to formal controls in some way, whether heads of departments or deans. In this sense academics are
implicated in sustaining managerialist discourses in universities. From a Foucauldian perspective, this instrumentality may be conceptualised as either a formula of resistance or a formula of power. Either way, the acceptance of managerialism as a way of structuring the everyday life in universities gives academics a framework of norms and principles for organising both themselves in relation to themselves and others. Taking a stance on the governance of oneself is, for Foucault, an important element of rationalising and justifying one's perceived freedom within a domain. As such, one's view of how freedom has been constituted, along with perceptions of structures, practices and techniques which constrain or facilitate freedom over oneself, within a community and in relation to one's environment are crucial. It is interesting to note that respondents considered their level of autonomy, and of academics as a whole, to be diminished, but still reasonably high, and certainly high in relation to other occupations. Thus, the findings support the main research proposition that academics have retained a strong sense of professional identity, despite the sometimes rapid changes in context and conditions. They should be regarded not as defenceless victims, but as agents operating within a discourse. As such, they are never completely without power and therefore have the potential to invoke change.

As intimated above, one of the key frustrations expressed by academics in this study is burgeoning administration. Although universities have always been bureaucratic, respondents now feel that political demands for increased accountability have increased bureaucracy to new heights. Whilst there was an acceptance of the principle of accountability, its translation into mechanisms of bureaucratic audit appears to be a particular irritant. Frustration is mainly over a forced diversion of effort away from teaching and research and, interestingly, though respondents acknowledged that administration could provide an alternative career path, there was little interest in pursuing this route. Manager-academics must take responsibility for failing to address issues of workload and for simply introducing new, and in some cases, significant bureaucratic procedures without much attempt to handle this strategically. Taking a humanistic view, academics are unlikely to be content and motivated in their work if they feel swamped with administration. Adopting a more rationalist perspective, part of the purpose of management is to ensure that resources are being employed efficiently. If work is distributed unevenly or irrationally across units then resources are not been exploited optimally. Either way, manager-academics need to do better. The unanimity of responses from chartered and statutory universities in this regard is interesting and
contrasts with earlier studies suggesting plurality indicating that differences based upon institutional type are diminishing. There may be identified a greater reliance on career-track manager-academics in statutory universities - this may now be diminishing, possibly due to the problems of burnout and credibility amongst peers.

In addition, the findings suggest some change in relations between academics and administrators, such that some aspects of academic life are overwhelmed by the increased power of administrators. Expressions of frustration signify not only reluctance to take on what may be perceived as boring, mechanistic tasks one step removed from core pedagogical work, but also a deeper rooted clash of values and possibly also perceived loss of power. Academic managers share with academic staff a common background, shared values, a sense of collectivity and fraternity. By contrast, the ties that bind academics and administrators are often tenuous and feelings of 'them and us' predominate. The status awarded to academics as members of a vocational profession grants access to power and influence within universities and, through prestige and reputation, to peers in subject-based elites. Understandably, from the academics' point of view, this power may be jeopardised as the volume of administration grows and their involvement in it increases. The findings also suggest an underlying unease that whereas under the older style of university management the relationship between the individual and the head of department was transparent and to an extent might be negotiated, the advent of 'professionalised' administration has shifted the balance of power from academics to administrators. Backed by external demands for quality assurance, administrators may rather indirectly, but effectively, make demands for tasks to be performed according to certain criteria within specific deadlines. If this is perceived as a shift in power, the frustration certainly arises from a lack of discussion not only about the mechanics but about the implications in terms of autonomy and relative status. A number of respondents voiced their frustration that administrators often do not seem to support academics but make additional demands upon them, thereby suggesting that power relations between academics and administrators may be in the process of changing - by default. Administrators are likely to be viewed as part of a culture of compliance whose values are increasingly viewed with suspicion by academics. Naturally, academics will resist the downgrading (as they see it) of academic values and the concomitant rise of bureaucratic imperatives.
From a Bourdieuan perspective, the situation might be conceptualised as one of domination in which administration has become a mechanism by which the established order is subtly being reordered under a gloss of quality assurance and accountability. Traditionally, bureaucratic and top-down authority is weak in organisations employing professionals. In general, these organisations are held together by commitment and trust, which, being intangible, are difficult to place on any structural chart. Accountability is assumed and seldom overt since, without line management, even if direct orders are given, units or individuals often lack the clout to ensure compliance. Once formal mechanisms of accountability are introduced, organisational structure, culture and climate are liable to change. The current research suggests that the current, narrow definition of accountability, expressed in terms of specific targets and measurable outcomes, not only curtails autonomy, but may strangle creativity and originality, thus jeopardising the normative justification for academia. Accountability in the sense in which it is being operationalised, may be seen as a legitimising discourse which brings forth a state of being and mechanisms of domination which appear at first glance to be objective. In Bourdieu’s analysis, such mechanisms are far from objective, but contribute to the efficacy of the ideology, ‘The most successful ideological effects are those which have no need of words, and ask no more than complicitous silence’ (1997:188). Thus, in contrast to the Foucauldian perspective outlined above of academic professionalism having been maintained through an unwritten agreement between parties, the Bourdieuan view suggests a much more insidious trend, namely that academics are being subjected to strategies and mechanisms of domination, but, preoccupied with daily tasks, believing that they are trusted to get on with their work and have a relatively high degree of autonomy, simply do not recognise it. This is not to implicate the relationship between manager- academics and academic staff (these are socially constructed and may be warm); rather that the domination is objectified, systematic - and pervasive.

Thus, manager-academics are instrumental in promoting reworked relations between academics and administrators, although their influence is indirect and the frustration of academics is directed towards administrators rather then manager-academics. It is in this sense that managerialism has been unsuccessful; whilst in principle manager-academics might support the corporate, entrepreneurial ideal when occupying a role in which social engagement rather than technical expertise is foremost, it is tempting to retreat behind bureaucracy both as a shield and an indirect mode of control. The responses suggest that manager-academics are unaware of the extent of their influence in terms of academics’
sense-making. The importance of the dominant coalition (Head of Department, Head of School, management team, and so on) is by virtue of their influence over rewards and sanctions; and whilst academics may welcome the hands-off approach, somewhat paradoxically perhaps, this may also generate uncertainty. The responses suggest that the way in which managerialism is operationalised at the local level, total workload, and workload allocation are related to perceived supportiveness of manager-academics. Following social construction theory, manager-academics would be well advised to consider their role in maintaining the professionalism of their staff. For example, if workloads are seen to be allocated unfairly, academics can be expected to experience cognitive dissonance. This is likely to focus upon those allocating the work. There will be a large degree of symbolism in the sensemaking and reaction, and even false interpretations. It may be anticipated that academics will work around the apparent inequity through horse-trading with colleagues to ameliorate the worst effects of the apparent injustice. This is the social aspect of sensemaking, which is not explored in any great detail in this particular study. Nevertheless, at an individual level the outcome, in the eyes of those who feel aggrieved, distrust is likely to result, possibly a lack of respect, bringing into being a state of defensiveness of professionalism. This is an undesirable state within an organisation which employs professionals and is dependent upon their output for its reputation and status. Thus, within complex organisations such as universities or hospitals, managers face levels of resistance and pragmatic problem-solving that line management models are ill-equipped to deal with.

Managerial discourses have not achieved a hegemonic status within the public sector. They have not replaced other frameworks of understanding but have been superimposed upon the existing, sometimes contradictory, multiplicity of discourses. The current research suggests that individuals appear to take an agentic role in evaluating managerialism and placing themselves in relation to it. It is interesting that participants in this research appear to respond to change by accepting modern narratives of flexibility, risk-taking and change. Of all aspects of active professionalism, participants cite continuous professional development (CPD) as the most crucial. In this, academics share the outlook of many other professions in modern society; a view commonly ascribed to a career-oriented approach to the world. Ironically perhaps, this very willingness to engage in managerial discourses may potentially make academics difficult to manage. If academics are ‘buying into’ postmodern narratives and accepting the need to identify, create and maintain a position relative to themselves and others, then this very process –
and the ownership resulting from it — may reinforce the independence of the academic community. This suggests that academic-managers need to understand that their priorities and convictions can be pursued so far and no further. Perhaps this is a key message from this research. Universities are not like other organisations; academics can be difficult to manage, whatever form the organisation takes. If manager-academics are to lead effectively, they need to be seen to be communicative, empathetic and inclusive.

Ultimately, professionalism is a social construct and maintaining professional identity is about analysing the environment and taking a stance about one's relationship with it. Academics seem to have the ability and freedom to do this. From the current study, the one area where professional control appears threatened by managerialism is being involved in decision-making where the outcome directly affects the individual. Involvement in decision-making is a core element of trust between managers and employees. The participation of academics in decision-making long-established, but academic democracy and consensual decision-making may have declined in line with the ascendancy of hierarchical models of authority. It may well be that collegiality is being replaced by less communal and more isolated life, and a sense of redundancy, not in the contractual sense, but in the sense of having a proactive role to play in the community. This is the main threat to professionalism. Citizenship responsibilities, altruism, working toward the greater good are values lying at the heart of the professions. Eliminate academics from decision-making and their feeling of value decreases, with the associated psychological problems that follow. Indeed, the current findings indicate that staff no longer feel supported, involved or valued. Exclusion from the process of consultation leads to frustration and distrust — and ultimately disengagement. Disengagement may be difficult to diagnose, since even in a withdrawn, disengaged state individuals may appear compliant and conformist, even working apparently proactively towards attaining performance targets. Yet, since academics have a strong need and drive towards self-actualisation and independence of thought and action, this is a very dangerous development indeed, raising fundamental questions about the position of academics in the university. For academics, it begs the question of whether reliance upon the traditional discourse of academic professionalism is adequate both for academics to maintain their relative power within the institution, and universities (as a collective of professionals) vis-à-vis the state.
9.2 Contributions of the research to existing knowledge

Although this research in many ways only scratches the surface of what is an inherently complex set of phenomena, it is hoped that it makes some small contribution to the existing knowledge concerning managerialism and academic professionalism:

- The first contribution of this research is that it provides a broad overview, using a mixed methodology, of the perceptions, feelings, views and behaviours of academic staff across a range of disciplines and institutions. This contrasts with the bulk of existing studies in the field which tend to be small-scale, narrowly focused and reliant upon qualitative methods.

- Secondly, the research adds to the under-researched and somewhat contradictory literature on professionalism, not necessarily in terms of definitions and characteristics, but, more importantly, in terms of exposing power relations between academic professionals, employers, government, students and society at large.

- Furthermore, the study makes a small contribution to balancing the somewhat parochial view presented in the bulk of extant literature on the relationship between managerial discourses and academic professionalism. The responses in this research largely reject the deprofessionalisation thesis expounded in the literature and present a much more positive view of academics’ ‘lot’ than the literature.

- In addition, the research supports earlier studies in uncovering evidence of ongoing proletarianisation as a result of massification, growth of administration and a failure of manager-academics to deal successfully with day to day operational management. Manager-academics are not highly rated by their staff in terms of supporting them in achieving their objectives. Their level of support for activities that are absolutely core to the academic role is perceived to be low.

- The research also reveals a high level of professionalism and a genuine desire not to ‘short-change’ students by taking shortcuts. Instrumentality is lower than anticipated. Whilst this is good news for students, the effect on academics appears to be a lengthening of the working day and growing frustration over workload.

- The study also exposes academics as largely agentic individuals who have ‘bought into’ modern narratives of flexibility, change and risk-taking.
Additionally, the research uncovers increasing bureaucracy accompanied by a shift in power away from academics to administrators. From this research there is little doubt that, despite the armies of ‘professional’ administrators admitted to universities in recent years, academics do not feel that their administrative loads have decreased. On the contrary, the presence of more administrators seems to have led to a growth in the amount of administration to be undertaken by academics. Much of this seems to be related to external demands for accountability, however some seems related to the desire by manager-academics to utilise bureaucracy as a tool of (indirect) management.

Furthermore, the study exposes how bureaucracy might be employed as a mechanism of control. The apparent rationality of bureaucracy has failed to convince academics that the administration they are required to undertake is of much value. Respondents recognise a shift in the balance of power between academics and administrators, with the latter becoming less supportive and more demanding. Drawing primarily upon Foucault and Bourdieu, the research identifies how manager-academics might employ bureaucratic administration as a tool of operational management.

The research also exposes how little the culture of universities has changed at ‘grass-roots’ level. Whilst managerial discourses appear to be tolerated, there is some evidence of resistance and a certainly signs of ongoing commitment to protect academic professionalism. If managerialism was intended to invoke culture change, then it must be considered a failure in this respect.

Finally, the study uncovers serious shortcomings on the part of manager-academics. They do not appear to be managing workloads well – simply pushing more and more bureaucratic administration onto academics with little strategic review. They also do not appear to be particularly good at consulting staff over decisions which affect them or making staff feel that their opinions matter and that they are valued. This is worrying and should be addressed as a matter of urgency. The position and reputation of universities is a function of the reputation of its academic staff. If academics feel overwhelmed with bureaucracy, unvalued and redundant (socially-speaking), this is likely to result in frustration, demotivation and withdrawal. Currently, despite manager-academics’ shortcomings, there appears to be a lot of goodwill towards them and a strong commitment to students and the academic profession. How long this can be
sustained in an environment where academics are overloaded with administration, and excluded from discussion and consultation can only be speculated.

In addition to these contributions, this study also provides a basis from which potential areas for further research may be identified. Set against a backdrop of changing conditions (with the immanent introduction of differentiated tuition fees and the introduction of a national, unitary pay-scale for both academic and non-academic staff), studies might include: an examination of whether the differing perceptions of female academics regarding heavy workloads actually indicate some gender inequality, or whether they are simply perceptual; whether the chartered/statutory duality is disappearing with regard to how these institutions are managed; power relations between academics, manager-academics and administrators; changing relation between students, academics, institutions and the state. It would also be of interest to explore this topic from a community-based, rather than individual perspectives, which may expose the influence of academic discipline, or institutional culture, and so on. There is plenty of scope, since, as intimated, this is a relatively under-researched field containing a relatively small number of leading researchers. The findings of this study suggest a need for further research into the role and practices of professional administrators, the nature of the relationships between administrators and academics and the implications for academic autonomy of the rising status and authority of administrators within universities. The findings also suggest an urgent need for further research on manager-academics, specifically in terms of good and bad practice with regard to staff inclusion, consultation and motivation. Universities should not tolerate a situation where the manager-academics are making staff feel undervalued and redundant. Such an outcome is to the detriment not just of the individual, but the academic profession, universities, and the sector as a whole.

9.3 Limitations

Like any other piece of academic research, this study is subject to limitations. The intention was to explore a number of current issues relating to the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism. Like all research, the validity and generalisability of the outcomes are limited by a number of weaknesses in the design. Firstly, the total population of full-time academic staff employed in English universities is given by HESA as 68,000 (2005 figures). Decisions had to be made regarding the sample size, which were partly shaped by external factors (such as the number of institutions that
agreed to be surveyed) and partly by the decision to employ simple, stratified, random sampling at both the qualitative and quantitative stages of data collection. In addition, the sampling was limited by a number of pragmatic considerations, such as time and money constraints. At the initial stages, specifically the focus group and the interviews, it was difficult to find academics willing to participate in the research – hence, it was decided to hold the focus group with the four willing participants who turned up rather than postpone and continue to trawl and try to persuade others to join the group. Another consideration in the size of the focus group was to try to keep the session to one hour – the participants agreed to an hour, but were unwilling to go beyond this; with this limitation it may well have been counter-productive to have too large a group since this would have restricted individual input.

Similarly, the interviews were limited to eleven in the first instance – again shaped by stratified, random sampling. Ideally, the number of interviews could have been increased, however, as above, there were resource and time considerations to take into account. Whilst it was decided that the interviews had provided a wealth of useful information and, on the basis of this, the quantitative stage could be embarked upon, nevertheless it should be acknowledged that further interviewing would certainly have enhanced the quantity – and possibly the quality – of the data. The only mitigation is that it was intended to undertake a large quantitative survey and that the phenomena could be triangulated by employing a focus group, interviews and the online survey.

Regarding the quantitative survey, the instrument is acknowledged as being rather weak in some areas. In retrospect, it could have been much more probing regarding individual's perceptions of the use of mechanisms of accountability as technologies of control, and whether and how relations are changing between academics, manager-academics and administrators. It was difficult to probe these issues without leading respondents in a particular direction, therefore the instrument was kept quite (and maybe simply too) broad. A more experienced researcher may well have found ways of probing without leading, resulting in a more narrowly focused and insightful instrument.

Additionally, it is acknowledged that in stratifying the sampling simply according to university type an opportunity has been missed to explore any discipline-based differences. In attempting to glean a broad overview of the state of the sector as a whole, the data collection was structured ordered according to university type, then rank within
the hierarchy, age, gender and length of service as an academic. In retrospect, it would have been a simple matter to also order according to discipline, so an opportunity has been missed. It must be acknowledged that in treating the academic profession as an entity, the lens may have been unduly focused upon homogeneity rather than difference. In mitigation, other studies cited in the research (particularly in the Dearing and Carnegie Reports) have also aggregated responses in order to provide a broad overview of the state of the academic profession. Given the similarity of perceptions between the participants in this research, the Dearing Report (1997) and the Carnegie Foundation Report (1994), it may now be timely for a follow-up study which disaggregates the academic profession into discipline-based sub-groups.

9.4 Final Comments

This research set out to investigate the relationship between managerialism in English universities and academic professionalism. It is located within the contemporary discourse of neo-liberal, free market philosophy in which the university is viewed a key player in creating the knowledge society. An examination of the perceptions of full-time academic staff, using their espoused theory of action, has confirmed that academics feel under increasing pressure from steadily increasing workloads and a requirement to ‘do more for less’. Responses indicate that academics appear to accept modern narratives of flexibility and continuous change, however, that stated, they appear to be less instrumental than one might anticipate, and in an attempt to maintain professional values and standards, profess to be working longer hours than ever before. There is evidence of both cognitive and behavioural responses to the increasing loads, both in terms of rationalising and sensemaking and, in a significant minority of cases, of innovation (or ‘corner-cutting’) in teaching and learning activities. The participants see a relationship between workload and overall performance, citing a reduction in the amount of time available for research and increasing difficulty in executing projects according to their own priorities as the key effects.

Turning to managers, this research suggests that manager-academics are not perceived to be supportive, despite generally allowing staff to get on with their work without much day to day interference. Generally, they are not rated well by academic staff. It is suggested here that the ‘hands off’ approach may be more symptomatic of an unwillingness to leave comfort zones and a reliance upon bureaucratic auditing as a mechanism of control than
any conscious decision to engender trust-based relations. One of the key areas is workload allocation, by which manager-academics are judged either to be reasonably supportive, or not. There is some frustration that, despite the introduction of ‘professionalised’ administrators, the burden of academic administration falling upon academic staff continues to grow. In aggregate, these views suggest scope for improvement in the management of universities at middle management (departmental, School or Faculty) level, and reveal the imperative of finding ways to encourage manager-academics to improve the ‘soft’ side of management, to make staff feel included and valued.

As far as academic professionalism is concerned, there are encouraging signs of an ongoing commitment to maintain standards. The participants in this research appear to be realists and pragmatists, accepting the reality of modern, managerial discourses and the requirement to position themselves in relation to them. Modern academics need to recognise that their autonomy, authority and expertise will continue to be challenged (perhaps increasingly), both from above (the political and institutional leadership) and below (student-consumers). With the continuing drive towards a still more market-driven, competitive model with increasing differentiation between institutions, there is a danger that the academic profession may fragment, diluting its collegiality and rendering it still more susceptible to external pressures. This study has thrown up little sign of the fragmentation or internal combustion suggested in the literature; on the contrary, it suggests an unexpected degree of homogeneity. As such, the academic profession needs to consider how external forces may exert pressure to fragment and how this might be resisted (if resistance is deemed appropriate), how the profession as an entity might develop in future and how new forms of accountability might be built upon to enhance trust, autonomy, motivation, reflexivity and democratic dialogue – for the good of the profession itself, students and society as a whole.
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### Appendix A

#### Key Prompts - Focus Group

- Tell me about your workload (heavy or light, how much teaching and admin do you have? How much time do you have for research? Is your workload increasing or decreasing, and so on....)
- How are workloads allocated in your department?
- Do you consider academia to be a 'profession', and if so, how would you define academic professionalism?
- Do you feel you have a lot of autonomy in your job?
- Do you experience any constraints that prevent you doing your job as you would wish? If so, what are they and how do they affect your work?
- How important is autonomy to you?
- Do you feel a sense of accountability in your job? In what way? To whom?
- Is there a relationship between autonomy and accountability? If so, what?
- Do you feel that amongst your colleagues there is a shared set of values; of standards? If so, what are these?
- Do you feel that your departmental mangers (HoD and his/her team) support you in achieving your goals?
- Do you feel that departmental management constrains or helps you in your work?
- Do you feel under pressure? Why, and in what way?
- If so, how do you deal with this? What do you do to cope?
- How satisfied are you with your job?
- Would you recommend a job as a University lecturer to your children or a close friend?
### Appendix B

**Key prompts - Interviews**

- Describe your work. What do you **do**?
- Tell me about your workload. Is it light or heavy, getting lighter or heavier? How much teaching and admin do you do, and how much time for research?
- How are workloads allocated?
- Do you consider academia to be a profession, and, if so, how would you define it?
- Do you feel that amongst your colleagues there is a shared set of values, standards and so on?
- Do you feel that the departmental managers (your HoD and his/her management team) are supportive of you?
- What do they **do** that either helps you or hinders you?
- Do you feel that have much autonomy?
- How does this manifest itself?
- Do you feel accountable in your job – if so, to whom and in what way?
- What do you think of the Academy of Higher Education?
- How important is accountability to the concept of academic professionalism?
- What is the relationship between autonomy and accountability?
- Do you feel that you are constrained in any way from achieving your objectives? If so, how?
- Do you feel under pressure? If so, in what way?
- Have you consciously developed any strategies to help you to cope with your job?
- If so, what do you **do**?
- How satisfied are you with your job?
- Would you recommend a job in academia to your children, or a close friend?
- Do you think conditions in higher education are getting better or worse for you personally; for students?
E-mail to Survey Group

Dear ..... 

I am a Lecturer in the postgraduate School of Management at the University of Surrey currently undertaking PhD study into academics' perceptions and beliefs about formal management systems and practices in higher education and how this impacts upon academic professionalism, autonomy and accountability.

Your university has kindly given me permission to contact academic staff to invite them to participate in the survey.

If you are full-time member of academic staff I would be extremely grateful if you could take just a few minutes to respond to the survey. I hope you can find time for this as (somewhat ironically, given the context) it is currently an under-researched field. The survey can be accessed by clicking on the link below:

http://surveys.som.surrey.ac.uk/survey?code=1732792

Please be assured that participation in this survey is completely anonymous. Results will be treated confidentially and used solely for the purposes of my PhD.

Best regards,
Ailsa Kolsaker
Appendix D

Questionnaire on University Management and Academic Professionalism

Dear Colleague,
Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire which seeks to explore the relationship between management and academic professionalism. Responses are anonymous, will be treated confidentially and used only for the purpose of the study. No individual data will be made available to third parties.

Ailsa Kolsaker

Section I: About You and your Institution

Age: 20 - 29 [ ] 30 - 39 [ ] 40 - 49 [ ] 50 - 59 [ ] 60 + [ ]
Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]
Number of years working as an academic: <5 [ ] 6 - 10 [ ] 11 - 15 [ ] 16 - 20 [ ] 20+ [ ]
Rank: Senior (Professor, Reader) [ ] Academic (S.L. and Lecturer B) Junior (Lecturer A) [ ]
Institution Type: Chartered [ ] Statutory [ ]

Section II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your experience, do you consider the management decisions in your department to be fair?</th>
<th>Very Unfair</th>
<th>Unfair</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Very Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your experience, do you consider the management decisions in your department to be transparent?</th>
<th>Very opaque</th>
<th>Opaque</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Transparent</th>
<th>Very transparent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your opinion, is there less or more managerial control than five years ago?</th>
<th>Much less control</th>
<th>Less control</th>
<th>Neither/nor control</th>
<th>More control</th>
<th>Much more control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How free or constrained are you to:</th>
<th>Very constrained</th>
<th>Constrained</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Very Free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decide what you teach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide what you research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide what administration you do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network and attend conferences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside the university?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How free or constrained do you feel overall?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, more free or constrained than five years ago?</th>
<th>Much more constrained</th>
<th>More constrained</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>More free</th>
<th>Much more free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment if you wish:


Do you feel your administrative load is: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very heavy</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Light</th>
<th>Very Light</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much heavier</td>
<td>Heavier</td>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>Lighter</td>
<td>Much lighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heavier or lighter than 5 years ago?

Do you feel your teaching load is: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very heavy</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Light</th>
<th>Very Light</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much heavier</td>
<td>Heavier</td>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>Lighter</td>
<td>Much lighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heavier or lighter than 5 years ago?

Do you feel your marking load is: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very heavy</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Light</th>
<th>Very Light</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much heavier</td>
<td>Heavier</td>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>Lighter</td>
<td>Much lighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heavier or lighter than 5 years ago?

Comment if you wish:

IF you feel your workload is increasing, do you consciously use a coping strategy? 
Yes [ ] No [ ]
If so, what is it?

Do you think administration can lead to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prestige and status in the university</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion/personal career development</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitely Not | Probably | Undecided | Possibly | Definitely
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you personally choose this path?
Section III Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your view, is it easy or difficult to find time for research?</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Very Easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier or more difficult than 5 years ago?</td>
<td>Much more</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>About the</td>
<td>Easier</td>
<td>Much Easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find it easy to plan and execute research according to your own priorities?</td>
<td>Very difficult</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Neither/nor</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Very Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you feel your research is constrained, what is constraining it?

Comment if you wish

Part IV Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you feel your performance is affected by workload?</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>To some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think performance monitoring improves your actual performance?</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>May or</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>may not</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment if you wish


**Part IV Professionalism**

Do you agree or disagree that the following are characteristics of professional identity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither/ Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External validation through professional affiliations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing a common set of values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a worthwhile contribution to knowledge in your field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing knowledge with your students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being held accountable for your performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a high level of autonomy in teaching and research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking with others in your field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active involvement in departmental decision-making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to continuous professional development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a member of the Higher Education Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment if you wish

**Part V Management Support**

How supportive or unsupportive do you consider your departmental managers to be in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Very Unsupportive</th>
<th>Neither/ nor</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting you in pursuing your objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that your workload is reasonable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating autonomy in teaching and research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting you to get on with your work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring intangible as well as tangible outcomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating opportunities for networking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting you about decision that affect you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making you feel that your views matter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
Part VIII Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academics are valued as much today as 5 years ago</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither/ nor</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line management models enhance professionalism in academia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line management mechanisms replace trust between academic managers and academics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New forms of accountability reinforce the professional status of academics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal performance management enhances the performance of academic staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics have a lot of autonomy in their work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms of accountability and autonomy go hand in hand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is attractive to work as an academic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More attractive than 5 years ago?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you recommend it to your children?</td>
<td>No, definitely</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neither/ nor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has higher education become better or worse over the last 5 years?</td>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Neither/ nor</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Much better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For society as a whole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment if you wish

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey.
Appendix E

1. Age distribution

The descriptive statistics for the categorical variable, Age, indicate that there are few respondents in the 20 – 29 age group. Similarly, relatively few aged over 60. Ages are spread reasonably evenly over the 30 – 39, 40 – 49 and 50 – 59 age groups.
2. Post/rank distributions

The descriptive statistics for the categorical variable, 'Post/Rank' indicate an obvious deviation from a normal distribution. The majority of respondents are mid-ranking, with a relatively large minority of senior status. Junior academics constitute only a relatively small part of the sample.
3. Years employed as an academic

The descriptive statistics for the categorical variable, ‘Years employed as an academic’ indicate a slight deviation from normality, skewed slightly towards fewer years.