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This study focuses on academics, their experiences of work and their academic identities. Over the past three decades, the Higher Education sector in the United Kingdom has been subject to a series of policy initiatives which have dramatically transformed the sector, so that it is barely recognisable from the sector as it existed during the post-war period from 1945 to 1979.

This study focuses on the consequences of these changes for the academic labour process by considering the nature of the work performed by academics and how that work is managed and controlled (Braverman 1974). In addition, the missing subjective element of Braverman’s analysis is provided by an evaluation of academic responses and the formation and reformation of academic identities under identity regulation.

The research strategy centred on the selection of one pre-1992 university and one post-1992 university for a comparative case study. This study is deliberately focused on the reported experiences of academics, whose major role, is teaching and/or research and not manager academics. Consequently, qualitative research which stresses the socially constructed nature of reality and provides rich descriptions is selected.

This study demonstrates that managerialism is deeply entrenched within the university sector. Work intensification continues unabated, whilst academic identities are regulated to achieve managerial objectives which are centred on targets and league tables. Research outputs have been commodified and teaching quality gamed in the new target driven culture pervading the university sector. The intensification of the managerialist impetus with the accompanying loss of academic autonomy and academic voice, is converting universities from institutions of teaching and enquiry to surplus creating business corporations, with academics as wage labourers.
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Chapter 1

Introductory Chapter

1.1 Introduction

This research focuses on academics, their experiences of work and their academic identities. Over the past three decades, Higher Education (HE) in the United Kingdom has been subject to a series of policy initiatives which have dramatically transformed the sector, such that it is barely recognisable as the sector that existed during the post-war period from 1945 to 1979. The policy initiatives, which began in the early 1980s and which have continued to the present day, have involved a departure from the post-war period of neo-corporatist public management and a movement to neo-liberal public management, namely, New Public Management (NPM). This study focuses on the impact of these policy initiatives on the work experience of academics, their academic identities and what it means to be an academic at this current time.

Since 1979, with the election of Margaret Thatcher and the Conservative party, the political landscape under both Conservative and subsequent Labour governments, has witnessed a seismic movement to the political right. The public sector, including HE, has been subjected to a cumulative series of fundamentally political initiatives with regard to its funding, mission and management. The HE policies of Conservative governments since 1979 have not been reversed by the election of successive Labour governments. In addition, the policy changes imposed on HE have their origins in the prevailing political landscape of neo-liberalism rather than being formulated from the needs of the HE sector (Shattock 2008).

As a consequence of the nature of HE policies, the role of the academic has undergone a continuous series of changes over this period of time, which would be indiscernible to the newly appointed academic. Junior academics who are just beginning their academic careers, will not necessarily have experienced these changes and are more likely to consent to the status quo, however this does not mean that these changes have
not occurred or that the academic labour process and academic identities have not changed. Consequently, it is important to document the outcomes of these changes.

This study focuses on the consequences of these NPM policies on the academic labour process by considering the nature of the work performed by academics and how that work is managed and controlled (Braverman 1974). The importance of these policy changes lies in how they are experienced within the academic labour process but also in how and why academics sense of self or social identity is effected or determined by the symbolic changes which result from the implementation of these policies. It is important to note for this study, that academic identity is not a stable entity, it is complex, personal and shaped, as well as being controlled (Alvesson & Willmott 2002a) by institutional factors. As a consequence, this study presents an analysis and evaluation of the effects of policy changes in HE on the academic labour process and academic identities.

This chapter begins with a brief explanation of the historical context for the development of NPM and its basic principles. The justification is provided for the use of LPA and the academic identity framework to assess the impact of NPM policies on academic labour. Following this justification, a resume is provided of the development of HE policies and the increasing marketization of the HE sector. The chapter then discusses the advent of managerialism in HE which began with the Jarratt report and has since included the Rewarding and Developing Staff (RDS) initiative. This is followed by a brief resume of previous empirical work on the academic labour process and academic identities. There is a paucity of recent research which examines the linkages between NPM, the academic labour process and academic identities and consequently this provides the rationale and the specific objectives for this study. The second part of this chapter details and justifies the framework for this study, including the justification for the use of a critical realist research methodology. Finally, the importance of this study is justified, which is followed by an explanation of the structure of the following chapters.
1.2 Background and context of the study

The advent of neo-liberalism in both the UK and the USA has been accompanied by the growing dominance of NPM and the management ideology of managerialism (Klikauer 2015) within both the private and public sectors of the economy. Managerialism is more than just management, it combines management with an ideology and an expansionary impetus (ibid.). Managerialism asserts that “managing” and “management” are universally required in a modern society (Deem et al. 2008:6) and that all organizations can optimize their performance via the use of generic management skills (Klikauer 2015). The delivery of public services under the managerialist ideology has been ascribed the term “New Public Management” (Hood 1991) in the UK and is espoused more fully in Osbourne & Gaebler’s (1992) Reinventing Government in the USA. NPM is composed of several overlapping, but not necessarily consistent components which have been drawn from institutional economics and principal-agent theory (Hood 1995, Pollitt & Bouckaert 2011). Consequently, the terms NPM and managerialism are often used interchangeably in the public sector literature.

In order to evaluate the impact of NPM policies on academics, the perspective of labour process theory, originally conceived by Marx (1969), but revived by Braverman (1974), will provide the guiding theoretical framework. The core of LPA asserts that labour is an input into the production process and has to be controlled in order for capital accumulation (surplus) to occur and this leads to a struggle between capital and labour (Thompson 1990, Jaros 2010). Although this framework was originally applied to work relations within manufacturing (Braverman 1974, Burawoy 1985), it can equally be applied to white collar work (Smith et al. 1996). Academic labour is the input into the process of knowledge production and is subject to increasing controls by university management in order to optimize labour outputs. Consequently, this study will use LPA as the appropriate framework to analyse the work relations of academics.

This study argues that increasing management controls via audit and surveillance have manifested in a degradation of academic labour and a consequent deleterious impact on the academic labour process. The ideology of managerialism asserts that institutional
reform is necessary for the removal of obstacles, so that managers have “the right to manage” (Kliklauer 2015). As a consequence academics may attempt to respond to these management controls to protect their academic autonomy and academic identities. Before moving on to explain the inter-relationship between academic labour process and academic identity, the definition of academic identity will be explored. Identity "loosely refers to subjective meanings and experience, to our ongoing efforts to address the questions "Who am I?" and "How should I act?" (Alvesson et al. 2008:6).

Three theoretical perspectives of identity formation are presented and evaluated, namely, social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner 1979), post-structuralist identity theory and core LPA identity and interests (Marks & Thompson 2010). The theoretical framework provided by core LPA and interests provides the most appropriate framework as it aligns with LPA but also permits workers to act in defence of their symbolic resources for their academic identity. It is recognised that the formation of an identity does not occur on an isolated basis but is formed with reference to and in the context of social relationships and institutions (Halford & Leonard 1999) and is conceived, in this study, as a changing and dynamic concept.

Henkel (2000) identifies the discipline as the primary determinant of academic identities, with the institutional environment as the next most important determinant. Consequently, academic identities are formed and reformed in relation to the work undertaken by academics, namely discipline based teaching and research activities (Deem 2006) as well as in relation to their institutions of work, namely, universities (Henkel 2000). In addition, the common values, such as individual autonomy, which transcend individual disciplines and institutions (Clarke et al. 2013) are also important components of identity formation. However, managerialism as an ideology, via institutional structures, seeks not only to exert control over the academic labour process but also to regulate or control academic identities in order to align them with corporate aims and objectives. This study argues that, as a consequence of these controls, the academic is subject to proletarianisation and this is the generative mechanism for the damaging impact upon academic identities.

This study considers the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities. The bridge between the academic labour process and academic
identities is provided by proletarianisation and the loss of academic autonomy. The justification for this approach is that a focus on the academic labour process can be viewed as an objective exploration of the changing nature of the work performed by academics and how the nature of that work is controlled by management. LPA permits the inclusion of academic behaviour in response to management controls, either to consent or resist, in order to protect their material interests (Marks & Thompson 2010). However, academics may also consent or resist attempts by management to control the symbolic resources which are incorporated in academic identities (ibid.). Academic workers have a perception of themselves as individuals working in particular discipline areas and performing particular roles and in order to protect these perceptions, that is, their academic identities, may resist management controls. The use of an academic identity framework also permits an assessment of the audibility of the academic voice.

1.3 The Higher Education sector in England

The 1980s began with two types of HE Institution, universities and polytechnics. Both were publicly funded and controlled by public sector bodies. Until 1981, English universities were largely autonomous with little government interference. Although there was a close relationship between the state and the universities, universities enjoyed a large degree of autonomy and little state interference (Shattock 2008). However, the policy changes during the 1980s and 1990s demonstrated a clear move towards more central governmental control as universities became more politically salient.

Although Margaret Thatcher did not appear to have any strongly held views with regard to universities and HE (ibid.), her economic and political views resulted in policies which impacted on the HE sector. From the early 1980s onwards, the neoliberal doctrine gained increased momentum which resulted in the increasing marketization of the HE sector. The view of successive governments was that the market was sovereign and HE would be released from the restrictions of the public sector and be subject to competition and market forces. Since the 1992 Further and Higher Education Act, all universities can compete against each other for research funds and subsequently since 1998, with the introduction of student fees, universities
can compete against each other for students. Students would henceforth be buying a service and were to be treated as consumers (Becher & Trowler 2001) or paying customers.

However, the marketization of HE was to be a managed move; the government would retain control of the market by steering rather than directly managing the market. For instance, at the end of 2015, the government still retained control of the size of research funds, but had? temporarily relinquished control over the total number of students who are eligible for state provided student loans. In essence, universities have moved from a state of “autonomy” to one where they are suppliers of student education and knowledge outputs in a market steered by the government. Consequently, the neo-liberalist rhetoric of free markets and competition has not been accurately reflected in the actual provision of HE.

Along with a change in the governance and marketization of universities, the HE sector has undergone a process of massification over the past 30 years, which has impacted on the academic worker. In 1970, only 8.4% of 17-30 year old participated in HE, in 1990 it was 19.3%, in 2000 it was 33% and by 2014 it was 47% (BIS 2 Sept 2015).

Alongside this increase in student numbers, there was a sharp decline in per capita spending per student during the 1990s, but this began to grow, albeit relatively slowly over 2000’s. However, since 2011-12, total HE funding has increased in real terms, although the balance of funding has shifted away from central government to students (IFS 2015).

1.4 The academic worker in Higher Education

The Jarratt Report of 1985 was the fundamental turning point for the introduction of managerialism into universities (Kogan & Hanney 2000). From 1985 onwards, universities transitioned from being self-governing to being publicly governed (Shattock 2008) and the state would now steer universities in order to achieve its national policy objectives (Ferlie et al. 2008, 2009). Although, the election of a Labour government in 1997 appeared to herald the renewal of social democracy via “The Third Way”, this did not change the direction of HE policy (Ferlie & Andresani 2009). The
Dearing Report (1997) and the Bett Report (1999) both highlighted the need for better leadership and a more effective management of people. Subsequently, in 2001, the *Rewarding and Developing Staff (RDS)* initiative was introduced by HEFCE, with a percentage of university funding withheld until a detailed Human Resources policy was produced. This entailed universities moving away from university autonomy built on institutional trust and professional autonomy to regulatory autonomy (Enders et al. 2013), whilst also enabling universities to manage and control academic work to more closely align them with corporate objectives (Waring 2013).

The work relations of academics have been subject to a number of studies (Wilson 1991, Miller 1991, 1996, Halsey 1992). In his 1991 study, Miller examines the impact on academics at Aston University following the funding cuts of the 1980s. In *The Decline of Donnish Dominion*, Halsey (1992) argues that the academic professions are gradually undergoing proletarianization and that managerialism is gradually dominating teaching and research, which is supported by Wilson (1991) and Miller (1995). Willmott (1995) provides the politico-economic justification for using labour process analysis to study academic labour. Further work by Bryson (2004) found that teaching and research academics had different experiences following the changes of the 1990s, but remained optimistic about their work. Dent et al. (2004) argued that NPM has not led to deprofessionalisation and that academics find ways to ameliorate its impacts, which Deiefenback (2009) argues has led to “impression management”. The aim of this study is to provide detailed evaluation of work relations and academic identities in universities at this current time.

Research on the concept of academic identity is often associated with how academics view themselves as professionals and the related concept of professionalism (Nixon et al. 2001, Kolsaker 2008). However, there is no agreement with regard to what is meant by professional or whether academia can be called a profession (Piper 1994, Williams 2008). However, it is more helpful to consider how academics perceive themselves and their work. Friedson (2001), does not discuss professions but instead puts forward a view of professionalism, which is applicable to the profile of an academic. Henkel (2000, 2005) dismisses the concept of professions as unhelpful
when discussing the perception of self and focuses instead on academic identities, which can include the attributes of professionalism.

Henkel’s (2000) Academic Identities and policy change in Higher Education is the seminal study of academic identities in the changing policy environment of HE. Her work recognises that academic identities are formed and reformed via the dynamic between academics, their discipline and their institution. Her unique contribution is in recognising that the institution is an important determinant of academic identity. Government policy changes which penetrate the university alter the relationship between the university and the academic and consequently impact upon research and teaching academic identities. Henkel’s work provides a detailed study of academics across a range of disciplines in eleven universities during the 1990s. Since the publication of her work, there have been no significant or detailed studies of the impact of policy changes on academic identities.

1.5 The justification and aims of this study

It is now appropriate to consider, more fully, the justification for this research. As previously outlined, the HE sector in England has been subject to a continuing series of policy changes over the past 30 years. It will be argued that these policies, implemented under the umbrella of NPM have fundamentally altered the purpose and nature of HE and the experience of academics. There is a dearth of recent research which considers the impact of policy changes from the perspective of the academic worker, utilising a labour process framework. In addition, although Henkel’s work considers academic identities, it is based on empirical evidence from the 1990s (Henkel 2000). Previous studies (Halsey 1992, Bryson & Barnes 2000, Bryson 2004) of academic labour have aggregated the experiences of academics across disciplines or across universities. The work of Miller (2001) documented the experience of academics at Aston University in the 1980s, however, there is a lack of research which compares how the implementation of managerialist controls in different institutions has impacted upon both the academic labour process and academic identities.
This study provides a comparative study of the work relations of academics and academic identities in the light of increasing managerialism within universities. As a consequence, it analyses how changes have been implemented by management in two different types of university and provides an evaluation of how academics have responded to these changes which have been imposed on them and the effect of these changes on their work. The term “imposed” is used deliberately as academics have not been consulted or been a party to policy changes in the HE sector. The technical-rational approach (Knight & Trowler 2001) to change implementation has usually been adopted or alternatively the managerialist mantra of “there is no alternative” (Klikauer 2015).

The aim of this study is to present: A comparative analysis of the work experience of academics and academic identities. This is set against the backdrop of NPM policies which have been imposed on the university sector over the past 30 years.

In order to achieve this aim, this study has a number of objectives:

i) to analyse and evaluate academics' perceptions of their role in a university

ii) to determine and analyse the impact on the academic labour process and academic identities of NPM policies, with respect to the research role

iii) to determine and analyse the impact on the academic labour process and academic identities of NPM policies, with respect to the teaching role

iv) to determine and analyse the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities, with respect to the working environment of academics

1.6 Framework for this study

The framework for this study is the English HE system. Although, many of the NPM initiatives were initially implemented across the United Kingdom, this was not the case for later reforms, hence the decision was made to focus on England. Although the
1992 Further and Higher Education Act abolished the binary divide between the pre-1992 universities and other HE institutions, mainly the former polytechnics, there continues to be a division between these two types of institution. *The Times* and *The Sunday Times* Good University Guide makes awards to “The Best Modern University of the Year”, namely a post-1992 university. In this study, the division is indicated by the use of the terms pre-1992 and post-1992 universities. NPM policies have been applied and implemented across the English HE sector.

In discussing the impact on the academic labour process and academic identities of NPM policies, it is noteworthy to compare the experiences of academics across two types of universities. Although all universities have been subject to the same NPM initiatives, institutional structures determine the nature and extent of their implementation and this leads to differences in their impact on the academic labour process and academic identities.

The research strategy centred on the selection of one pre-1992 university and one post-1992 university for a comparative case study. The two universities are both in the Midlands, are of comparable size, and could be considered as mid ranking in their respective groupings. Given the fragmented nature of the academic profession, in order to provide a richer and deeper understanding of a particular “academic tribe” (Becher & Trowler 2001), it was decided to explore the experiences of academics in the broad area of Management and Business. In addition, the focus of this study is intentionally on the experience of academics, more precisely, employees whose major role, is teaching and/or research and not management. In order to provide a contextualised understanding of the causes (generative mechanisms) of academic identities, a critical realist framework is adopted. A more detailed explanation of the critical realist methodology and the research strategy is provided in Chapter 3. In order to collect the empirical data, academics from both universities were interviewed by the researcher. The interviewees were selected to ensure a cross section of academics across discipline areas, a balanced gender mix and a range of seniority. The research consisted of semi-structured interviews with a duration of sixty to ninety minutes. The evidence provided from the interviews and documentary evidence were analysed using a thematic approach and the findings presented under the headings of the major determinants of
academic identities namely research, teaching, administration and the institutional environment.

1.7 Why is this study important?

This research is important as it privileges the academic worker, by analysing the work relations and perceptions of identity as experienced by academic workers. The adoption of this perspective as opposed to an alternative organizational or managerial perspective enables a deeper and wider understanding of the processes and outcomes, within a university, to which an academic is exposed. As a consequence, it is possible to take a step back and consider the implications of these findings for the current state and future of HE in England.

The research question considers what it means to be an academic in the 21st century. In addition, it reflects upon how neoliberal policies, via managerialism, have impacted upon the HE sector. Moreover, there are also much wider implications with regard to the current and future role of HE in society and, consequently, the future role of the academic worker.

The contribution of this study to the literature is to demonstrate that there is evidence to suggest that the implementation of new management policies in the English HE sector has led to a deterioration of the working conditions of academic workers. This deterioration has contributed to a deleterious impact on academic identities. This study contends that NPM initiatives have impacted negatively on the work of academics and academic identities, which in turn, have radically compromised the quality of HE in England.

The preliminary hypothesis for this study can be stated as: the experience of work for academics and academics perceptions of themselves has been significantly impacted by the implementation of NPM policies which have been introduced into the English HE sector.
1.8 Structure of the study

The structure of this study is as follows:

Chapter 2 begins with an exploration of the origins and development of NPM in the English public sector, including HE since 1979. Secondly, it provides a critical review of the development of labour process theory (LPT) since Braverman’s work in 1974. The chapter then proceeds to provide a review of empirical studies of public sector workers and academics, that have adopted the labour process framework. Thirdly, the chapter outlines three approaches to identity theory before explaining the justification for the use of the core LPA identity and interests framework. The chapter discusses the formation of academic identities and Henkel’s work which relates academic identities to changes in HE. Finally, a justification is provided for the integration of NPM policies, the academic labour process and academic identities to explore the current work experience of academic.

Chapter 3 provides the justification for the adoption of a critical realist stance and a qualitative research strategy. It provides a brief theoretical review of critical realism and a justification for its relevance to this study. It then progresses to a discussion of the research strategy, research design and research methods. Finally, it presents the ethical considerations and limitations of this study.

Chapter 4 presents the findings and the discussion in relation to the academics’ perceptions of their overall role in a university. In addition, it also presents the findings and the discussion in relation to the academics’ research role within the university and how this has been affected by NPM policies, namely the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and Research Excellence Framework (REF). It considers how the implementation of these policies in the two universities have impacted upon the academic labour process and in turn on academic identities.

Chapter 5 presents the findings and the discussion in relation to the impact of NPM policies on the teaching and administrative roles of academics and its consequent
effects on the academic labour process and academic identities. In addition, it presents the findings with regard to how the other material and symbol aspects of the institutional environment, namely: the appraisal process, management, the allocation of work, academic voice and the general working environment have impacted on the academic labour process and academic identities.

Chapter 6 considers the importance and implications of these findings at the present time and then considers the possible future implications of these results for the academic workforce and HE. This chapter begins by restating the aims of this study and providing a brief summary of the findings. It then reaches some conclusions and notes the limitations of this study. Finally, there is a discussion of the likely implications for academics of REF 2021 and the Teaching Excellent Framework (TEF).
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This aim of this study is to assess the impact on the academic labour process and academic identities of NPM policies. More specifically, it is a comparative case study analysis of academics who are employed in two different types of university, with a specific focus on the impact of NPM policies on their experiences. The work experience of academics is undertaken using LPA as put forward by Braverman (1974), whilst the analysis of academic identities follows from the seminal work of Henkel (2000) and the work of Marks & Thompson (2010) with a focus on identity and interests.

This study contends that the source of academic identity is primarily the academic labour process and that in turn, both academic identity and the academic labour process are determined by the mediation of government policies within the institutional structure of universities. Universities are situated within the macro environment of the public sector and have consequently been subject to external political influences from government. The changing experiences of academics can only be fully understood by situating the changes within their historical and political context, that is with reference to the paradigm shift in the provision of public services over the past 30 years.

In order to place this study within the relevant literature, it is necessary to explore the existing literature which relates to the academic labour process, academic identity and interests and NPM. In addition, this study adopts a critical realist methodology which is fully explained in chapter 3. This chapter is organised thematically and begins with an exploration of the origins and development of NPM in the English public sector, including HE since 1979. Secondly, this chapter provides a critical review of the development of labour process theory (LPT) since Harry Braverman’s seminal work in 1974. It then provides a review of empirical studies of public sector workers, before moving on to examine existing work on the academic labour process. Thirdly, this
chapter critically reviews the concept of identity and theorisations of identity, namely, Social Identity Theory (SIT), post-structuralist and core LPA theorisations. It then provides a critical review of the empirical literature on academic identities based on the seminal work of Mary Henkel (2000). In meeting these objectives, the focus will be to critique the existing literature, but also to demonstrate how an understanding of NPM, LPA and identity and interests and their dynamic inter-relationships can provide the foundations for a reasoned understanding of the work experience of academic labour in the most recent past.

2.2 New Public Management

This section of the literature review begins with an examination of the origins and development of NPM in the UK, before moving on to discuss the impact of NPM policies on the HE sector.

2.2.1 The advent of New Public Management

The policies which have been imposed on the English public sector since the early 1980’s, are based on a neo-liberal ideology which is manifested in managerialism and can be identified as “New Public Management” (Hood 1991). As HE in England is a publicly provided service, these policies have been imposed on Universities and have impacted on the academic labour process and in turn on how academics perceive themselves, namely their academic identity (Henkel 2000). In order to assess their potential impact on academic identity and the academic labour process, it is necessary to consider the material, structural and political imperatives which have led to the development and implementation of the NPM reforms in HE.

NPM is an evolving movement or theme of neo-liberal ideas which has been introduced, in various forms, both within and across the services provided by the English public sector (Dent et al. 2004). HE, as a publicly provided service in England has consequently been subjected to these same neo-liberal ideas. Academics have not been singled out as a special case, but are one of the many groups of workers
(professionals), who have been subjected to the implementation of NPM reforms in the public sector.

The contemporary study of public management can be said to have its origins in the curriculums and research of the new public policy schools in America and in the efficiency-driven managerial reforms which originated in the United Kingdom and New Zealand (Lynn 2007). Although NPM, as it came to be called, became a global phenomenon, its implementation in the United Kingdom began with the election of the 1979 Conservative Government. On taking office, the government was faced with a number of economic and political issues. The 1970's were witness to two oil price shocks as well as the destabilizing effects of economic globalization, which all led to increasing pressure on public sector finances (Deem et al. 2007). The Conservative government, armed with its neo-liberal political ideology, sought to regain control of public finances and the public sector by adopting the market orientated policies of the private sector. The eventual outcome of these reforms has completely transformed the public sector to the extent that it could be defined as a “cultural revolution” (ibid. 4).

Before exploring the nature of these reforms, it is useful to briefly explain the foregoing consensus with regard to the role of the public sector.

The post-1945 settlement, with regard to public sector management, was a settlement of three overlapping types: the political-economic, the social and the organisational settlement (Clarke & Newman 1997). The political-economic settlement was based on the compromise between capitalism and socialism via its commitment to a mixed economy based on the Keynesian principles of macro-economic planning and public spending on social and welfare services. In addition, the organizational settlement was based on two modes of coordination: bureaucratic administration and professionalism, which together produced the notion of 'public service' (ibid.). Bureaucratic administration ensured predictable outputs which were socially, politically and personally neutral, whilst the employment of professionals within the public sector provided the trusted knowledge and skills with regard to the causes and solutions of social problems.
"Between the late 1940's and the mid 1970's, then it is possible to see the welfare state as being sustained by a triple social neutrality; first, the bi-partisan political settlement which proclaimed the welfare state ...; second, bureaucratic administration which promised social impartiality; and third, professionalism which promised the application of valued knowledge in the service of the public" (Clarke & Newman 1997:8).

Consequently professionalism was actively sought and viewed as indispensable for the organisation of the welfare state. Professionals, including academics, were valued as experts in their field of knowledge (ibid.).

The economic events of the 1970's increased the financial pressures on government finances and provided the opportunity for the New Right to attack the assumptions of the post-1945 consensus and to construct the perceived crisis of the welfare state. Public spending was now viewed as a wasteful use of resources rather than as a social investment and precipitated the demise of Keynesianism. In addition, the increasing demands for equality and fairness in treatment from various sectors of society resulted in the inevitable attack on the public sector and its organisational form (ibid.).

The criticism by the New Right of the existing order was centred around several themes: the costs of state welfare (that is, the growing levels of taxation); the state as a monopoly provider of goods (depriving consumers of choice); the effect on welfare recipients (they were becoming work shy) and the perceived hostility of bureaucrats to the public and the self-interested conduct of professionals (Deem et al. 2007).

The criticism was not solely concerned with the failure of the public sector to provide choice for consumers, although this was the message being delivered, it also viewed government provision of services as a “perpetually failing” activity (ibid. 9). Consequently, the attack on the public sector was not simply centred around the above criticisms, but it was also an attack on the organizational regimes of the welfare state (ibid.).
Given the "crisis of the Welfare State", how was it to be reconfigured in order to conform to the Conservative government's ideal of the purpose of the public sector? In order to answer this question, this section will briefly discuss the fundamental aims and policies of NPM in the UK, before proceeding to examine the NPM policies in HE.

Following the 1979 general election, Margaret Thatcher introduced a series of reforms which favoured a more “business-like” approach to public sector management whilst Ronald Reagan, US president from 1980-1989 introduced similar reforms in the USA (Pollitt & Bouckaert 2011). This new direction in the management of the public sector in the UK was termed “New Public Management” by Hood (1991), whilst Osborne & Gaebler’s Reinventing Government (1992) put forward a similar, "steer-don't row", prescription for public administration in the USA (Lynn 2007). Pollitt & Bouckaert (2011) view NPM as a coming together of two different ideas, namely, new institutional economics, which includes public choice, transactions cost and principal-agent theory, with an emphasis on 'make the managers manage' and managerialism including professional management, with an emphasis on 'let the managers manage'. Consequently, NPM is not a coherent theoretical paradigm, it is comprised of several overlapping doctrinal components (Hood 1995). These doctrinal components can be summarised as:

- Unbundling of public sector into corporatized units organised by product
- Contract-based competitive provision, internal markets and term contracts
- Stress on private-sector styles of management practice
- More stress on discipline and frugality in resource use
- More emphasis on visible hands-on top management
- Measureable standards and measures of performance and success
- Greater emphasis on output controls

(Hood 1995: 96)

These doctrines were not all equally emphasized in all departments in the UK public sector and neither were they fully consistent with each other and this led to tensions in the implementation of policies. The tensions are created because NPM is an uneasy amalgamation of different ideals. For instance, the principal-agent model is essentially
low trust, whilst managerialism is concerned with leadership and innovation and adopts a more trusting view of the creativity of staff (Pollitt & Bouckaert 2011:10).

Before moving on to discuss the nature of public management reforms, it is useful to pause and draw a distinction between NPM and managerialism. This is pertinent for a study of the work experience of academics. Managerialism can be viewed as a general ideology which serves the interests of those in management roles (Deem & Brehony 2005), whereas NPM (Hood 1991 1995), based on neo-liberalism, defines new forms of administrative doctrines which outline how public services are run and regulated.

“Managerialism … regards managing and management as being functionally and technically indispensable to the achievement of economic progress, technological development and social order … technically and socially, superior to any conceivable form of social practice and organization such as craft, profession or community” (Deem et al. 2008: 6).

In turn, management can be differentiated from managerialism.

“Management is an element of any complex organization, and involves the definition of objectives and the linking of appropriate resources and work structures to their pursuit…. Managerialism … is the condition in which management becomes an end in itself and displaces the values and primary objectives” (Kogan 2004: 2).

This distinction is further defined by Klikauer (2015) who explains that managerialism merges management with ideology and expansion. Managerialism is viewed as an ideology as it seeks to spread its managerial techniques from managerial organisations into wider spheres such as society (Klikauer 2015:1105). Managerialism is an ideology which believes that organizations have more similarities than differences and therefore generic management skills and theory are equally applicable to all types of organizations. “Managerialists pretend to have advanced knowledge and know-how deemed necessary to the efficient running of organizations” (ibid:1104). Consequently, NPM, although not a coherent theoretical paradigm, has its foundations in a neo-liberal
view of society and seeks to determine the nature of public policies, whereas managerialism although it has some affinities with neo-liberalism, is concerned with establishing the superiority of management and management techniques over any other alternatives (ibid.).

In order to introduce this new ideology of managerialism, which challenges and undermines the post 1945 consensus, “new control technologies” are required (Deem, et al. 2007). The aim of these control technologies is to radically reconstruct professional service provider identities (Alvesson & Wilmott 2002b) in order to transform the workings of the public sector to be more akin to the private sector. The reconstruction of academic identities is a necessary outcome of managerialism and NPM.

The introduction of NPM initiatives can be divided into two waves of reform (Pollitt & Bouckaert 2011). The first period from the early 1980s to the 1990s is viewed as a response to the global economic disturbances of the 1970’s. The reaction to these disturbances implied that the welfare state had become unaffordable, ineffective and overly constraining on employers and citizens (ibid.). The second period emerged with the coming to power of New Labour in the 1990s. This latter period, has been defined as a period of “Neo-technocratic managerialism” (ibid.) or “Digital-Era Governance” (Dunleavy et al. 2005) and has been dominated by its increasing emphasis on accountability, audit, metrics and managerialism (Dent et al. 2004). In this later period, governments felt they were losing public trust and that this trust could be regained by offering the public more transparent and responsive public services. Consequently public management, particularly after the financial crisis of 2008, became a politically popular answer to the range of challenges faced by government (Pollitt & Bouckaert 2011). Having provided a general overview of NPM, it is now appropriate to discuss the impact of NPM initiatives on HE.

2.2.2 New Public Management and Higher Education

Since the early 1980s HE has been subject to the ideology of neo liberalism, including the imposition of new public management initiatives, which include marketization, modernization and minimization (Brown & Carasso 2013). It is within this historical
and continually changing context that this study has been undertaken. This section aims to locate the study against the backdrop of recent policy changes in HE. It begins by providing a general overview of the changes in HE policy and then proceeds to discuss the specific policy changes which have impacted on the two traditional functions of academics, namely research and teaching. It concludes by further reiterating that it is within the context of these recent policies that the examination of academic identity and interests is undertaken.

Prior to the 1980s, from an organizational perspective, universities could be viewed as professionalized bureaucracies, reflecting Mintzberg’s ideal type of the professionalized organisation (Mintzberg 1979). However, from the 1980s onwards, HE moved from being self-governing to being publicly governed explicitly, in order to meet national policy objectives (Shattock 2008). The governance of universities (pre-1992) by senate and committees was felt to be too resistant to change and consequently, universities, along with other public services, were now to be subject to "steering" by the state (Ferlie et al. 2008 2009).

Although it would be difficult to argue that universities did not need to change, it was the imposition of a particular ideology, which perceived all public sector service providers to be failing, which is open to criticism (Shattock 2008). The policies which were imposed on HE were not specific to HE and were generally not designed to solve any identified problems within the sector (ibid.). The same generic policies imposed on HE were also imposed on the National Health Service, Social Services, Schools and Further Education and eventually other public service providers.

The changes to HE can be divided into two broad time periods. The first period from 1979 to 1997, began with severe expenditure cuts, but by the mid 1980s NPM policies were being introduced. The Jarratt Report (1985), which had been commissioned by the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP) to consider how universities could operate more efficiently, recommended that lay-dominated governing bodies should have more power and that Vice-Chancellors should take on the role of Chief Executive. The report also recommended that universities “should work to clear objectives, develop performance indicators and achieve value for money” (Harvey
2005: 264). This report is heralded as the turning point for the introduction of
managerialism into universities (Kogan & Hanney 2000). It is now appropriate to
consider more fully the major policy reforms which have impacted on the academic
labour process and academic identity, namely, those concerned with research and
teaching.

In 1983, Swinnerton-Dyer had taken on the role of the chairman of the University
Grants Committee (UGC) and found that there was no transparent mechanism for the
allocation of research funding to the universities. Given that cuts were being imposed
on HE, and that universities needed to be assured that their shrinking allocations were
fairly allocated, he implemented a “research selectivity exercise” to assess the quality
of research. As a result, in 1986, each university department was assessed on the basis
of just five research outputs from the previous five years and a submission of “up to
four pages” on the department's strengths (THE 2013). It was the first attempt to assess
the quality of university research and consequently it was imperfect and subject to
much criticism (Phillimore 1989). The performance indicators which were used not
only affected the allocation of research funds, but also the public perceptions and
reputations of individual academics (Bence & Oppenheimer 2005).

The second assessment in 1989, following the criticisms of the 1986 exercise, included
a number of significant changes, including the request that each academic could submit
two articles for assessment (ibid.). The 1989 assessment was better received that the
first assessment, however, it was still subject to significant criticisms by both
universities and academics (ibid.). Again, further amendments were made for the next
research assessment, now called the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) in 1992.
For this assessment exercise, academics were required to submit up to two publications
and two other forms of public output (ibid.) for each selected academic and the total
number of publications for the department.

The 1992 Further and Higher Education Act abolished the binary line, which removed
the distinction between polytechnics and universities. Polytechnics were now able to
take on the title of university and as a consequence were able to play a full part in the
RAE of 1996. For this assessment, only “research active” academics were required to
submit up to four publications for assessment. Research was graded according to seven
possible ratings scores. However, in order to ensure that research funds were selectively allocated no funding was allocated to academic departments with the lowest rating scores, as in 1992. By 1996, research assessment and the funding of research had evolved from an initial low key quantitative evaluation in 1986 to a qualitative evaluation via the use of performance indicators.

Along with the auditing of research quality as outlined above, there has been the introduction of the quality assurance agenda. According to the HEFCE, quality assurance exists to assess “the quality of education in institutions …” (HEFCE 2016). However, Morley (2003) puts forward the more cynical view that it "was introduced as a regulatory device for the process of production rather than as a check on the quality of the product itself" (Morley 2003: 15). In 1986, the Reynolds committee, which had been set up to consider academic standards, put forward formal codes of practice covering external examiners and postgraduate studies (Morley 2004: 15). The auditing of universities was further extended following the 1991 White Paper Higher Education: A new framework which put forward new audit procedures for quality assurance and recommended that the new Funding councils have responsibility for the quality of teaching and learning (ibid.).

Consequently, from 1993 teams of senior academics were sent into universities, by the newly formed HEFCE, to assess the quality of teaching. A 1993 White Paper Realising Our Potential stated that all universities were to have their education provision “assured” and in addition that ‘accountability’ to the taxpayer was to be enforced (Cabinet Office 1993). These pronouncements could be viewed as signalling a movement from quality control to quality assurance and enhancement. This is significant as quality control implies inspection at the end of the production line, whilst “assurance involves auditing mechanisms and systems for quality management embedded in every stage of the production process” (Morley 2004:16). Consequently, teaching by academics was no longer to be assessed by a consideration of their examination papers and marking, but assessed continuously throughout the teaching process. By the end of this period, both research and the quality of teaching were subject to performance measurement with the rankings made publicly available.
The second period of change began in 1997 with the election of the new Labour government. During this second period, there were a further three research assessment exercises in 2001, 2008 and 2014. Following the 1996 RAE, extensive consultations and revisions were made for the forthcoming RAE in 2001. There was increasing evidence of manipulation and game playing by universities, including the non-inclusion of some academics’ work and consequently their designation as non “research active”.

The 2001 exercise required academics to submit four outputs for assessment and was the most rigorous and thorough exercise to date (Roberts 2003). It altered processes in order to achieve greater consistency between subject areas (units of assessment), the acceptance of e-publications and included more non-UK members on the panels. In addition, more recognition was given to the particular circumstances of academics, e.g. stage of their career. As in the previous two research exercises funding was not awarded to the lowest scoring submissions.

However, by this date it had "evolved into an intense competition in which HEIs strived not only for funding but also for prestige" (ibid. paragraph 63). The results demonstrated that 55% of academics were now working in departments rated as excellent as opposed to 33% in 1996 (HMT et al. 2006). Four reasons can be put forward for this huge increase in top rated research: increased quality, grade inflation, more strategic submissions or a combination of all three (Brown & Carasso 2013). Given that prestige and reputation management were now important determining factors, university strategy and game playing were beginning to have important repercussions for the academic worker.

The 2008 research assessment exercise still required academics to submit four outputs but it enabled "pockets of excellence" to be identified and funded, as opposed to providing an overall grading for a submission. However, despite the fact that 90% of funds were now received by 48 universities as opposed to 38 universities prior to 2008, research funds were still allocated selectively which led to increased concentration (Brown & Carasso 2013). Consequently, the majority of universities received little or no research funding, but continued to make submissions, despite its cost to the university. In 2003, Roberts proposed that teaching-focused institutions could opt out
of the "ever-expanding RAE" in return for a base level of funding to sustain research capabilities, but this was rejected (Roberts, 2003). This suggests that research submissions were no longer concerned with funding research but with reputation management and demonstrated "competition through emulation" (Brown & Carasso 2013). As a consequence of the increasingly competitive nature of the research assessment exercise, it was inevitable that pressure would be exerted on academics by university management and would impact upon the labour process and academic identity.

In 1997 the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) was established which continued the “subject reviews” of teaching until 2001. However, in this year a group of Economics Professors at Warwick University wrote a letter to The Guardian newspaper which heavily criticised the processes of their subject review (Guardian 2001). This raised much further discussion in HE journals and led to the resignation of the Chief Executive of the QAA and the complete revision of the process (THE 2013). Consequently, from 2002 to 2005 there was a partial reduction in the auditing of HE in recognition of the escalating bureaucratic burden of the QAA requirements (ibid.) and a lighter touch was introduced, which no longer included subject reviews, but focused on whether universities had the correct auditing processes in place.

However, in 1995, in return for abandoning subject reviews, the HEFCE introduced the National Student Survey (NSS) in which all final year students are asked to complete a questionnaire regarding the quality of their student experience at their university. The results are collated for each course and university and made publicly available to parents and potential students. This consumer model of student satisfaction was described as “a hopelessly inadequate improvement tool” by Harvey (UCU 2010) and as an indicator of “how well student customers’ expectations have been managed” (ibid.) rather than a reliable indicator of teaching quality. The involvement of academics in the assessment of teaching quality was not mentioned (ibid.). In addition, although the HEFCE stated that “the design of the NSS means that there are limitations on its use for comparative purposes…” (HEFCE, 2010: 4), this did not prevent private sector organisations and universities from using NSS results to make comparative
quality judgements between and within universities and consequently on the academic worker.

In addition to the introduction of the NSS, there was an increasing demand for more information from universities on the outcomes of academic courses, including employment and salary data of graduating students. In addition, as a component of the ‘key information set’ (KIS data), universities were also required to publish information with regard to student completion rates (HEFCE 2010). As this information is important for “reputation management” (Brown & Carasso 2013: 175), it could be used by university managers to exercise pressure on academics into achieving benchmark pass rates on modules.

Alongside the above changes to the assessment of research and teaching quality, was the introduction of the 2001 Rewarding and Developing Staff (RDS) initiative and the subsequent movement to a single pay spine for all academics and administrative workers from 2004-2007, with "more local flexibility and payments for personal contribution" (ibid. 187). This initiative was effectively the introduction of Performance Management and Performance Related Pay (Waring 2013), whereby universities were able to use general or specific performance indicators, including research outputs, NSS data and module pass rates, to assess “academic performance” and to determine pay, although it was not implemented with the same level of zeal in all universities.

These NPM policies had two major impacts on academics: loss of autonomy and loss of trust (Enders et al. 2013). The reforms entailed a move away from university autonomy, built on institutional trust and linked to professional autonomy, towards a new organizational autonomy or “regulatory autonomy” (ibid.). "Regulatory autonomy” captures the use of organizational autonomy as a tool of governmental control, with the aim of aligning university goals with those of the government. However, an increase in accountability involves the parallel view of a loss of trust (Trow 1996). This loss of trust can be demonstrated by the implementation of micro-management control technologies to ensure that academics do not compromise university performance and reputation, for instance, with regard to the REF (Amaral et
al. 2008). In addition, increasingly complex governance regimes and control technologies have "institutionalized distrust" in the capacity of public service workers to act in the public interest (Deem et al. 2007).

In summary, there has been a major paradigm shift with regard to the delivery and management of public services. Managerialism, under the auspices of NPM, began to be implemented with the election of the Conservative government in 1979. The principles of NPM pervaded all the policies enacted on public service providers, including universities. The Jarratt Report (1985) signalled the beginning of NPM policies on HE, which have fundamentally changed the governance of universities, their role in society and as a consequence the experience of being an academic worker. Thus, it is now pertinent to consider LPT which will provide the foundation for examining the work experience of academics.

2.3 Labour Process Analysis

This section of the literature review will seek to explain the development of LPA over the past 40 years and why it is the relevant framework for the study of academic labour. The discussion begins with a brief overview of Braverman’s landmark publication in 1974 of Labour and Monopoly Capital and what came to be called the first phase of LPA. This is followed by an appraisal of the second phase of LPA, where Braverman’s contribution was recognised but also criticized on a number of fronts. The third phase of LPA was characterised by the formulation of a core theory, but also a debate concerning the “missing subject” which eventually led to several academics leaving the “labour process community”. This section is then followed by a brief overview of later developments in LPA. The final sections discuss how the labour process framework has been used to explore the experiences of public sector workers and academics.

2.3.1 Braverman’s Labour Process Analysis

Although, the “labour process” was originally conceived by Marx in the nineteenth century (Braverman 1974), it was not taken up for the study of work relations until the late twentieth century. The development of LPT research and writing is commonly
referred to as having a number or overlapping phases or waves. The first phase began in 1974 with the publication of Harry Braverman’s *Labour and Monopoly Capital* and although this was not the only work in this period which focussed on the labour process, it was this work which sparked controversy and led to a concentrated and developing focus on the labour process.

Braverman (1974) builds upon Marx’s analysis of the dynamics of capitalist development. In order for capitalists to maximize profits, valorisation is essential. Valorisation involves a two stage process, firstly, surplus value has to be extracted from the worker and secondly, this value has to be realised when the product is sold, thereby creating profit for the capitalist. In order to maximize profit, surplus value must be maximized and this requires the capitalist to exercise control over labour. For capitalists to acquire control over the labour process, they must reduce the level of control exercised by labour. This reduction in worker control over their labour process is achieved by “deskilling” the workforce.

Braverman explores how the application of ‘modern’ management techniques (Taylorism), along with mechanisation and automation, led to the inevitable tendency towards the degradation and deskilling of work. He asserts that the control of the labour process is achieved by the deskilling of labour. Labour is deskilled as the conception of the task is separated from the execution of the task. Management takes over the role of the conception of the task, while the worker executes the task. It is contended that there is a tendency for tasks to be divided from one another and then increasingly subdivided, so that conception is concentrated, insofar as possible, in limited groups within management. The traditional content of skill is destroyed and an increasingly homogeneous workforce is created which is excluded from entering the ranks of management (Braverman 1974: 443-4).

In the second half of *Labor and Monopoly Capital*, Braverman surveys the conditions and consequences of the other effects of the rapid accumulation of capital in the monopoly era. Several of the areas surveyed are pertinent to this research. Firstly, he notes the growing influence of the state in regulating every sphere of the economy as well as the construction of a dual labour market through the casualization of labour. He
also attends to the condition of a range of “intermediate” occupations, which enjoy a “privileged market position” (ibid. 407). These intermediate occupations would include engineers, accountants, nurses and teachers. These groups could not be classed as any “part of the class that personifies capital and employs labour” (ibid. 405) or as members of the class whose labour they “help to control, command and organize” (ibid.405). However, due to the dynamics of capitalist development, their work is continuously subjected to a process of fragmentation and degradation, and consequently, it is anticipated that workers in these intermediate occupations will increasingly experience their work in ways that strengthen their affinity with “the mass of working-class employment” (ibid. 408).

This study notes the increasing influence of the of the state, through NPM policies on the HE sector and will put forward the view that the advent of modern management techniques, namely managerialism, has led to the "intermediate" category of workers, namely, academics experiencing degradation and deskilling of their work.

2.3.2 The Second Wave of Labour Process Analysis

From the late 1970s to the late 1980s, LPT experienced a second wave of interest which focused on the UK (Thompson & Smith 2010) and included some major criticisms of Braverman’s work. Three criticisms are pertinent to this study; they relate to deskilling, management strategy and Braverman’s objectivist framework. The concept of “deskilling” was attacked on a number of fronts, which included the romanticising of craft work. Additionally, it was argued that there are other variables such as pay and conditions, work intensity and progression opportunities which can determine job quality, apart from skill (Grugulis & Lloyd 2012). However, these variables can easily replace deskilling when discussing the degradation of work. In Braverman’s defence, most of the criticisms of deskilling are at a level of “fine-grained detail”, of a work which was intended to provide an overview of trends and a stimulus for the revitalisation of critical studies of work and class (Littler 1990).

The second criticism of Braverman’s work is with regard to management strategy. Braverman exclusively identified the principles of Taylorism for designing work and
controlling labour. Friedman (1977) criticises Braverman for confusing one particular strategy for exercising managerial authority in the capitalist labour process with managerial authority itself and puts forward an alternative strategy of “responsible autonomy”, where workers are given more discretion over the immediate production process. Other commentators have stressed the importance of appreciating the coexistence of differing dimensions, mechanisms and levels of control that mediate particular capital-labour relations (Thompson 1983, Friedman 1990). Even if all workplaces attempt common methods of control, the outcomes will be variable and diverse given the differentiated nature of capital and the owners of labour power. This was evidenced in the work of Burawoy (1985) where he found similar labour processes in American and Hungarian factories, but with a harsher discipline which emanated from a stronger control imperative from the Communist party officials. It has also been demonstrated that workers ‘buy into’ the system at work, via the processes of seduction, surveillance and self-discipline (Knights & Willmott 1989). Ackroyd & Thompson (1999) argue that workers retain the resources to resist, misbehave or disengage and categorise worker misbehaviour into four areas: working time, working effort, the product of work and work identities and this could be seen as a way in which workers attempt to recover some of their lost autonomy (Fleming 2001).

The final and perhaps most significant criticism of Braverman’s work is his decision to use an objectivist framework in which the “subjective dimension” of class is not included in the analysis. This is because Braverman believed that the ‘objective’ and ‘subjective’ can be separated and that the former can be discussed independently of the latter. Braverman concentrates on the ‘objective’ dimension of class on the grounds that that “the development of a class for itself is conditional upon the objective conditions... which ferment this revolutionary consciousness” (Littler 1990:10). However, Burawoy (1979) argues that the inclusion of the subjective is important in not only explaining labour’s antagonism but also its compliance and consent to managerial controls. For example, Burawoy (1979) highlighted the notion of “making out”, whereby employees creatively find time and space to pursue their own objectives within the broad rules set by managers. He argues that in this way, the workers consent to managerial controls, although it could be argued that this could also be a demonstration of resistance to control.
How will these three potential criticisms be dealt with in this study? Firstly, deskilling is only one component of the degradation of work. In this study, the term deskilling will be used, for instance, to indicate that the management of teaching and even consultation about the management of teaching have been rescinded. In addition, other conditions of work will also be taken into account when addressing the issue of degradation, for example, the continuous monitoring of performance, the increase in lower skilled administrative tasks and the lack of recognition or promotion prospects if certain research targets are not achieved.

Secondly, as already noted, managerialism as a modern form of management will be shown to have the same deleterious impact as Taylorism. It will also be demonstrated that the implementation of the same policies in two different universities does not necessarily have the same impact on the academic workforce. It will also explore, to what extent, academics ‘buy into’ the university system and to what extent they resist in order to retain some autonomy and their academic identity. Additionally this study will consider how workers resist or do not resist the new managerial imperatives.

Although Braverman (1974) used an objectivist framework, he did not deny the existence of the subjective dimension. Consequently, this study will use a broadly labour process framework with the inclusion of the objective and subjective dimensions. The subjective dimension will be incorporated by the consideration of how academics react to changes in the labour process by their attempts to maintain or re-create their academic identities.

2.3.3 The Third Wave of Labour Process Analysis

A third overlapping wave of labour process research and writing existed from the mid-1980s to the end of the 1990s (Thompson & O’Doherty 2009). This was a controversial period for LPT as it appeared to be fighting two major battles. The first battle was a defensive battle fought against the newer perspectives of new economies, flexible specialization and post-Fordism. ‘New economies’ were knowledge economies and were based on individualized, consumption-orientated actors. The prevalent view
was that old economies had been based on command and control work relations whereas ‘new economies’ had “collaborative high-trust, high commitment work relations” (Thompson & Smith 2010:15). Although ‘new economies’ may have been expected to change work relations in universities, in practice, there has been no discernible positive impact on employee relations in the university context.

The second battle consisted of a bitter debate within the labour process paradigm, which eventually led to a serious rift between the consolidators and the reconstructionists (Thompson & O’Doherty 2009). The latter group eventually left the LPT fold and re-badged their work as Critical Management Studies (CMS). The consolidators perceived that there were common concepts which prevailed in labour process research which they wished to reinforce and put forward as a core theory to differentiate them from the seemingly contradictory case studies about skill, control and related issues. On the other hand, the reconstructionists aimed to reconstruct LPT “to develop a more adequate, materialist theory of subjectivity” (Willmott 1990: 337). This came to be called the “the missing subject” debate. The different directions of the consolidators and the reconstructionists will now be elaborated as they are relevant for this study.

Thompson (1990), as one of the consolidators, put forward a core theory for labour process analysis. LPT is distinctive in that the role of labour and the capital-labour relation is privileged as a focus for analysis (ibid.). Four key features are identified as being relevant for the analysis of the capitalist mode of production. Firstly, as surpluses are derived from labour and appropriated by capital, this justifies the privileging of labour in academic analysis. Secondly, the labour process is continuously being transformed due to the logic of accumulation that compels capital to revolutionize the production of goods and services resulting from the competition between capitalists. Thirdly, in order to secure this transformation, capital must retain control, although there is no requirement for this control to take any specific form. Finally, given the dynamics of exploitation and control, forms of conflict and resistance are endemic to capitalist relations of production and result in a structured antagonism between capital and labour (Edwards 1990:128). However there is recognition that the effective transformations of the labour process cannot rely wholly on control or coercion, “at
some level workers’ co-operation, creative and productive powers, and consent must be engaged and mobilized” (Thompson 1990:101). As a consequence, what is of analytic significance is the social form of labour, that is, wage-labour, rather than the end product or service produced by labour (Brook 2013).

The core theory of LPA is the foundation of the analysis in this study. Academic workers are the labour which is privileged for analysis in the context of universities that compete against each other for students and research funds. In addition, the implementation of NPM policies and managerialism within universities attempts to ensure that academic workers are controlled in order to meet the competitive demands of the university. However, these controls result in a structured antagonism between management and academic workers and may result in consent or resistance. In addition, although direct and indirect controls in the form of surveillance and appraisal of academic work, are necessary they are not sufficient to exert control, therefore universities will also attempt to gain the co-operation and consent of their academic workers in order to achieve their strategic objectives.

Marks & Thompson (2010) argue that the reconstructionists (post structuralists) have a particular view of subjectivity and this view is encapsulated in “identity”. However, identity is defined as precarious and insecure and socially constructed from discourse, with a focus on self-exploration rather than the dynamics of the employment relationship (ibid. 317). In addition, identity work, defined as an “interpretive activity involved in reproducing and transforming self-identity” (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002: 627), may be undertaken by workers. In this view, identity work is perceived as the driver to attain a secure and stable sense of self. An alternative understanding of the concept of identity will be used in this study and is discussed shortly.

It can be argued that the Marks and Thompson view may accurately represent post structuralist research in the 1990s, but not of later research concerning identity and resistance, where the methodology has moved towards the adoption of an “extra-discursive”, materialist frame of reference” (Jaros 2010: 74). In addition, Jaros (2010) argues that despite the claims made with regard to their differences, the core LPT protagonists (consolidators) and the post modernists (reconstructionists) have more in
common than they publicly admit and that there has been a movement towards a more
common approach.

Friedman (2004) put forward three possible alternative approaches to incorporating the
so called “missing subject”. The first approach is the “sense of justice or fairness”
approach. This approach puts forward the view that how workers and managers
perceive the fairness of the interaction between workers and managers will influence
their actions in the labour process. This study incorporates this view by interpreting
how fairly academics believe they are being treated in their interactions with university
management and their corresponding response. For instance, an academic who
believes that being set a two week deadline for marking work is not fair may decide to
resist and not meet the deadline.

The second alternative approach draws on Veblen (1899) who asserted that much of
human behaviour is motivated by a desire to feel better than others and in particular to
act in ways which lead others to feel envious of us (Friedman 2004). Veblen was
particularly interested in how this manifested itself at an individual level and coined the
terms conspicuous consumption and conspicuous leisure. In the context of this
research, managers would wish to draw a clear dividing line between them and
academic workers and consciously or unconsciously find ways of demonstrating that
they are “superior” to academic workers. It will be particularly interesting to explore
the extent of such behaviour and any reactions to it, within the two universities.

The third alternative solution to tackling subjectivity put forward by Friedman (2004),
is to integrate the concept of emotional labour (Hochschild 1983) into LPA. Emotional
labour can be explained as “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable
facial and bodily display” (Hochschild 1983:7) by service workers. This has the effect
of alienating service workers, who are required to adopt a set of management
determined feelings in order to enact specific public displays of emotion in their
interactions with customers for commercial purposes. Hochschild (1983) put forward
the view that workers undergo a “transmutation of feelings”, which results in private
feelings being packaged into public displays of emotions which are "consumed by
customers as a commodified interaction” (Brook 2009: 533). The requirement for
workers to display such emotions can result in “surface acting” or “deep acting” (Hochschild 1983). However, it is acknowledged that there are intermediate states of 'acting' between these two extremes (Taylor 1988, 1999) which results in an 'incomplete transmutation of feelings' (Brook 2013: 335). Consequently, emotional labour is theorised as an ‘aspect of labour power’ and as ‘sold for a wage’, and consequently a revised version of Hochschild's concept is compatible with its integration into LPA (Brook 2013).

Hochschild’s concept has been subject to a number of criticisms with regard to its “inability to capture the complex and contradictory experience of emotional labour and its control by management” (Brook 2013: 335) and this has led to attempts to reorient her theorisation (ibid.). However, Brook (2013) argues that the major weakness of Hochschild's theorisation derives from her focus on “workers’ individualised experiences” (ibid.). Although Hochschild's work recognises the activities of the collective emotional labourer, she is not able to explain them or how they relate to the individual worker. The integration of emotional labour into LPA would provide such an explanation.

The concept of emotional labour can be justifiably integrated into LPA as its theorisation of emotional labour is ‘'sold for a wage' and 'an aspect of labour power' (Brook 2013: 333). More importantly, emotional labour is understood as an "inseparable dimension of labour power" rather than as a discrete variant (ibid.). In addition and in accordance with LPA, the experience of the worker can be analysed not in an individual capacity but collectively as an essential determinant of workplace social relations.

Consequently this study will put forward the view that academic workers are required to exert physical, mental and emotional effort in combination and simultaneously in order to perform their role. For example, in order to perform the role of teacher in a classroom situation, emotional labour is expended in combining the physical and mental effort as well as in interacting and reacting to the student in order to provide the required service. In addition, mental and emotional labour is required when interacting with colleagues and management. Emotional labour is understood in its widest sense as
put forward by Hochschild (1983) rather than the much narrower concept of emotion management (Bolton 2005).

In conclusion, this study will endorse the view that subjectivity is not “missing” within LPA. Traditionally the core labour process theorists recognised that resistance provided an element of subjectivity. However, the incorporation of emotional labour into LPA provides a formal inclusion of subjectivity and enables a richer analysis of workplace social relations.

2.3.4 Recent developments in Labour Process Analysis

Since the beginning of the 21st century, LPT has developed and now incorporates the expansion of labour indeterminacy to include not only labour effort in the workplace but also the ability of the worker to quit his place of work (Smith 2006) as well as embracing a realist methodology (Ackroyd 2009). Both of these developments will now be discussed.

Smith (2006) develops LPT by dividing labour power into two elements: effort and mobility power. He determines that labour indeterminacy has two components, consisting of labour effort and labour mobility. This is the double indeterminacy of labour power. Conventional LPT has concentrated on the former with much less emphasis on the latter. Smith (2006) argues that the mobility choices of workers and the retention strategies of employers are closely related to the organisation of the labour process.

Labour indeterminacy is conventionally defined in terms of labour effort which could more specifically be called ‘production indeterminacy’ (Smith 2006). In this study, production in universities can be defined as the production of research outputs and the provision of teaching services. When the employer hires labour power, what the employer receives and what the worker provides in terms of labour effort is indeterminate. Whilst the unit of payment can be predetermined, the amount of effort expended by the worker for a unit of payment cannot be determined in advance. This indeterminacy of labour effort is the subject of conflict between capital and labour. In
addition, new competitors, new techniques, new managers or new ways of organising work will render any established work effort agreements vulnerable to change. The HE institutions have been subject to all of these changes.

The introduction of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) in 1986, which was superseded by the Research Excellence Framework (REF) has led to an increase in competition between universities in order to maximise their research ratings and research funds, under academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie 1997), in relation to research paper outputs. Traditional non-profit making universities now also compete with profit making universities for home and foreign students. The continual development and introduction of new technology has changed the nature of the teaching process and the advent of NPM techniques, along with new ways of organising teaching have all led to major changes in the work effort agreements in Universities. Consequently, the academic labour process is undergoing a continuous process of change as a result of labour indeterminacy.

However, there is a second type of indeterminacy which relates to the ability of the worker to terminate his contract with one employer and to work for another employer (Smith 2006). Smith argues that the individual or work group could use the threat of quitting to re-negotiate the working arrangements within the firm. He continues by arguing that earlier work (Edwards 1979, Friedman 1977, Kelly 1985) on employment relations has emphasized effort bargaining over exit bargaining as the former provides gains for the average worker. Exit bargaining is regarded as having no effect on the internal production regime or is only available to selected workers. In addition, ‘quitting was unable to resolve collective grievances, and it was therefore not necessarily a strategy that furthered worker’s interests as a whole, although it did of course permit individual workers to escape to a preferred job’ (Edwards & Scullion 1982: 92). However, Smith continues to put forward the view that quitting may be viewed as “a signalling device that can force change in management regimes, especially within competitive labour markets” (Smith 2006: 393).

Theoretically, there may be a case for investigating the threat of quitting as a response to being dissatisfied with conditions at work, but unfortunately, it is unlikely to be
supported with empirical evidence. Firstly, it would seem to imply that employers as demanders of labour power and workers as suppliers of labour power have equal power within the labour market. Although this may be the theoretical viewpoint of neo-liberal economics, this is not what is observed in English labour markets in the 21st century. More commonplace is the individual worker bargaining with a relatively more powerful buyer of labour in the market, for example, the doctoral student who has just obtained a doctorate applying to a university for employment. This second form of labour indeterminacy applies in a competitive market, where there are many buyers and sellers of labour services. This is not the case in the English HE system as there are few universities relative to the number of academics. An individual academic may threaten to quit one university to work for another university and attempt to re-negotiate their existing working arrangements. However, this is unlikely to be a successful strategy for an individual academic although it may prove to be an effective strategy for a group of academics.

In addition, LPA has become more explicitly linked with critical realism (Thompson & Vincent 2010). It is recognised that LPA is applicable to an analysis of a specific (bounded) workplace environment. However, it is also recognised that the workplace does not exist in a vacuum and that there exist external causal phenomena which can influence and impact upon the workplace environment. Consequently, the layered ontology put forward by critical realism permits the integration of external influences into the analysis of the work environment.

“Realism contends that there is a real world independent of the knowing subject and there are distinctive causal processes in human relations that involve chains of connected events. These generative mechanisms produce outcomes whether or not the human subjects involved in them are aware of their existence” (Ackroyd 2009).

This study will adopt a critical realist methodology in conjunction with LPA, in order to explore and explain the generative mechanisms which have impacted upon the academic labour process and consequently upon academic identity and interests. A more detailed explanation of the inherent consistency of critical realism with LPA is
provided in the following chapter. However, at this stage it can be stated that the
generative mechanisms at the national (macro) level or at the local (meso) level,
notably government inspired NPM policies and the context of their implementation
need to be ascertained. Consequently, when comparisons are made between two groups
of academic workers and differences are observed, there are two possible explanations:
differences in the academic labour process or differences in the context (university) in
which they operate. Both of these possibilities are explored in this study.

In summary, LPT is more than just a study of work; it can be viewed as a species of
“normal science” as it incorporates theory, historical studies and empirical research
(Ackroyd 2009). Moreover, LPT is not only a theory of workplace behaviour, but a
study of workplace behaviour within the context of contemporary capitalism with its
complex set of institutions and dynamic processes. In relation to this study, LPT will
be used to analyse the experience of academics, within the broadly political framework
of neo-liberalism, in the context of NPM and managerialism, within two different
universities.

In conclusion, LPT emphasises “the dynamics of control, consent and resistance at the
point of production” (Thompson & Smith 2010: 11). Core LPT asserts that:

“capitalist labour processes are characterized by capital’s need to control
labour; a logic of accumulation that impels refinements in technology and
administration: a fundamental, structured antagonism between capital and
labour; and because it is the place where labour is valorised, the ‘labour
process’, the point of production, is privileged for analysis” (Jaros 2010:71).

Consequently, this study will determine and analyse the direct and indirect controls on
academic labour in the work environment of structured antagonism. In addition, it will
consider the responses of academics, that is, the extent of their consent and resistance,
to these controls in order to defend their academic identities and material interests. This
study focuses on the experiences of academics and consequently privileges the
academic for analysis as understood in LPA.
2.4 White collar workers and Labour Process Analysis

Up until the 1990s, LPT had only been applied to ‘blue-collar’ workers. However, Smith, et al. (1996) argued that it is equally valid to apply labour process concepts to higher white-collar workers in order to uncover their experience of work. This present study identifies academics as higher white-collar workers and will utilize a labour process framework to examine their experiences of work.

“...almost all of the population has been transformed into employees of capital. Almost every working association with the modern corporation or with its imitative offshoots in governmental or so-called non-profit organizations, is given the form of the purchase and sale of labor power” (Braverman 1974: 404).

Before going on to discuss some of the existing research on the academic labour process, it is instructive to outline some of the findings from studies of other public sector workers. The aim is to demonstrate that the experiences of other public sector workers, who have also been subject to NPM policies, are similar to those of academic workers. The main findings relate to work intensification, de-skilling and degradation, surveillance and the quality/identity nexus.

2.4.1 Labour Process Analysis and public sector white collar workers

Given the emphasis on efficiency and cost savings, unsurprisingly, work intensification is the main finding of many studies. In their study of further education lecturers, Mather et al. (2007 2009) provide evidence for the existence of work intensification and extensification, which followed the passing of the 1992 Further and Higher Education Act. This Act increased the maximum weekly teaching hours from 21 to 23 hours per week, the in-attendance requirement was raised from 9 to 14.5 hours a week and lecturers’ holiday entitlement was reduced from 60 to 35 days. These contractual changes alone represented a significant increase in work intensification.
The aim of ‘workforce remodelling’ for teachers was to free up time by allowing teaching assistants to perform ‘non-essential’ administrative tasks (Carter & Stevenson 2012). However, this did not reduce the number of hours worked by teachers. The time which was made available was quickly filled with increased expectations, demands and initiatives to raise the level of student performance. In essence, the teacher’s work had become intensified; the number of hours worked did not fall and the removal of less demanding tasks, increased the intensity of their work.

In addition, research on other public sector workers throws light on the extent of de-skilling, degradation of work and resistance. De-skilling was evident in Further Education as lecturers were teaching courses outside their areas of specialism (Mather et al. 2007, 2009). However, with regard to teachers, de-skilling has not been an obvious outcome of the workforce remodelling: teachers have shed some of the less skilled, administrative tasks but gained more managerial ones (Carter & Stevenson 2012). Although there was some collective and individual resistance by lecturers in Further Education to the new work practices, this served to slow the process and mitigate some of the effects rather than prevent their introduction.

Lecturers in Further Education found themselves increasingly under surveillance via the observation of lecturer performance in the classroom, ‘student voice’ and CPD (Mather & Seifert 2014). Although intensified observation was declared to be a developmental tool by management and was purported to enhance professionalism, it was viewed by lecturers as a chore (due to the preparation of detailed lesson plans), a slight on their professionalism and a management tool to punish the transgressors (ibid. 105). The lecturers were fearful of ‘failing’ as failure was punishable with disciplinary measures (Mather et al. 2007 2009).

Nurses were particularly concerned with their view of quality and its assessment and the contrasting views of management. Hospital management sought to change the hospital culture to customer care and quality consciousness. However, for managers the assessment of quality was in terms of outcome: cost-effectiveness, patient turnover and patients’ complaints. In contrast, the nurses outlined quality care in terms of structure (health care setting), process (how care is delivered) and outcome (patient
satisfaction). There are clearly contradictory tensions within a system which attempts to combine the provision of a quality service for patients and a “value for money” service (Bolton 2004).

Research with regard to the labour process of nurses and lecturers in Further Education has found that professional identity has an important role to play in studies of labour process. Bolton (2004) found that the sense of professional identity led nurses to provide quality care for the increasing number of patients, thus accommodating work intensification but it also allowed them to resist some of the demands of management. Lecturers in Further Education self-identify as professionals and their identity has been eroded through “measures to cheapen the lecturer labour force, rendering it more easily replaceable, manageable, compliant and flexible” (Mather et al. 2009: 153).

Having considered some research findings with regard to other public service workers, it is now appropriate to discuss empirical work with regard to academic workers.

2.4.2 The Academic Labour Process

The examination of academic work in England under a broadly labour process framework began in the early 1990s with the publication of White-Collar work: the non-manual labour process edited by Smith et al. (1991), which included work by Miller on the academic labour process. Further analysis of the academic labour process was published by Wilson (1991) and Willmott (1995).

Willmott (1995) provides one of the earliest and most insightful analyses of the changing academic labour process during the 1980s. His work provides the politico-economic justification for the use of labour process analysis to examine the changes in the academic labour process and the consequent pressures to commodify and control the work of academics. Labour process analysis provides the link between changes in the structure and control of work and the dynamic development of class relationships in organizations and society (Willmott 1995: 997). It is argued that the organization and control of the work of academics, is conditioned, but is not determined by capitalist priorities and disciplines (ibid.).
The use of LPT permits the analysis of policy changes in HE and the consequent changes in working conditions of academics in the context of the role of the state in economic and production relations. The Taylorist direct supervision, which was discussed in Braverman’s work, is not applicable to academic labour, as the nature of control is not a day to day direct control of the academic work, but manifests itself in a variety of forms. In the 1980s, indirect control was exercised via recruitment and promotion and the attempt to maintain “involvement and motivation” (Miller 1991). In this study, LPA is used to examine how NPM policies and managerialism are enacted within universities to exert control, both directly and indirectly on the academic worker in an attempt to achieve their strategic objectives.

In 1992, Halsey published *The Decline of Donnish Dominion*, which reached some prophetic conclusions about universities and academics. Halsey’s work was founded on survey data from 1964, 1976 and 1989, and based on this historical overview, he concluded that:

“the academic professions are undergoing a gradual proletarianization; managerialism is beginning to dominate over collegiate cooperation; implicit vocational preparation is being replaced with explicit vocational preparation; research is being increasingly tailored to the demands of government and industry and the don is becoming “a salaried or even a piece-work labourer” (Halsey 1992:13).

In response to Halsey’s conclusions, Miller (1995) considers whether the extent of the degrading and deskilling process is consistent with the proletarianization thesis. He acknowledges that there has been an intensification of all three areas of academic work, namely teaching, research and administration. However, to what extent does this amount to a process of degradation and deskilling as outlined in Braverman’s labour process analysis? Miller (1995) asserts that there are processes of commodification and compartmentalization of knowledge and some degradation and deskilling in the teaching situation, particularly with regard to reduced opportunities to engage in small group teaching. In addition, there has been an increase in the proportion of staff on
untenured, short-term, part-time or temporary contracts and there has also been a relative decline in pay.

Miller (1996) examines the impact of the cuts in university funding in 1981 and 1986, with specific reference to Aston University. As a result of the cuts the number of academic staff was roughly halved and the staff-student ratio increased from 1:10.3 to 1:15. Many courses were closed down and academics were encouraged to move, retrain or leave. The research selectivity exercises of 1986 and 1989, for the first time, graded research departments in terms of their outputs and funded universities accordingly. Consequently academics that had not been research active became very vulnerable. Many academics lost their jobs and were shortly replaced by increasing numbers of ‘young, cheap and keen’ academic staff appointed on short-term contracts (Miller 1996).

In his evaluation of whether academics have undergone proletarianization, Miller draws on Derber’s (1983) distinction between ‘ideological’ proletarianization and ‘technical’ proletarianization. ‘Ideological proletarianization is used to describe the first phase of extension of control, whilst ‘technical’ proletarianization is reserved for the later stages of control. It is concluded that as academics still largely influence the processes of both their research and teaching they may retain quite high degrees of ‘technical’ control, but the raw material (students or problems to be investigated) is increasingly being determined by the combined influence of the state, institutional managers and the market and consequently, they are losing ‘ideological’ control of their work. Miller found evidence of the development of a “them” and “us” mentality. The findings also support the increased marketization of academic work as demonstrated in the requirements that: teaching and research should meet the competitiveness needs of the economy, reduced funding means universities have to look to the private sector for funds and lastly there is the promulgation of a corporate management structure over a collegiate approach. Although, it is difficult to show the direct subordination of academic labour to the needs of capital and therefore ‘to demonstrate a full version of the proletarianization thesis’ (Braverman 1974), however, the direction of travel is definitely along this path.
Bryson (2004) conducted a further study of academic staff following the changes in HE in the 1990s. He found that teaching staff and research staff had different perceptions of their positions following the changes. Although the roles of teaching staff had not changed, in practice the roles they most enjoyed had been squeezed. The increase in class sizes, the focus on standards and accountability meant that academics now spend proportionately more of their time on more mundane tasks. Workloads had increased, with less opportunity for academics to pursue their own interests and research was now concentrated on outputs suitable for assessment mechanisms. Along with work intensification there has been a loss of autonomy. Research staff, however, who tended to be more recent recruits, found that they had much greater autonomy in the planning and execution of their work, although they had little control of the longer term objectives of projects. Long hours were accepted as a means to an end, however the major problem was job security. Increased autonomy appears to have been traded for reduced job security.

However, both teaching and research academics had similar levels of morale and both sought challenge, variety and autonomy in their work. Recognition of their work by their peers and the intrinsic dimensions of their work were more important than the material aspects (i.e. pay) of their work. Bryson did not find any evidence to support Halsey’s view of a profession in ‘crisis’ over the period of his study.

When examined from a labour process perspective, it appears that academic staff had been reasonably successful in resisting commodification (Willmott 1995) and had been able to maintain traditional academic values. Academics had experienced changes in the form of control, with some resonance with Miller’s (1995) view of ‘loss of ideological control’. There was some evidence of deskilling for a small number of staff who had been coerced into narrower roles. Work intensification, had left less time for ‘high skill’ activities such as research which provided evidence of work degradation (Willmott 1995). Academic staff also found a mismatch between their concept of quality and quality as defined by the surveillance agencies for teaching and research. This replicates the findings of Bolton (2004) in her work on nurses in the National Health Service (NHS).
Bryson (2004) also finds that there was an increase in casualization, which in itself represents a loss of control. Contract research roles were now less of an apprenticeship and more a commodification of research productivity with poor career prospects. There was evidence of a move towards proletarianization, but as yet ‘deprofessionalisation’ had not advanced very far. Bryson concludes by stating that “academic staff remain optimistic and seem to enjoy the work that they do” (ibid:55). Dent et al. (2004) also argue that NPM has not led to deprofessionalisation and that professionals broadly accept NPM and look for ways of ameliorating its impacts. However, an alternative view put forward by Diefenback (2009) is that people learn to play the game very quickly and practice “impression management”. Although this may be viewed as subversive, this is what is required; that people, function, think and act within the boundaries set by the system. As will be seen, this has important implications for academic identity.

Fanghanel & Trowler (2008) consider how academic work has become invisible work. Although various methods can be used to calculate the teaching component of an academic's work, from the 510 hours maximum contact time used in post-1992 universities to less formal systems used in pre-1992 universities, academics often feel that the system used did not represent the reality of the teaching commitment (Fanghanel & Trowler 2008). When "teaching" was allocated, there was a degree of arbitrariness in terms of what counted as teaching, with much of the input not accounted for. The true cost of tutoring students and/or carrying out innovate work was either misunderstood or undervalued. Equally, the time allocated to research was rarely specified. Academics felt that their true input was not acknowledged by their institution and in fact, the institution turned a blind eye to the actual number of hours worked by academics. Some academics worked on their research at the weekends or when they were on sick-leave (ibid.).

More recent work by Mingers & Willmott (2013) demonstrates how the work of academics can be shaped by performance measures. In particular, the use of journal lists, for instance the Association of Business Schools (ABS) ‘Journal Guide’, “can dominate and define the focus and trajectory of a field of research” (ibid. 1). The use
by managers of such guides for the direction of published research, not only influences the work and labour process but also the identity of academics.

In summary, this section has identified and examined studies, which have used a labour process framework to highlight the experiences of higher white collar workers in the public sector and academics, in the recent past. These studies demonstrate that there is a similarity in the experiences of public sector workers, in relation to work intensification, deskilling, surveillance and what is understood by quality. In addition, work by Miller (1991, 1995 and 1996), Halsey (1992), Willmott (1995), Bryson (2004) and Dent et al. (2004) demonstrate that the academic labour process has been subject to continuing degradation. From the evidence presented, academics have consented or at least not resisted the attempts by management to exert increasing control over their labour. The more recent work of Fanghanel & Trowler (2008) and Mingers & Willmott (2013) suggests that the allocation of work hours does not accurately reflect actual work and therefore indicates work intensification, whilst the use of particular performance measures can alter the research focus of academic work. Consequently, these findings indicate that the work of academics continues to be controlled by the managerial techniques of work allocation and performance measures.

2.5 Identity

Identity has become a popular frame through which to investigate a wide range of phenomena in the social sciences (Alvesson et al. 2008). This study will utilise the construct of identity in two senses. Firstly, identity will be used to give academics a voice with regard to the impact of NPM and managerialism on their experience of work. Secondly, identity will be used as the link which demonstrates the interconnectedness between the academic labour process, academic identities and NPM and managerialism. This is a dynamic relationship and is continuously being reviewed as policies are implemented within the organisational setting of the university. In order to provide a focus on this relationship, it is necessary to ascertain what social scientists understand by the term identity.
This section begins by considering how identity can be conceptualized, before moving on to evaluate alternative theorisations of identity, namely, social identity theory, post-structuralist identity theory and core LPA identity theory.

2.5.1 The concept of Identity

How can the concept of identity be defined? Although this may appear to be a reasonable requirement of research on identity, Foster (2012) illustrates that often epistemological questions about identity are left in a black box. In simple terms, it is possible to use the definition provided by Giddens as the answer to the question "Who am I?" (Giddens 1991: 53). Self-identity is "the self as reflexively understood by the person in terms of her or his biography" (Giddens 1991:33). Identity can also be understood as an individual's understanding of his or her "place in the world" (Baumann 1998:35). Moreover, social theory literature often uses the terms "self" or "subjectivity" as alternative concepts for "identity". Although a variety of theoretical traditions have examined these concepts, many of them share an emphasis on human self-consciousness (Collinson 2003) as the major driving factor of identity formation.

"As reflexively monitoring and purposive creatures, we human beings have the capacity to reflect upon ourselves and to see ourselves as separate from the natural and social world around us" (Collinson 2003:529).

Although we may view ourselves as separate from the social world, it is important to stress that the formation of identity or identities does not occur on an isolated basis, identity is necessarily formed with reference to and in the context of social institutions and relationships (Henkel 2005).

Despite the recent, but now contested literature on the "the end of work thesis", it will be argued that the environment of work and the work that individuals perform still provides the most important discourse for the formation of self-identity, particularly for skilled and professional workers. Some social theorists (Baumann 1998, Beck 2000) have put forward the argument that work now plays a much diminished role in contemporary life experience and hence self-identity. However, the evidence
demonstrates that work remains an importance source of identity (Doherty 2009, Foster 2012). The underlying conclusion is that "work matters" and that work fulfils important and social needs and remains an important locus of social relations (Doherty 2009:97). The view taken within this research will be that there continues to be a strong relationship between work and identity for workers, particularly for academic workers. We can now move on to an examination of how the nature of the relationship between identity and work can be conceptualized.

2.5.2 Theoretical Conceptualisations of Work Identity

The conceptualization of work identity has undergone an evolutionary process in modern times. In brief, work identity began its conceptual life as an unchanging, stable, functional concept but in recent times has been more critically presented as a changing, dynamic, emancipatory concept (Alvesson et al. 2008). Social identity, more particularly work identity has been theorised and represented in a number of alternative guises. Three alternative theorisations are put forward and expanded, namely, social identity theory (SIT), the post-structuralist view of identity and the core LPA theorisation of identity and interests.

Social Identity Theory

Firstly, with regard to social identity, the most influential and prominent theory in this area is social identity theory (Ashforth and Mael 1989, Haslam 2004). In social identity theory (SIT), self-identity is determined by whether an individual belongs or does not belong to a particular social grouping. The individual does not view themselves in terms of their own unique characteristics, but in terms of their belongingness to a particular social group. Self-esteem is the key driver for membership of a particular social group (Tajfel 1978). However, it can be argued that in many situations, SIT can provide a rather simplistic view of identity. It may be that individuals have affiliations with several social groupings and consequently have multiple identities, which are not usually neatly compartmentalised. In addition, identities are likely to be ever changing, given the dynamic nature of the social world. Consequently, on its own, SIT has limited explanatory power for workplace relations.
Post-Structuralist Identity Theory

The post-structuralists put forward a particular theorisation and understanding of the concept of identity. As previously noted, the “missing subject” in LPA is provided by the concept of identity, but with the particular understanding that self-identity is concerned with reducing anxieties and insecurities within the workplace environment. In much of the recent post-structuralist writing on identity, identity is socially constructed, but more pertinently it is only constructed from discourse (Marks & Thompson 2010). The individual worker appears to be the passive recipient of the dominant organizational discourse. The self is discursively constructed, fluid and fragile (Ainsworth and Hardy 2004:155) and identity is not related to the structured antagonism of the workplace environment.

An escape from the above socially determinist view is provided by identity work. Still within the post-structuralist tradition, this theoretical framework encompasses the mental work undertaken by individuals in order to construct an identity or persona, which answers the question of 'who am I?' and 'who are we?' (Knights & Willmott 1989, Sveningsson & Alvesson 2003). Identity is viewed as a form of 'becoming' rather than 'being' (Alvesson, et al 2008:15) with the corollary that identity work enables individuals to deal with the ambiguous and contradictory experiences of work.

Watson (2008) elaborates and gives more analytical power to this concept by taking into account that whenever an individual undertakes identity work, there will be some element which is working on the 'external' as well as on the 'internal' elements of personal identity (Watson 2008). The individual will wish to adopt an internal view of self but will also wish to 'manage' how they would like other individuals to perceive them. Both internal and external aspects are derived from social-identities which are focal elements of social discourses. It is argued that elements of discourse are personified in 'social-identities' which makes them accessible to individuals, unlike the abstractions of a discourse. For instance, an academic worker would derive their personal identity from the social-identity of 'academic' which has its focus within the discourse of professionalism. However, an individual may not necessarily fully adopt a
particular social identity, but may encompass interpretation, modification and even resistance (ibid.).

Collinson (2003) focuses on insecurities as the major determinant of identity work. Multiple insecurities can intersect and operate simultaneously and that any attempt by individuals to overcome these insecurities via identity construction can have unintended and contradictory outcomes. The various forms of insecurity which are pertinent to this study include the economic insecurities surrounding paid employment, for example, job insecurity and the reinforcement of individualism (Waring 2013). Insecurities can also be reinforced by individuals’ attachment to particular notions of self (Knights & Willmott 1999).

Collinson (2003) identifies three alternative ‘survival practices’ or identities which are adopted by individuals: 'conformist', 'dramaturgical' and 'resistant' in an attempt to protect themselves from insecurities (ibid.534). In brief, 'conformist' implies that "individuals are preoccupied with themselves as valued objects in the eyes of those in authority, subordinating their own subjectivity in the process" (ibid. 536).
"Dramaturgical" applies to individuals who find alternative ways of expressing themselves as subjects in the workplace, for instance, individuals “might become increasingly skilled manipulators of self, reputation and image in the eyes of significant others” (ibid.). This is identity work, but identity work which creates a persona or reputation which is not based on any reality but on some idealised notion of what significant others may wish to view. In other words, a performance is enacted. Stronach et al. (2002) also consider performativity and illustrate how professionals are torn between ‘economy of performance’ and ‘ecologies of practice’. The former refers to how professionals are assessed and evaluated, whilst the latter term refers to their own beliefs and practices.

The third survival practice of identity construction is named 'resistant'. It is argued that resistant selves are a primary means by which workers communicate their discontent about the workplace, which may include indifference, 'foot dragging' and 'whistle blowing' as well as irony and satire. However, it is argued that the adoption of a resistant self or an alternative culture may be motivated by the need to restore self
respect and dignity (Collinson 2003). This 'resistant' concept of identity construction is conceptually comparable to identity control (Alvesson et al. 2008).

However, it will be argued that it is not sufficient to define identity work as primarily a 'choice' of subject positions offered within competing discourses even allowing for moderation and some customisation. A more critical view would focus on the degree of agency which individuals actually possess in order to determine their own personal identity within their work environment. It is imperative that accounts of identity construction are not overly voluntaristic, exaggerating autonomy and under-emphasizing conditions, processes and consequences. Theoretical work centred solely on the "identity work" approach does not allow for other drivers in identity work such as managerial regulation (Thompson 2010).

Managerial regulation is identified as an important determinant of individual identities in Alvesson & Willmott (2002a) theoretical framework of Identity Regulation or Control. This framework considers the role of organizational elites and discursive regimes which seek to regulate individual identities and the resulting political and material consequences (ibid. 623). It adopts a much more critical view of identity formation as a result of the employment relationship and asks the following questions: “To what extent are identities controlled by organisations?” and “How do individuals consent or resist these controls on their personal identity?” It is also pertinent to ask the question: “What is the impact on individuals of attempts to control their personal identity?”

These are the questions which will be addressed in this study when examining academic identities. Organisations, more specifically universities, can attempt to control identity through covert and overt means. The functional role of HRM, via its direct and indirect influence over the academic labour process may disguise some of the means by which academic identity can be controlled and/or managed for the benefit of the university, the results of which may not always be of benefit to the individual.

From the above evidence, it would appear that post-structuralist views of identity have evolved since the early writings in the 1980’s. The later works in the 2000s (Alvesson
& Willmott 2002, Collinson 2003, Watson 2008) have moved away from categorizing identity and identity work as a means of coping with anxieties and insecurities and offer explanations centred on material interests and structural relations as determinants of identity work and resistance.

Core LPA Identity and Interests

Marks & Thompson (2010) as core LPA or sub-Marxist (Brook 2013) proponents of LPA recognise the post-structuralist contributions to identity and identity work. However, they disagree with the post-structuralist view that discourse is the major determinant of identity and argue that although discourse may be one determinant of identity, it is not the only determinant. They dismiss the idea that “the self is a blank slate on which anything can be written” (ibid. 322).

More specifically, Marks & Thompson (2010) put forward two criticisms of post-structuralist views of identity. Firstly, they argue that the explanatory power of identity is oversold and secondly, that the concept of identity is under and mis-conceptualized (ibid.). It is argued that much of the work on identity fails to discuss what motivates or drives identity work, apart from discourse. Consequently, Marks & Thompson (2010) put forward an alternative account of identity and the concept of interests is brought to the fore, which provides a materialist understanding of what motivates identity work.

Structured antagonism, as already identified, is one of the major foundations of core LPA of workplace relations. Capital and labour have divergent and incompatible interests in the workplace, consequently the interests of labour can be defined as “a socio-economic position that generates a propensity to act in defence or pursuit of scarce material resources” (ibid. 323). Although collective interests are always latent and require articulation in order to be activated, workers possess the motivation to defend their material interests.

In contrast to interests which pertain to material resources, workers may undertake identity work which can be defined as “interaction with and appropriation of symbolic resources” (ibid. 324), which may include status and esteem, sense of belonging or
discourse. The motivation for the appropriation of symbolic resources may include the desire to assert their own identities, within struggles over power and resources or to obtain satisfaction from particular conditions of work and employment (ibid.).

The major contention of this study is that the pursuit of interests and identity will inform worker behaviour. Although it is acknowledged that there is a dynamic interaction between material and symbolic resources, they may not necessarily be in alignment with one another and the pursuit of a particular identity may dominate over material interests. The attempt by workers to defend or pursue their material interests provides the reasoning for their behaviour in the structured antagonism of the workplace environment. In addition, the defence or pursuit of symbolic resources, which may or may not be in alignment with the worker’s material interests, provides the motivation for identity work. As Marks & Thompson (2010) state, interests are rarely disavowed in identity discussions, but often they are a “hidden script in identity explanations” (ibid. 332).

For the purposes of this study, it is important to understand that the defence and pursuit of material and symbolic resources will inform the behaviour of academics at work. The material interests of academics are likely to include: autonomy, work allocation, introduction of new technologies, methods and procedures, performance appraisal and pay. Symbolic resources are likely to include: ability to voice opinions, inclusion in REF and RAE and the physical environment. There may be significant synergy between the defence and pursuit of these material and symbolic resources, but there may also be significant divergences.

In addition to the above reconceptualisation of identity and the inclusion of interests, more recent work has put forward the justification for using a critical realist framework for empirical studies of identity (Marks & O’Mahoney 2014). This work is entirely compatible with core LPA insights into identity and interests and critiques of SIT and post-structuralist identity theories. In addition, the critical realist framework recognises that identity is embedded in social structures, such as class, where distributions of power may limit the resources for building identities (ibid. 69). Consequently the critical realist framework is consistent with LPA, both of which are integral to this
study. The interrelationships between critical realism and empirical identity work will be fully explored in the following chapter.

In summary, this section has considered the concept of identity and its usefulness in explaining how individuals view their place in the social world. Three alternative theorisations of identity: SIT, post-structuralist and the core LPA theorisation of identity and interests have been examined. The first two theorisations, SIT and post-structuralist have limited explanatory powers with regard to worker behaviour in an environment where resources are contested and relations between labour and capital are those of structured antagonism. More recent post-structuralist work has however explored identity and identity work with some reference to workplace relations. Core LPA theorists conceptualise identity work as attempts by workers to defend and pursue symbolic resources and material interests. This latter view is adopted for this study as the inclusion of interests provides the essential link with LPA which forms the foundation for this study. The following section provides the justification for using identity, including interests, as an appropriate framework to analyse the experience of academic workers.

2.6 Academic Identities

Why choose to view the experiences of academic workers through the window of identity? Why is it a useful framework? Firstly, the identity framework allows a focus on identity from the academic’s perspective, that is, it can provide a micro view of the academic self. However, it also allows a critical interest to be taken of universities, from a macro perspective, in order to reveal and question, what Alvesson et al. (2008) call, the "darken" aspects of contemporary life in universities (ibid. 17). The macro perspective examines the external generative mechanisms for identity and interests. Consequently, the use of an identity frame provides a bridge between the micro and macro aspects of academe. The following sections identify the possible sources for an academic identity which is followed by an analysis of the impact of NPM on academic identities, with specific reference to research and teaching.
2.6.1 Formation of an academic identity

It will be argued that the most valued and important sources for the formation of academic identities are the discipline and the associated notions of academic freedom, autonomy and purpose along with the institution of work, namely the university (Henkel 2000). However, the notion of the academic profession has also been put forward as a source of identity (Williams 2008, Nixon et al. 2001, Kolsaker 2008) and this will now be examined, before moving on to discuss the other determinants.

Much of the work on academic identity is concerned with how academics view themselves as professionals and the impact of HE reforms on professional identity. However, there is no agreed definition for the term “professional” and also no agreement with regard to whether academics form a profession. It can be argued that there are two key issues when attempting to define profession or professionalism.

Firstly, Williams (2008) argues that professions exist within the two competing agendas of “ecologies of practice” and “economies of performance”. Ecologies of practice refer to “shared and personal experience ... tacit ways of acting ... affective dispositions that people within a profession develop” (ibid. 535). Economies of performance relate to “performative or managerialist ways of measuring what constitutes professional practice” (ibid.). These competing agendas can be summarised as how professionals view themselves (inside view) and conversely how professionals are viewed by managers (outside view). As a consequence, academics in constructing and re-constructing their identities face these competing pressures.

The second issue when trying to define profession or professionalism is that the concept of profession and professionalism is context dependent and historically changing (Williams 2008) and therefore it is not a static concept (Dietrich & Roberts 1997). With regard to the changing historical context, the professional academic in the 21st century would be almost unrecognisable from the professional academic in the 1960s.
In line with the changing historical context of professional workers, the sociological literature on professions and professionalism has shifted from broadly functionalist approaches, through to trait or attribute approaches (Goode 1960, Johnson 1972), towards a focus on professional power during the 1960’s and 1970’s. Since the 1990s the focus has shifted to a consideration of the occupational control of work (Williams 2008). The latter two approaches are particularly relevant to this research and will be discussed more fully.

Within the professional power approach, there are two alternative views, the Marxist and the neo-Weberian views. The latter view focuses on market conditions within society where groups compete against each other and with the state in order to gain power and status. The Marxist approach is centred on the social relations of production and a need to locate the middle classes in the class system. There is a broad spectrum of views under the Marxist umbrella, which range from the view that “professions are seen as a means of articulating the state and fulfilling the global functions of capitalism” (Dietrich & Roberts 1997:23) to the view that the professions are subject to proletarianization and de-skilling, gradually losing status and power (Braverman 1974, Halsey 1992). The second view will be articulated for this study, given that academics do not fulfil all the criteria for a profession (see below) and there is evidence to suggest that, in modern times, this view provides much greater explanatory power.

Friedson (2001) in Professionalism: The Third Logic is concerned with the status of professions in advanced industrial society and argues that the principles which organise and support the work of professionals differ markedly from those of the market which celebrates competition and efficiency. He puts forward an idealised view of “professionalism”, rather than professions, which is based on the view that the occupations rather than consumers or managers control work. The idealised view of professionalism:

“portrays the broad range of knowledge and skill within which the special kind of knowledge ascribed to professionalism is to be found, knowledge believed to require the exercise of discretionary judgement and a grounding in abstract theory and concepts” (Friedson 2001:13).
The idealised view of professionalism as put forward by Friedson applies most nearly to doctors and legal professionals, although academics possess many of the attributes of professionalism.

However, several writers have expressed the view that academics cannot be viewed as a professional group (Piper 1994, Taylor 1999, Nixon et al 2001). Piper (1994) has argued that academics are Janus-faced: “academics look to their occupation for their identity as teachers, but outside for their identity as subject specialists” (ibid: 6) and this dual professional identity is becoming increasingly difficult to sustain (Nixon et al. 2001). More pertinently, Piper asks where does the knowledge expertise of the academic lie: is it in teaching or in the discipline content? If the expert knowledge is within the discipline, then there is no single academic profession as the disciplines are too diverse with little shared knowledge. If the expert knowledge resides in teaching, then the lack of comprehensive training for HE teaching suggests that academic workers do not qualify as a profession (Williams 2008). Consequently Piper defines academics who work in universities as “expert workers” whilst Taylor (1999) defines academics as “craft workers” as they learn to teach via a process of imitation.

Both Piper (1994) and Taylor (1999) put forward the view that academics only display professional attributes in their roles as discipline experts. Williams (2008) drawing on Piper’s work and emphasizing the increased stratification of academics with growing casualization, teaching-only contracts, and research contract staff, argues that it is becoming harder to talk of a unified profession. Consequently, it is argued that the academic "profession", given its relatively fragmented nature (Kogan et al. 1994) and its weak source of integration, in comparison with the medical or legal professions (Clark 1997) cannot be used as a source of academic identities.

However, academics have particular expectations about the nature and purpose of their work and their role in society, which could be defined as professionalism (Friedson 2001). Consequently, whether we or academics self-define themselves as a profession, academic workers, expert workers (Piper 1994), craft workers (Taylor 1999) or higher white collar workers (Smith et al. 1996), there is no dispute that this group of workers has, over the past 30 years, experienced profound changes to their labour process and
how they perceive themselves, namely their academic identity. It is now pertinent to explore, in more detail, the major determinant of academic identities.

The major determinant of academic identities is the discipline. Disciplines which may be determined by membership of specific discipline communities, societies or departments have provided the traditional formation of academic identities (Henkel 2000). In general, academics develop their identity as they progress through their careers, via the continuity of their research, control of their working context and conformity with developments within their discipline (ibid.). Academics can also be viewed as identifying themselves with their particular academic tribe (Becher & Trowler 2001). However academics are not a homogenous group, the formation of their academic identities will differ even within a department of academics of the same discipline.

Academic identities are formed and reformed via the dynamic between academic workers, their disciplines and their institution of work (Henkel 2005). Although the discipline and academic freedom provide the major sources of meaning and self-esteem, values and morals can also be included (Fitzmaurice 2011). Fitzmaurice (2011) found that the notion of providing a service can provide an academic with identity. Service can involve considerable emotional and intellectual work and includes supporting students and having the opportunity to do original thinking and generating new knowledge. For some academics, gender, class and family are also important determinants of ways of experiencing and being in the world and consequently impact upon the formation of their academic identity (Clegg 2008).

2.6.2 Academic identity and new public management

The impact on academic identities of NPM policies, from the late 1970s to the 2000s was initiated by the seminal work of Mary Henkel (2000). Henkel recognised that the changes in the last quarter of the 20th century impacted directly on institutions and research councils and not disciplines (Henkel 2000). Consequently, Henkel’s work analyses how far the HE policies have permeated universities and whether they have altered the relationship between the university and its academics. Henkel’s findings result from interviewing academics in seven disciplines across eleven universities in the
UK, during the period 1994-1997. Her findings examine how the research and teaching role of academics has been impacted by NPM policies and consequently how this has impacted upon academic identities. The aim of this study is to provide an updated and a more focused analysis and comparison of the experiences of academics in Business and Management disciplines in two different types of universities.

More recent research has highlighted two further outcomes of HE policies: namely the individuation of the academic (Waring 2013) and the attempt to integrate academics more fully into their university (Musselin 2008). Individuation has occurred due to the introduction of individual appraisal of academics within universities (Musselin 2008, Waring 2013). Simultaneously, universities have attempted to increase the integration of academics into their university via, for example, the adoption of the university’s objectives and mission statement. As each university is now in a competitive market, there is a need to market each university as “different and better” than their competitors and this involves academics becoming affiliated to the university’s ethos and marketing identity and integrating it into their own academic identity (Amaral et al. 2008). The following two sections provide a critical overview of the impact of NPM policies on research and teaching and consequently on academic identities.

### 2.6.3 Academic identity and research under NPM

One of the major changes in HE has been the focus on the importance and evaluation of research. Research is now to be viewed as a national resource with the potential to increase economic growth and enhance the quality of life. Consequently, the preferred type of research is policy orientated or "strategic research" rather than basic research (Henkel 2005). Governments, in addition, have favoured collaborative research predicated on alliances between academics and industrialists as well as group over individual research (Henkel 2000).

For academics there is a strong relationship between identity, reputation and research. Academics need to acquire a public identity which they obtain through the peer review system which generates reputations and so helps to reinforce identities (Henkel 2000). For academics, career advancement is about obtaining, sustaining and enhancing public
identity. Public identity provides academics with a sense of self-esteem and a sense of professional identity. This relationship between public reputation and individual identity is largely due to research.

Several authors (Henkel 2005, Smith 2012) have examined the impact of the new research regime on the academic identity of academics who define their role as mainly research oriented and who in the main are employed in the pre-1992 HE institutions. For the purposes of the research assessment exercise (RAE) in 2004, academics were classified as either research active or research non-active. Only academics classified as research active were included in the RAE. The academics, classified as research non-active, were not necessarily research inactive, but their research output was deemed to be of too low a standard to be included. As a consequence, these academics were completely demoralised as they felt that they had lost their academic identity (Henkel 2005).

In reality, the impact of the reforms on the research experience of an academic and their academic identity will depend on how their research experience is altered and their pre-existing academic. Harley (2002) found that the academics’ view of the RAE varied and depended on the stage of their career and the institution in which they worked. Some academics felt that the RAE threatened their current identity whilst other academics viewed it as an opportunity to secure or enhance their academic status. Those academics who disapproved of the RAE felt that the criteria on which academics were judged was not appropriate. Whilst the major criticism of the RAE in the pre-1992 institutions was that it stressed short-term, quantity over quality, the major criticism in post 1992 universities concerned the detrimental impact it would have on teaching. Currently there is very little recent empirical research work on academic responses to these changes (Smith 2012). However, this current research will explore the impact of the research assessment framework (REF) of 2008 and 2014 on academic identities.

Henkel (2000, 2005) documents the view that the government's policy on research was to engineer a shift from basic research which was valued for advancing knowledge only, to strategic research, which in addition would eventually lead to economic and
social benefits. Academics, particularly in the sciences, were pressured by research funding councils to produce more policy oriented research rather than pure science research. In line with these policy changes, the Research Councils responsible for distributing the funds for research underwent restructuring in both management and mandate in order to reflect these new research expectations. Most of the changes in national research policies were primarily directed towards the natural scientists and consequently, research policy impacted most heavily on this group of academics and their academic identity (Henkel 2000, 2005). Consequently, academics found themselves in situations of conflict. Their academic discipline and the requirements for progression in their career required academic research, whereas the research councils were increasingly requiring academics to put in bids for more applied research which would maximise impact.

Whilst research policies reinforced the value of research, the ability to research was conditional on attracting income and delivering publicly recognised output. As previously stated, there was now an arbitrary division between academics who were "research active" and could have their research included in the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), and "research non-active" academics whose research was not included in the RAE. As far as universities were concerned, the only "research that was valued" was research that was included in the RAE and/or was income generating. For designated "research non-active" academics, this private sense of loss has become a public loss of status and power, which has impacted on their academic identity (Henkel 2000).

An alternative perspective on academic research is provided by more recent empirical work. Smith (2012) examines the nature of academic identities for academics involved in health inequalities research. From her empirical work, Smith documents five ideal identity types to which academics may aspire and considers the extent to which these ideal types correspond to the lived experience of the academics. The five ideal types are: (i) academics as entrepreneurs; (ii) academics as policy advisors/policy-relevant researchers; (iii) academics as ‘pure’ scientists, operating in ‘ivory towers’; (iv) academics as advocates for social/political change and (v) hybrid academic identities as responses to contemporary academic workplaces.
In Smith’s study, no-one aspired to the ideal type of (i) the academic as entrepreneur or to (iii) the academic as a pure scientist operating in ‘ivory towers’. Academics only aspired to (ii) academics as policy advisors/policy-relevant researchers and (iv) academics as advocates for social/political change. However, very few academics felt that the contemporary university environment was conducive to the achievement of their ideal type and consequently it was not always fully realised (Smith 2012:170).

However, the most interesting group of academics were those who adopted the ‘hybrid identity’, that is (v). This group attempted to undertake ‘politically critical’ but ‘socially engaged’ research. They attempted to frame research grant applications in ways which would appeal to policy audiences; were vague in order to reduce the extent to which their work could be viewed as threatening or adopted different guises depending on the audience. Consequently these academics attempted to aspire to their ideal research identity, but were aware that they needed to obtain research funding. This was a clear attempt “to simultaneously reinforce and resist pressures to produce (directly) policy-relevant research” (Smith 2012:171). However, these academics, found that adopting this identity was highly demanding and usually not satisfying.

2.6.4 Academic Identity and teaching under NPM

For many academics, particularly those working in post-1992 universities, an important determinant of academic identity, in addition to discipline, is teaching rather than research. As highlighted earlier, the changes in HE have led to the massification of HE. However, it is not simply that there has been an increase in the number of enrolled students which caused concern, but the change in the characteristics of the student population (Henkel 2000). Some of the students who were now entering university had lower levels of numeracy and literacy than previous cohorts. In addition, the students' expectations of a HE were very different to those of their lecturers. For many students, HE was about obtaining a degree in order to obtain a job and not about education for its own value. Many academics were dismayed or demoralised by students who adopted a minimalist, satisficing approach to their studies, that is, they expended the minimum effort required to achieve limited goals (Henkel 2000). In addition, many academics
felt under pressure from their institutions to ensure that students did not fail, and that the attitude of management was that student failure was actually staff failure. Disillusionment was widespread. There was a feeling of loss, particularly amongst academics in the post-1992 universities who identified themselves primarily as teachers. The environment in which academic identities had been formed had changed so fundamentally that it adversely impacted upon the satisfaction and self-esteem derived from their working lives.

Along with the changes in the composition of the student body, new government policies now promoted a more direct link between HE and the labour market. This involved preparing students for the labour market and integrating transferable skills into the curriculum. Many academics accommodated the new language of skills into their curriculum, whilst at the same time sustaining their own values and agendas. However, accommodation is not a solution but a provisional strategy, which may lead to eventual assimilation of the new language and management (Henkel 2000:223). Another major development was modularisation of the curriculum. This was found to "diminish academics' sense of identity, loss of control or restricted autonomy and reduced expectations in terms of the nature of knowledge acquired by students in higher education" (Henkel 2000:226). Modularisation involved a transfer of power from academics and departments to the institution. The degree of power ceded to the institution depended on the relative power of the department and the strength of its subversive strategies.

It would appear from Henkel's seminal study of nine institutions in England and academics from the pure sciences, social sciences and humanities, that there were varied responses to the changes which impacted upon the teaching component of academic work. The impact on academic work and consequently academic identity varied between the type of institution, the discipline area and the power and strength of departments to maintain the status quo. However, many of the changes appear to have had a demoralising impact on academics' self-esteem and consequently their academic identity.
Fanghanel and Trowler (2008) have argued that the changes to teaching and learning in HE, which have impacted less than positively on academic identities, have been based on inappropriate theories of change and teaching and learning. They argue that they are informed by "linear rationalistic theories of change" as well as a "transmissive view of teaching and learning" (ibid.305). Teaching is viewed as a process, which is dissociated from its social, political and economic context, rather than in practice. In practice, change is highly complex and that the specific policies will in different contexts lead to different outcomes. Consequently such theories of change may not be appropriate when discussing the impacts of change in an academic setting. It is suggested that a socio-cultural theoretical perspective would provide a more realistic interpretation of teaching in practice. This approach places the context of practice centre stage.

In summary, the framework of academic identity enables both a micro and a macro perspective of the academic self to be undertaken. Henkel (2000) identified the main determinants of academic identity as discipline and the institution. Her seminal work considered how the changes in HE had impacted on the academic roles of teaching and research. This research will build upon this work by providing an up-dated and in depth exploration of the experiences of academics in one discipline in two different types of university.

2.7 Summary and Conclusions

This chapter began with an exploration of the origins and development of NPM in the English public sector, including HE since 1979. Secondly, it provided a critical review of the development of labour process theory (LPT) since Braverman's work in 1974. The chapter then proceeded to provide a review of empirical studies of public sector workers and academics that have adopted the labour process framework. Thirdly, this chapter has critically reviewed the literature on identity theories and also the formation of academic identities. In addition, it has reviewed the existing literature with regard to academic identities in relation to both research and teaching.
As a consequence, the following conclusions can be reached. Firstly, NPM policies have continued to be implemented during the past 30 years. The HEFCE, which was established in 1992, has been the main conduit for the introduction of NPM policies into the university sector. HEFCE, at the behest of the government, has been responsible for introducing a series of measures which have sought to measure the ‘quality’ of teaching and research in HE. With regard to the role of the academic as teacher, teaching was initially assessed via Subject Reviews until 2002, however these were later reduced to institutional audits. However, since 2005, the NSS along with other performance indicators have been used to assess the ‘quality’ of teaching in universities and hence the performance of academics. Research was initially assessed in 1986 under the RAE framework and this has continued under the revised framework of the REF. Although ostensibly an institutional measure of research quality, there are clearly implications for the academic labour process and academic identity of these measures.

In order to assess the impact of these measures on academics, it is pertinent to use the labour process framework. It has been demonstrated that this framework focuses on the worker and not on the institution. By using this framework, it is possible to examine and interpret the direct and indirect controls, imposed by a university on its academics, in an attempt to meet its strategic objectives. In addition, when NPM policies are implemented within universities, not only are the policies aimed at controlling the material aspects of academic labour, but also, increasingly, they impact on, intentionally or unintentionally on how academics perceive themselves, namely their academic identities.

This study argues that in order to study the work experience of academics, it is necessary to consider the generative mechanisms (Ackroyd 2009), namely NPM policies and managerialism, which have led to changes in the academic labour process. However, it is also necessary to consider how these policies impact on academic identities and how academics respond to university attempts to regulate or control their academic identities. This study argues that NPM policies and managerialism, the academic labour process and academic identities are inter-related. Consequently, a policy which is implemented within a university will impact on both the academic
labour process and academic identities, but in turn, academics are able to respond in order to defend their existing labour process and academic identities.
Chapter 3

Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this study is to evaluate the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities. This has been undertaken by a consideration of the outcomes of NPM policies, with the aim of ascertaining the drivers behind the changes in the academic labour process and academic identities and interests. With this aim in mind, this chapter will provide the justification for the use of a critical realist methodology alongside a compatible research strategy in order to achieve its purpose.

This chapter begins with a discussion of the meaning of methodology and its philosophical constituents of ontology and epistemology. This is followed by an explanation and justification for the use of a critical realist stance for this study. The chapter continues with a justification for the selected research strategy, research design and research methods. Justification is then provided for the methods used to analyse the data and evaluate the research findings. Finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion of the ethical considerations and the limitations of the research strategy.

3.2 What is meant by methodology?

This study interprets methodology to mean the overall approach to the research, which has been informed by a particular view of the world (ontology) and by how we can know about the world (epistemology). Given that this empirical study aims to find causes and explanations for the current work relations and identities of academics, critical realism (Bhaskar 1979), with its structured ontology and epistemology, provides the appropriate philosophical stance. At this point, a brief explanation of epistemology will be provided before moving on to a detailed discussion of ontology.

Epistemology is the philosophical theory of knowledge that addresses questions about: what can be known, how we can know what we know and whether this knowledge is
reliable or not (Bryman 2016). A key issue is whether the social world can be studied according to the same principles, procedures and ethos as the natural sciences, namely positivism or whether an alternative approach is required. The study of people and their institutions is fundamentally different to the study of the natural sciences and consequently the alternative approach of interpretivism is more appropriate (Mason 2002). Interpretivism, as applied to this study, involves the researcher finding out how academics interpret their work environment and then interpreting these findings within a social science framework which encompasses LPA and the concepts of academic identities and interests. Before discussing the epistemological stance of this study more fully, an overview of ontology will be presented.

Ontology is concerned with the theory of being and existence, that is, the way in which the world is viewed (Bryman 2016). The term social ontology is concerned with how we view social entities in the world. Traditionally, two extreme views are discussed in relation to ontology. If social entities are viewed as objective entities, that is, they have a reality external to social actors then we can adopt an “objectivist” stance. Conversely if social entities are viewed as constructions which are built up from perceptions and actions of social actors, then we can adopt a “constructionist” stance. Consequently, this study requires the incorporation of an objectivist and a constructionist perspective.

3.3 The philosophy of Critical Realism

The philosophical view of the world known as critical realism was led and developed by Bhaskar following the publications of A Realist Theory of Science (1975) and The Possibility of Naturalism (1979) in which Bhaskar puts forward his philosophy of social science, that is, social ontology. The social world is viewed as a multi-layered open-system of interrelated parts or entities that interact with each other over time. Entities can affect other entities and be affected by them. In addition, Bhaskar’s methodology of critical realism seeks to transcend the dichotomies and dualisms which had dominated the social sciences, by putting forward a social ontology which rejects the view that objectivism and constructionism are two competing and extreme ontologies.
Bhaskar (1979) examines whether the social sciences could be studied in the same way as the pure sciences, namely using a positivist approach. However, he rejects the positivist approach as regular patterns of events are unlikely to be a feature of social reality (Ackroyd & Fleetwood 2000). However, Bhaskar contends that although social reality is a conceptualised reality, it is also a material reality. Consequently although social reality is “dependant on conceptualisation, it is not exhausted by it” (Bhaskar 2014). The fundamental question for critical realists is:

“What properties do societies possess that might make them possible objects of knowledge for us?” (Bhaskar 1989:25)

The nature of reality (ontology) in critical realism draws a distinction between the real world (intransitive) and the way in which we experience the world (transitive). As a consequence, critical realists put forward a stratified or layered ontology rather than a flat ontology with three domains or realities: real, actual and empirical. The real domain represents the underlying mechanisms, structures, powers or relations which cannot be seen. The actual domain is what actually occurs, in the form of events or actions, which are caused by the real domain and which may or may not be visible. The empirical domain or reality relates to perceptions, observable experiences (Bhaskar 2014, Ackroyd & Fleetwood 2000) or what is reported to have occurred (Easton 2010) which may or may not represent the actual or real domains. Easton (2010) provides the example of an iceberg. We only observe the tip of an iceberg, we do not observe most of it, but that does not mean it does not exist.

The epistemological stance is concerned with, what can be identified as valid knowledge and how this knowledge can be obtained, that is, knowledge which is within the real domain. For the critical realist, the nature of valid knowledge is the discovery of the generative mechanisms which can provide explanations for the occurrence of outcomes. However, epistemic fallibility may occur, that is, the observations in the empirical domain may not always yield the real domain (Al-Amoudi & Willmott 2011).
In relation to this study, the task for the critical realist is to look behind the empirical evidence provided by academics and to seek to explain the *real*, that is, to discover and explain the underlying structures and mechanisms within the university which have led to the empirical evidence or outcomes. However, these underlying structures cannot always be easily identified by observation, because "ceteris paribus" cannot be assumed. It is not possible to carry out controlled experiments within the university setting.

Furthermore, Bhaskar (2014) dismisses the dualism of the structure/agency debate and argues that structure is always necessary and always pre-exists agency, but structure requires agency to maintain, reproduce or transform it. Structure would not be ongoing without agency, for example, if no one spoke a language (agency) then the language (structure) would disappear. Consequently, structure and agency are both required in Bhaskar’s Transformational model of social action (TRSA).

The TRSA can be understood with reference to this study. Within the university, pre-existing management structures which have been created in a previous time period, facilitate, but also constrain the exercise of agency by academics. Although academics are constrained in their actions by these management structures; through their actions they can attempt to maintain, reproduce or transform them. As a result of being emergent, that is “irreducible to people and their practices” (Lewis 2000: 252) and causally efficacious, management structures are *real* and not merely theoretical constructs. The causal efficacy of management structures on academics is transformational via the generative mechanisms of management structures (Ackroyd & Fleetwood 2000, Fleetwood 2008, Lewis 2000) under the TRSA. This study will explore how management structures acquire causal efficacy.

### 3.4 Labour Process Analysis and Critical Realism

As outlined in the previous chapter, Critical Realism is a natural ally of LPA. The core of LPA does not occur in a vacuum and there will be external factors which help to maintain the capitalist process as well as impact on local labour processes (Thompson & Vincent 2010). The methodology of critical realism with its layered ontology allows
the researcher to identify, both the local and external influences on the academic labour process, and understand the implications of the dynamics of these interrelationships.

How does Bhaskar's structured ontology of reality relate to this study? At the macro level, reality consists of the web of social structures which exist between the Government and the university and this can lead to the adoption of particular policies e.g. introduction of a Research Excellence Framework. At the meso level, there is a relationship between university management and academics, for example, managers can introduce an appraisal system. At the micro level, there are relationships between Heads of department and academic workers, for example, academic workers are appraised by academic-managers. In addition, there are also the relationships that exist between academics and other workers, for example, the IT workers and the administrative employees. This study aims to discover the generative mechanisms of these outcomes (intended or unintended) as they relate to the academic labour process and academic identities.

With reference to LPA, the material reality is that the academic is employed in a university. To obtain a richer understanding of the academic labour process and academic identity, it is necessary to take into consideration this material reality, which is a component of conceptualised reality. This material reality can be ascertained by a consideration of the academic labour process. The “properties” of the labour process can be viewed as a “possible object” of knowledge with regard to academic identity. In addition, it is not sufficient to simply understand the determinants of social reality, it is also necessary to understand how university social structures are affected by academics both current and past. Time is important as it presupposes a “presence of the past” (Bhaskar 2014).

Consequently, given the multitude of interrelated causal relationships which impact upon the academic’s work environment the use of LPA along with critical realist ontology will result in more theoretically informed explanations of the academic labour process. Critical realism provides the ‘connective tissue’ (Thompson & Vincent 2010) between the academic labour process and the broader political economy as manifested in NPM and managerialism.
3.5 Identity and Critical Realism

Academic identities (outcomes) are social constructions whose meanings are realised through social interactions within the university and academia and are continually being formed and reformed as a response to a changing and wide variety of social experiences. However, although academics are not passive recipients of identity their agency is limited, constrained and influenced by the pre-existing structures within the university environment, which is suggestive of a morphogenetic cycle (Thompson & Vincent 2010).

More specifically, when researching identity through a critical realist lens, it is essential that critical realist principles are adopted. For instance, the discursive effects on identity can be ascertained, but these findings will be located “within a wider framework that retroduces information about both social structures and the self and the relations between them” (Marks & O’Mahoney 2014:78). Consequently, this study will observe the following critical realist principles: the stratified emergent ontology; temporality; causal mechanisms, entities, agency and potential powers; temporality, criticality and materiality (ibid.). A brief resume of how these principles are incorporated into this study will now be provided.

Academic identity is an outcome that can occur in the empirical, actual and real domains which demonstrates the principle of a stratified or layered ontology. Within the empirical domain, evidence is collected from academics with regard to their perceptions or experiences relating to their identity. Temporality is included as academics are asked about their previous and current perceptions of their role and how this has impacted upon their academic identity. Subsequently, an interpretation of academic identities and interests is ascertained. This interpretation of academic identity is then put forward as one that occurs in the actual domain. An explanation for the causal mechanisms of academic identity (generative mechanisms) is then ascertained via a process of retroductive judgement (Al-Almoudi & Willmott 2011) and put forward as academic identity in the real domain. Retroductive judgement involves looking backwards from academic identities to find the explanation or generative mechanisms (mediated by cultural and historical contexts), that have caused these academic identities to emerge. However, it must be recognised that the evidence
provided by academics may be incorrectly interpreted and therefore what is presented in the actual domain may not necessarily represent the real domain, that is, the real generative mechanisms (the epistemic fallacy).

Throughout this process, it will be important to consider how emergent academic identities are constructed from social structures including university structures and discourse. In addition, it is important to ascertain the agency of academics in generating, modifying and reproducing their emergent academic identities. It is recognised that the transformative capacity of agency is a human potential and may not be actualised due to the constraints of social structures or due to the academic’s position in the social structure at birth (Archer 2000). Criticality is also considered when collecting empirical evidence on academic identities particularly with regard to the power relationships within the university; the extent to which academics have a voice and their ability to resist management discourses.

Critical realism adheres to an intransitive material reality, which is independent of the transitive knowledge by which it is described (Marks & O’Mahoney 2014). This material reality includes physical performative aspects, material resources, but also the embodiment in a physical person: with a gender or a colour. The temporal aspects of material reality which relate to the body, particularly mental attributes such as memory are also important generative mechanisms for consideration (ibid.). In this study, academics provided empirical evidence with regard to both material resources and virtual structures in the workplace as determinants of academic identity. It is now apposite to discuss the research strategy of this study.

3.6 The Research Strategy

This study seeks to interpret the nature of the academic labour process and academics' conceptions of their academic identities and subsequently to explore the causal mechanisms for these outcomes. Given the aims of this research, it is appropriate to adopt a qualitative rather than a quantitative research strategy. Qualitative research is congruent with a critical research framework, a study of the academic labour process and academic identities.
Bryman (2016) distinguishes four distinctive features of qualitative research which are applicable to this current study. Firstly, it is concerned with viewing the world through the eyes of academics and probing beneath surface appearances. Secondly, it is much more likely than quantitative research to provide rich description and detail, which Geertz (1973) terms thick description. Thirdly, qualitative research is more concerned with process than quantitative research. Finally, qualitative research tends to prefer flexibility, rather than rigid structures which may impose limits on the findings of the research. These four distinctive features of qualitative research all support its use for a study of the academic labour process and academic identities, but more importantly, a qualitative research strategy enables the adoption of a retroductive approach, which is a requisite of a critical realist methodology.

3.6.1 Research Design

The purpose of a research design is to provide "a framework for the collection and analysis of data" (Bryman 2016: 40). The research design for this study can be broadly defined as a cross-sectional comparative study (Bryman 2016). A comparative or case study approach was chosen in order to ascertain to what extent the different institutional structures within a university impacted on the academic labour process and academic identities. At the macro level, all English universities have been subject to the same NPM policies. However, at the meso level, they have not necessarily led to the same impact on academic labour and academic identities in each university. Given the different social structures within each university, it is instructive to compare and contrast, not only the outcomes in terms of the academic labour process and identities, but also the generative mechanisms that have had causal efficacy on the academic labour process and academic identities.

For this comparative study, one pre-1992 and one post-1992 university was selected. Given the different historical heritages of these two types of university and anecdotal evidence, it was expected that there may be both similarities and differences in the implementation of NPM policies in these universities and consequently similarities and differences in the experiences of academics. Previous studies (Henkel 2000, Waring
2013) have highlighted the similarities with regard to the effects of NPM policies. However, this study aims to investigate the generative mechanisms within the two universities which are causal for the academic labour process and academic identities.

The two universities which were selected for comparison in this study are both medium sized universities, rather than large metropolitan universities and are viewed as representative of the two major types of university in England (excluding Oxbridge). The two selected universities are within 30 miles of each other in the Midlands region in England. In 2012-13, the pre-1992 university enrolled a total of 10,880 undergraduate students and 6,380 postgraduate students. The post-1992 university enrolled 22,020 undergraduate students and 5,250 postgraduate students. The number of academic staff at the pre-1992 university was 1,975, including 595 part-time academics, whilst at the post-1992 university it was 1,890, including 630 part-time academics (HESA 2013). Both universities have Business or Management departments that include the disciplines of Business, Human Resource Management, Economics, Marketing and Sociology and offer a range of Business related degrees to both undergraduate and postgraduate students. In terms of research output and research funds, the pre-1992 university has traditionally produced proportionately more research output and attracted more research funds than the post-1992 university.

3.6.2 Research methods

Critical realism is not prescriptive with regard to any particular research methods, what is more important is that the research methods used not only seek understanding of the academics’ meaning and experiences but also recognise the “context, constraints and resources” in which these meanings and experiences take place (Smith & Elgar 2014:111). The research methods used need to be capable of allowing the generative mechanisms to be ascertained. In this study, the major research method used is semi-structured interviews, which will allow interviewees to relate their experiences to the context, constraints and resources within their own university. In addition, interview evidence is supplemented with government and local documentary evidence.

Semi-structured interviews provide the thick descriptions (Geertz 1973) and rich empirical evidence (empirical reality), that is, the academics’ interpretation of their experience of work and academic identities. Semi-structured interviews also provide
the flexibility to ask a range of questions including introductory, follow-up, probing and interpreting questions (Bryman 2016:473). In addition, from a critical realist stance, it is recognised that interviews are not simply concerned with passively recording information; they are an interactive process between the interviewer and the academic with the aim of generating responses “which formulate perspectives, observations, experiences and evaluations” (Smith & Elgar 2014). The interviews will provide the foundation stones of the empirical evidence for this study.

This study aims to provide a comparison of the experiences of academics located in a congruent group of disciplines within two Business/Management departments. Previous studies have considered the experiences of academics across disciplines (Henkel 2000, Kolsaker 2008) or across disciplines and countries (Enders 2000, Musselin 2013). In addition, Henkel (2000) demonstrates that the experience of scientists differ from the experience of academics in the humanities. Consequently, the experiences of academics within the context of a particular subject area and within the context of the workplace environment have not been explored. This is the gap which is filled by this study.

This study is focused on the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities, specifically on the experiences of academic workers, namely teachers and/or researchers and not manager-academics. As a consequence, in order to provide relevant and rich empirical evidence the selection of interviewees was based on a number of criteria. The overriding criterion was to interview academics whose primary role was teaching and/or researching rather than management. Secondly, only academics who had worked in their university for at least three years were selected. This was necessary, as academics employed for fewer years would not necessarily be aware of policy changes and would be less likely to be critical of the status quo. Thirdly, it was important to ensure that both female and male academics were represented in the sample and finally, academics were chosen from across the discipline areas in order to provide the broadest representation within the general subject area of Business/Management.
All the interviewed academics were selected with reference to the information provided on the university websites. As academics on temporary contracts are not included on such websites, all the interviewees were permanent employees of their university. This does not mean that the increasing casualization of academics within universities and the experiences of temporary or part-time academics are not important, but that their experience of work relations and academic identities are worthy of their own research study.

Following on from the criteria for selection, 30 academics were interviewed of which 29 were on permanent full-time contracts, the other academic was on a permanent part-time contract. Thirteen academics (five female and eight male), were interviewed in the pre-1992 university and 17 (ten female and seven male) academics were interviewed in the post-1992 university. All the academics had been employed in their university from three to twenty five years in a range of subject areas (Management, Human Resource Management, Economics, Business, Marketing, Finance and Accounting) within the Business or Management departments. All of the interviewed academics had a teaching or research role and seven also performed a management role. More detailed information about the interviewees is provided in Appendix 1. University employees whose only role was management or administration were not the focus of this study and were not selected.

The interviewing of academics was conducted over several months at the beginning of 2015. Each interview was approximately sixty to ninety minutes in duration and was digitally recorded and then transcribed. A pilot study to test the appropriateness of the questions was also undertaken at one of the universities. However, it is not always desirable or possible to include every potential topic area as a question as it may be viewed as leading the academic, consequently academics were permitted to articulate their own interpretation of events and to talk freely about how their work and academic identity had been affected by university policies.

With regard to the nature of the evidence collected, interviewees were asked a range of questions about their experience of work in their university. The questions asked academics to talk about their role with regard to research, teaching and administration.
and their expectations when embarking on an academic career. Interviewees were also asked for their views of how they were managed and their degree of control over their work. More detailed information on the interview questions are available in Appendix 2. In addition, documentary evidence was sourced, for the traditional purposes of triangulation but also to search for possible divergent or contradictory data which would also need to be explained (Marks & O’Mahoney 2014).

3.6.3 Data analysis

There are four major methods of analysing qualitative data: analytic induction, grounded theory, thematic analysis and narrative analysis (Bryman 2016). The most appropriate method for this study was thematic analysis. The process followed in this study was that all the interviews were recorded and then transcribed into word documents. All the transcripts were initially coded and then coded more selectively into themes. The thematic analysis used an informal Framework approach which was developed at the National Centre for Social Research in the UK (ibid). This involved constructing an index of central themes and sub themes in a table and then identifying evidence (coded text) from the transcripts in support of these themes. However, it is not sufficient to simply identify themes from the empirical evidence, it is also necessary to explain why the themes are significant (Bazeley 2013) and this is the raison d’être of the TRSA.

In addition, given the layered ontology of critical realism, it is important to note that evidence gathered in interviews is within the empirical domain. This interview evidence has to be critically evaluated not only on its own terms but also in relation to relevant documentary evidence. It is only following an evaluation of all the different types of evidence and a process of retroduction, that this evidence can be viewed as being within the real domain. It is necessary to use multilevel analysis or what is called triangulation, but this is not necessarily for validation of the data. The purpose, when using a critical realist methodology is to not only to look for similarities but also differences between the different sources and therefore to find the real generative mechanisms. Consequently, this study has made extensive use of government publications and sources, that is, from HEFCE (RAE, REF, TEF), HESA, BIS, DfEE,
Cabinet Office, CVCP and IFS; unions, i.e. UCU; reputable newspaper and magazine publications, i.e. The Times, The Guardian, The Telegraph and THE as well as printed documentation from the relevant universities (Appendices 4-9) in an attempt to ascertain the real generative mechanisms of academic identities in the two universities.

The findings, which are drawn from interview and documentary evidence, led to the themes identified and reported in this study. The themes which were initially selected from the interview evidence and represent the issues which appeared repeatedly in the transcripts, were augmented by documentary evidence and supported, where appropriate by existing literature. For example, the REF was identified as a NPM policy which was repeatedly mentioned in interviews when discussing the research role of an academic. As a consequence, it was necessary to consult the REF documentation, particularly where evidence from interviewees about the implementation of the REF in an institution was not always consistent with the REF documentation. Following such research, it was possible to put forward the view that the method of implementation of REF policies was a generative mechanism for academic identity.

As a consequence of adopting a critical realist approach to data analysis it was possible to identity that different generative mechanisms within universities had led to the differing effects on academic identities in the two universities. Having considered the relevant aspects of the research study, it is now apposite to move on to discuss the ethical considerations of this study.

3.7 Ethical and Quality considerations

It is important when undertaking social research and reporting on the findings that the research is conducted with due regard to ethics. Ethics, within the context of social science research, can be understood as the application of moral principles in the conducting and reporting of research. These moral principles can be articulated as treating the individuals who contribute to the research findings fairly and for the researcher to act with integrity. However, there are several different stances which have been taken by social research writers, which range from the universalist stance that advocates that ethical precepts should never be broken to the view that there can be
a certain amount of flexibility in ethical decision-making (Bryman 2016:123). This research has been conducted from a universalist stance, that is, there are certain codes of ethical conduct which should not be broken.

As a consequence, this research has been conducted with reference and compliance with the code of ethics of the British Sociological Society (BSA 2002). This code provides guidelines for researchers with regard to "ethical concerns and potential problems and conflicts of interest that may arise" in the course of their professional activities" and in addition states that researchers "must safeguard the proper interests of those involved in or affected by their work, and to report their findings accurately and truthfully" (BSA 2002). The specific guidelines which are pertinent to this research relate to professional integrity, relationships with and responsibilities towards research participants and anonymity, privacy and confidentiality. The nature of the ethical concerns of this research and how they have been addressed, in line with BSA guidelines are detailed below.

The purpose of this research is to identify the underlying social structures which have impacted upon the academic labour process and academic identities. Consequently, this study involved the participation, as interviewees, of academics employed in two universities. In addition, the university management, as the gatekeepers of their institutions, were also required to agree and to give their consent to the participation of academics in this research. All the academics who agreed to be interviewed were provided with information about the nature of the research and were also asked to sign an informed consent form (Appendix 3). It was recognised that some academics may have been unwilling to participate due to lack of time and/or through fear that their responses may be relayed to management and affect their current position and/or future work promotion. Although, academics were emailed and asked if they would be willing to take part in the research, there was no compulsion to do so.

It was anticipated that there may have been some unwillingness on behalf of management to allow access to academics. However, although this was an anticipated concern, this was not an issue at either of the two universities. These two issues, namely, the participation of academics and access to participants, involved
addressing both ethical and political concerns. With regard to the gatekeepers of the two universities, that is, the management of the universities, applications for ethical approval for this research were made to both universities and access was granted.

In relation to the academic participants, in line with BSA guidelines, four areas of ethical concern were addressed: harm, informed consent, invasion of privacy and deception (Bryman 2016:125). The first concern, harm does not just refer to physical harm, but can also involve harm to participants’ development, loss of self-esteem and stress. With regard to the proposed research, participants may be concerned about the harm it may do to their career progression if their answers are disclosed to management and/or appear to reflect poorly on their ability to adequately perform their jobs. This may be manifested in an unwillingness to take part in an interview or to answer questions as truthfully as possible. This issue was addressed by assuring participants of the confidentiality of any information which they provided in their responses.

The second concern is with regard to informed consent. All academics who participated in the research were fully informed about the nature of the research. Each participant was provided with full information about the nature of the research and full details of how confidentiality and anonymity would be preserved. Each academic who participated was asked to sign an informed consent form prior to the interview being conducted. The consent form also informed participants that their participation is voluntary; that they are free not to answer any of the questions and that they may withdraw any information provided at a later date.

The responses provided by the participants have been reported in a form which ensures that the individual remains anonymous and is not identifiable. Leading questions which could identify the participant were avoided. Privacy was assured via the maintenance of anonymity and confidentiality. The fourth ethical consideration is with regard to deception. Deception was also avoided by providing participants with full information about the nature of the research and the use of the interview data, via a participation information leaflet. The participation information leaflet provided detailed information for the participants with regard to how the interview evidence
would be reported and in what form. This information was in conformity with the Data Protection Act of 1998. In addition, this research did not involve any covert observation or questions which were designed to be misleading. In addition, participants who did not wish to answer specific questions did not answer them. All participants were also provided with the opportunity to receive a copy of the findings of the research.

An additional ethical issue that is worthy of mention is that the researcher may be deemed to have had a conflict of interest given that she is also an academic. Mercer (2007) discusses this issue of insider/outsider researcher and “insiderness” in relation to her own research. It is argued that “the insider/outsider dichotomy is actually a continuum with multiple dimensions” (Mercer 2007:1). Consequently, it is more correct to refer to the degree of insiderness, rather the two opposing extremes. In this study, the researcher is an academic at one of the universities in the study and consequently is more of an insider at her own institution of employment than the second institution. Being an insider or having insiderness may present several potential ethical dilemmas (Mercer 2007). The first dilemma may be viewed as what to tell colleagues about the research (ibid.). The view taken in this research was that all participants would be fully informed about the true purpose of the research, before the interviews were conducted. The participants were then able to make an informed decision with regard to their participation.

The second potential ethical issue “is the use of incidental data” (Mercer 2007), that is, information which the researcher has become aware of outside of the interview data collection process. With regard to this research, any information received in this way was not included in the research findings. In addition, with insider research, there could be an issue with regard to anonymity and confidentiality if a potential participant does not trust the researcher. However, if this was the case, the potential interviewee would, presumably, not take part in the research. However, these issues were not significant and consequently did not adversely affect the quality of the data collected for the research.
More recently there have been developments that link ethical issues with the quality of research (Bryman 2016:134). It is argued that research that is not of high quality in its design is unethical. As an inside researcher, there may be concerns with regard to the quality of the research. In brief, although prior familiarity of the HE sector has proved valuable, it is hoped that this has not led some aspects to be taken for granted and/or, for some aspects to be inadequately explored. There is the potential danger that the data may be interpreted from a preconceived perspective. However, this issue is considered in detail, through the adoption of a reflective approach in the final chapter of this study.

The perspective taken in this research is that although it is important that ethical guidelines and principles are followed from a process perspective when conducting research, it is perhaps more important from an ethical standpoint that the research should be of high quality. High quality research may be defined as research which meets four criteria: efficacy of design; excellent treatment of individuals; plausibility of products and transparency of process (Savin-Baden & Major 2013).

Efficacy of design is concerned with ensuring that the research contributes to knowledge, has a sound methodological basis and is conducted by a researcher who has the requisite skills. This study contributes to knowledge with regard to the academic labour process and academic identities using the appropriate methodology of critical realism. With regard to the excellent treatment of individuals, all academics were treated with respect and as equals throughout the research process. The final research product, that is, this study, will be fully scrutinised to ensure veracity in the findings, via the examination process.

In addition to the ethical considerations with regard to quality mentioned above, it is important to assess the more technical attributes with regard to the quality of research. When evaluating the quality of quantitative research, three criteria are used: reliability, that is, whether the research methods and techniques are accurate; generalizability, that is, the extent to which a wider claim can be made with regard to the research and thirdly, validity, that is, the research identifies or measures what is state as being measure or identified (Mason 2002:38). It is arguable whether these
ethical considerations with regard to quality are equally applicable to qualitative research.

Mason (1996) argues that reliability and validity criteria can be adapted for qualitative research, whilst Guba & Lincoln (1994) argue that qualitative research should be evaluated by very different criteria. A variety of alternative criteria for evaluating qualitative research have been put forward (Kirk & Miller 1986, Yardley 2000, Spencer et al. 2003). However, Hammersley (1992) puts forward a midway view between adapting the criteria for quantitative research and evaluating qualitative research by completely different criteria, which is named the subtle realist approach, which recognises the importance of validity and relevance. Validity, in this respect, refers to the plausibility and credibility of the empirical evidence as well as the amount and kind of evidence used to create an empirical account. Hammersley (1992) shares the critical realist ontology of an external social reality and the principle that the researcher’s role is to access that world and engage in representing or constructing it. The researcher’s account can be “valid or true if it accurately represents those features of the phenomena that it is intended to describe, explain or theorise” (Hammersley 1992:69). In addition, relevance is defined as the relative importance of the research topic to its relevant field and to those who are being researched (Bryman 2016).

With respect to this study, the research design fulfils the validity criteria of plausibility and credibility. A reasonably large sample size from one department from one university is deemed to provide a plausible and credible representation of working conditions and the determinants of academic identity. This study is also deemed to fulfil the relevance criteria as the working conditions and identities of academics are an important feature of the sociology of work and employee relations. In addition, the working conditions and academics’ perceptions of their identities are of obvious importance to academics.

3.8 Limitations of the Methodology

However, even if the research is deemed to be of high quality, it may still possess a wide range of possible limitations. The limitations may be broadly stated as conceptual
and technical limitations. Conceptual limitations pertain to the complexity of human relations and to the meaning which individuals give to these relations (Shipman 1995). Within social science there are a number of competing frameworks for interpreting social behaviour. For example, a critical realist researcher is concerned with “looking behind the scenes” to find the structures which may influence social phenomena, whereas the interpretivist researcher is concerned with how an individual makes sense of their world, often by analysing the words (narrative analysis) that they use. Consequently one limitation of this research is that the researcher has adopted a critical realist framework, rather than a pure interpretivist framework.

A second limitation relates to what may be called technical concerns, particularly with regard to the adoption of a qualitative research method. Bryman (2016) highlights four criticisms which are made of qualitative research: it is too subjective; it is difficult to replicate; there are problems of generalizability; and there is a lack of transparency. A brief explanation of each of these limitations will now be provided along with their relevance to this study.

Qualitative research is sometimes criticized as being impressionistic and subjective. This criticism may be applicable to research which begins in an open ended way and uses unsystematic methods to ascertain what is significant and important. However, this criticism is not applicable to this study which has started with a particular focus, that is, to assess the impact of policy changes on the academic labour process and academic identities. The critical realism stance adopted in this study has required the researcher to find and examine the social structures which determine the academic labour process and academic identities and consequently this study has used systematic rather than unsystematic methods to ascertain what is important and significant. However, all qualitative research is subject to the quality of the empirical data. The interviewees, namely the academics may not have provided all the relevant information, either consciously or unconsciously, in answer to the questions asked by the researcher. In addition, the empirical evidence may not have been ‘correctly’ interpreted by the researcher and consequently there is always the limitation of epistemic fallacy.
With regard to the criticism that it is difficult to replicate, this may be admissible as qualitative research may be influenced by the characteristics of the researcher who may have consciously or unconsciously emphasized particular issues or concerns. In this particular study, academics have been selected as the subjects for analysis, rather than managers or the organisation.

It has also been argued that qualitative research is not generalizable, that is, the findings of a study cannot be generalized to the total population. Bryman (2016) has argued that the "findings of qualitative research are to generalize to theory rather than populations" (ibid: 399). Consequently, the results of this study are not generalizable to other universities in England. This study focuses on the experiences of academics in two different universities, each with its own historical background. Following Bryman (2016), the findings from this study can be used to generalize to the theories of the academic labour process and academic identities, that is, to consider their generative mechanisms.

The lack of transparency is also a criticism of qualitative research, in terms of the methods used and the conclusions reached. This study has been carried out with the expressed intention to clearly explain the methods which were used to collect, analyse and reach conclusions with regard to the research question.

A possible limitation of this study is the reasonably small sample size. Although over thirty academics were emailed in one university, only fourteen academics were willing and able to be interviewed. However, the empirical evidence which was collected was rich and insightful. With more time and resources, it may have been possible to conduct more interviews. However, even with only thirteen participants in one university, the evidence suggested that saturation point had been reached.

**3.9 Conclusions**

This chapter has provided a comprehensive explanation of critical realism, along with the justification for selecting a critical realist framework for this study. It has been demonstrated that the critical realism methodology can be integrated with LPA as well
as the core LPA Identity and interests framework (Marks & Thompson 2010). Critical realism provides for a more theoretically informed explanation of the academic labour process as well as providing much greater explanatory power than a post-structuralist approach when ascertaining the determinants of academic identities. It allows the researcher to look behind the empirical evidence to find the real generative mechanisms for what is observed or recounted in the empirical domain. The research strategy as recounted in this chapter, ensured that an in depth understanding of the experiences of academics in a cognate discipline area in a pre and post 1992 university was achieved. It is now appropriate to present the findings of this study and the relevant discussions.
Chapter 4

The Academic and Research

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this study is to assess the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities. This chapter will address the following objectives of the study, namely:

i) to analyse and evaluate academics’ perceptions of their research role in a university and
ii) in relation to research: to determine and assess the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities.

The findings of this study and the following discussion will put forward the view that conducting research remains an important component of the academic role, but that the implementation of NPM policies has led to a significant impact on the academic labour process and academic identities in respect of this role. The teaching role of an academic will be discussed in the following chapter.

The chapter begins with a brief exploration of ‘becoming’ an academic and how academics’ perceive their role. This is followed by a more detailed exposition of academics’ interpretations of their research role in the two universities. The chapter then moves on to assess and compare the impact of the RAE and REF on the academic labour process and academic identities in the two universities. The final section of this chapter will discuss how NPM policies and the academic labour process have impacted on academic identities.

4.2 Becoming and being an academic

Although academia had not always been the first choice of career for some academics in the pre-1992 university, in fact, one academic called himself "a reluctant academic" (George-pre1992) and another called himself "an accidental academic" (Charles-pre1992), they recognised that they occupied a privileged position; they did what they
enjoyed every day and that "it was potentially the best job in the world" (Beatrice-pre1992). Academics acknowledged that the autonomy they were accorded to research their area of interest and the flexibility of working conditions, would rarely be found in the private sector. For many, the love of learning and enquiry combined with the independence and flexibility of an academic career meant they had found their natural home in academia.

"the idea of really getting some time to dig into a subject, trying to make sense of it yourself, is something that really appealed" (Amanda-pre1992).

The reasons given by academics for choosing their career in both pre- and post-1992 universities centred around two themes: having the autonomy and mental space to research in their chosen area and having flexible working hours. Many academics had also chosen their career because they wanted to be intellectually challenged. Several academics stated that they had sacrificed pay in exchange for freedom of thought and work flexibility and that they had made a deliberate lifestyle choice rather than an economic choice. This is supported by Bryson & Barnes (2000) who found that whilst academics acknowledged the importance of having a sufficient income to meet their needs, economic reward did not play a significant role in their meaning of work. Some academics had previously worked in business, but had purposely switched to an academic career, because it allowed them to manage childcare and work. Other academics had drifted into academia, either via university administration or because they had enjoyed the training component of their previous careers.

In summary, academics had chosen their career as it afforded them the autonomy and the opportunity to be intellectually challenged in order to research in their chosen area. As a consequence, economic reward, although important, did not determine the meaning of work for academics.

4.3 The role of an academic

How do academics perceive their role? The perceptions of academics with regard to their role in their universities will now be presented, beginning with the pre-1992 university.
4.3.1 The academic in the pre-1992 university

Academics in the pre-1992 university viewed their role as primarily to conduct research and secondly to teach and perform some administrative roles and duties. In this university, the administrative roles undertaken by academics could change on an annual basis and therefore, the roles performed are dynamic and continually evolving as a consequence of changing administrative responsibilities. Consequently academic identities are continually being formed and reformed (Henkel 2000).

One of the more refreshing findings of this research was the importance that academics in the pre-1992 university placed upon collegiality, also identified by Nixon (1997) and how it defined the way they worked and identified themselves. For many academics, it was important that they worked in a community with like-minded people who shared similar ways of thinking and with whom they could research and discuss ideas.

Teamwork was cited as an important component of how academics should conduct their work. Two academics expressed the view that they wanted to work in small teams. Beatrice, the longer serving academic had previously worked in a small team of academics and had found it satisfying, in terms of discussing ideas and receiving feedback and support.

“I think cultivating team work, so it’s not isolated, people working off on their own or feeling their careers are their own thing... what we need to be working on much better, is teams... really effective teams ... it’s about good ideas and taking good ideas forward. ... your passion for what you are doing comes from talking to other people, so you have to find ways of cultivating that...the team builds the sort of trust and relationships which are necessary to do that sort of support thing” (Beatrice-pre1992)

Charles, the junior academic felt that if he was in a team, he would be more productive and would not feel so isolated.
“I would love to work in a group, I do initiate work with colleagues and have initiated with some, and I work well with other people” (Charles-pre1992)

Several other academics also mentioned the importance of working in small teams, which was how they wanted to see themselves: as a team member with colleagues who shared their teaching, administrative or research interests.

Closely allied to this view of the importance of team working, was the nature of academic allegiances. All the academics stated their allegiance was to their colleagues, their academic tribe (Becher & Trowler 2001) and to their department rather than to the university (Henkel 2000, Bryson & Barnes 2000). Several academics took on administrative roles because they wanted to be "involved" in the department. Even when academics felt they were teaching over their allocation, it was stated that "teaching needs to be done" (Amanda-pre1992) and "everyone is doing their bit" (Louise-pre1992). It would appear that working collegially, as reported by Bryson & Barnes (2000) was viewed as a defining feature of academic work.

Interestingly, many academics highlighted the fact that it was not necessary to ‘self-promote’. Self-promotion was viewed as quite vulgar and demeaning in a public sector environment. The perceived view was that, if you performed well, you would be rewarded on your own merit and you were not in competition with your colleagues. Most academics acknowledged that being a good and supportive colleague and working together were essential attributes of being an academic and of academic identity. This was not the case in the post-1992 university.

Furthermore, collegiality was extended to the departmental managers. Academics commented that they were "protected" by the senior management within the department, particularly from the worst excesses of the university management. The junior academics stated that they were ‘looked after’ by their managers and that the managers were very accessible. This could be explained by the fact that the local managers were academic managers, in the sense that they undertook research and/or teaching as well as management roles.
In summary, the role of the academic and academic identity of the academic in the pre-1992 university was determined by the ability to conduct research, but it also involved teaching and administrative duties. Collegiality and team work were perceived as important attributes of academic identity, which included allegiance to the discipline, colleagues and the department rather than to the university.

4.3.2 The academic in the post-1992 university

Academics in the post-1992 university had a slightly different view of their role in a university. Post-1992 academics viewed their role to include the dissemination of knowledge to students and to conduct scholarly activity, which could include the advancement of knowledge. Not all academics viewed their role as publishing academic papers although some scholarly activity was deemed to be essential. However, some academics stated that an individual could not call themselves an academic if they did not conduct research. An academic viewed themselves as someone who thought about the world, adopted a questioning approach and hence was difficult to manage, had a mastery of a number of different areas or was immersed in their discipline. Immersion in their discipline was perceived to be what differentiated academics from school teachers. Several academics were studying for a doctorate and viewed themselves as training for or ‘becoming’ an academic (Alvesson et al. 2008).

Some academics had a more instrumental view of their role. Susan stated that academe was part of the supply chain in developing young people as employees. Other academics stated that it was useful to have been a practitioner in the outside world, as this knowledge could be passed on to students. Academics, who held course tutor roles, defined their roles as encompassing pastoral support, enabling social mobility and raising student expectations. Fitzmaurice (2013) also found that academics identified themselves as having much wider roles than research and teaching. One academic stated that the university perspective of an academic was to make money for the institution which has been termed academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie 1997).

In summary, academic identity, with respect to research, in the post-1992 university centred on a broader concept of scholarly activity and the dissemination of knowledge.
to students. Whilst some academics held a more instrumental view of their role with regard to the education of students, many others saw their role as wider than research and teaching. Collegiality was not an important attribute of being an academic or for academic identity. For comparative purposes, it is important to note not only what is articulated, but also what is not articulated by academics.

A comparison of the two universities would suggest that the perceptions of academics in the pre-1992 university are in alignment with professional bureaucracy Mintzberg (1979) or bureau professionalism (Clarke & Newman 1997) which prevailed prior to the introduction of NPM and supports Henkel's (1995) view of the formation of academic identities. These perceptions would appear to demonstrate that NPM has not fully permeated pre-existing academic identities in the pre-1992 university. However, in the post-1992 university, where hierarchical modes of management pre-dated the end of the binary line, academic identities are much more individually focused than collegiate which has been exacerbated by the implementation by NPM policies such as performance appraisal and performance related pay. These findings suggest that the individualisation of academic workers (Waring 2013) is more pronounced in the post-1992 than the pre-1992 university.

4.4 The academic as researcher

This section will assess the importance of research and the REF in the determination of the academic labour process and academic identities in the two universities.

4.4.1 Research in the pre-1992 university

Given the ethos and “raison d'être” of the pre-1992 institution, it was not surprising to find that academics viewed research as the defining feature of their identities. However, the term research was never defined by academics as “producing four 4* journal articles” over a period of six years, although academics quoted this as the university’s definition of research. The academics' view of research was clearly not in alignment with the university view and some academics espoused views which were openly hostile to this view of research.
“the absurdity of the system that makes you publish anything as long as you publish” (Lucy-pre1992)

The above academic views could be interpreted as resistant (Ackroyd & Thompson 1999, Collinson 2003) to the targets imposed by the REF exercise.

So how do academics view research and how does it impact upon their academic identities? For many academics, research has a much broader meaning and may be viewed as a moral endeavour (Fitzmaurice 2013). Academics viewed research as being concerned with innate enquiry and with maintaining and expanding knowledge. In addition, academics viewed the importance of research as much more than academics talking to each other via academic journals. Research was viewed as the dissemination of ideas to a wide audience, conducting outward facing research and being an "academic activist". Research is viewed as an activity which is intellectually challenging and provides the opportunity to read about different ideas and theories, but it is also an activity whose results could and should be disseminated as widely as possible for the benefit of society. Research was not about publishing four 4* journal articles in academic journals and achieving “a high score” (Willmott 1995:1023)

“It’s innate enquiry that’s what I see the academic life to be about, … you want to find out more about certain things and that’s what I am doing research for, not as an output for an article for a certain publication” (Keith-pre1992)

The role of an academic in social science and management was to provide a critical voice, to be the conscience of society and to allow society to have a conversation about itself. Many academics also perceived their role to include giving back to the community, for example, sitting on council committees as expert witnesses, whilst other academics discussed their role as a public academic aiming to influence decision making in society.

“I am very much wedded to the notion of the public academic, which is an old fashioned notion, ... as far as I am concerned, although I work in the institution,
I work for the public, which means, not that they are necessarily interested but when there is an opportunity, we get out there and talk to people and we do research for people” (Lionel-pre1992)

For academics, conducting research was crucial in order to be able to identify as an academic. Two junior academics related how they felt their credibility within the department had been enhanced with the achievement of their doctorates. They had finally arrived and they felt they were spoken to differently by colleagues, having achieved this ‘rite of passage’. One academic felt he was now "a colleague" (Danny-pre1992). The academics’ perception of their identities had reformed from being a research student to becoming an academic.

Several of the senior academics expressed a sceptical view with regard to the impact value of management research in academic journals, including the view that any academic who thought otherwise was "deluded" (Lucy-pre1992). For these academics, research attained its maximum potential impact via "reach" activities or via its incorporation into their teaching. Reach activities, which are ‘not counted’ in the REF are defined as the publication of articles in newspapers and books, with the aim of engaging with a wider audience than academics. Undertaking research and its potential for impact on society was an important determinant of academic identities. This supports Smith (2012) who found that the aim of academics to maximize the potential influence of their research on decision making within society was not achieved by publishing articles in academic journals.

Two longer serving academics had stories to tell with regard to previous assessments of research and its impact upon their academic identities. One academic, speaking of her previous experiences at another university, stated "I did play the game fully, you know, and it destroyed me and I'm not going to do it” (Lucy-pre1992). Another academic, who had recently returned to the university, related how he had previously held a substantial administrative role at this university, for which he received performance related pay from the Vice Chancellor on several occasions. However, he received a letter from an unrecognised university source stating that he did not have any research publications. His identity as an academic was questioned by what he believed was a
computer generated letter. This academic left the university, in order to re-establish his research credentials and consequently his identity as an academic. These two experiences provide evidence of how academic identities can be influenced by undertaking ‘too much’ or ‘too little’ research.

In brief, there was a divergence of views, between academics and the university, with regard to the purposes of research. The university's view is driven by the REF, that is, all academics are required to produce four high quality articles. The purpose of research to the academic is to conduct innate enquiry and to disseminate the findings as widely as possible. In addition, academic researchers also viewed their role as engaging with the wider community and to ‘give back’ wherever possible. Publishing articles in academic journals did not ensure the widest possible dissemination. The university view of the purposes of research led to deleterious effects on academic identity.

### 4.4.2 Research in the post-1992 university

The interpretation of research by academics in the post-1992 university was much broader than in the pre-1992 university. For some academics, research was defined as their personal research whilst other academics defined research as research activity undertaken by academics. Most academics defined research as scholarly activity, for example, reading research articles and incorporating them into teaching, reviewing articles for journals, presenting at conferences or undertaking applied research for payment.

For most academics research was an important component of their work, for both their credibility and their self-worth (Sarah-post1992) that is, their academic identities. Consequently, these academics found it frustrating when they were unable to conduct research.

“(Research) … I would say is very important and this is why it leads to frustrations because there is a sense of losing credibility if you can’t be as engaged as much as you [would] like in the process because of other commitments” (Walter-post1992)
Many academics tried to find the time to be research active, in order to maintain their academic identities. One academic with a heavy teaching load, tried to find the time to research, stating that “research is harder than teaching, but more rewarding” (Tom-post1992). Another academic, an associate editor for a 2* journal, spent many hours reviewing articles and book chapters which she viewed as a selfless act but for which there is no recognition within the appraisal process. However, she enjoyed writing and reading and it provided her with a sense of belonging to a community (Trish-post1992). Clearly, for these two academics, although research activity was not formally recognised within their academic labour process, it contributed to their academic identities (Henkel 2000).

Finding time for research is a recurrent theme in academics’ lives (Nixon 1997). Academics wanted a block of time to conduct research, rather than, for example, one day a week. One academic, who had teaching commitments over three semesters, wondered when he was supposed to do any research. He viewed research as a residual activity: it was what he would do, if he had time remaining, after teaching, seeing students and completing administrative tasks (James-post1992). Another academic stated “If you want academics to conduct research you have to manage academics and protect them from students” (Fred-pre1992). Due to the lack of time, two academics had spent three years working on a paper which was finally published in a 2* journal (Susan-post1992). Consequently, there was a huge feeling of frustration amongst academics that wished to be research active to attain their ideal academic identity but were unable to find the time.

A variety of views were expressed with regard to the relationship between research and teaching. Some academics stated that there was no necessary link between research and teaching, whilst other academics stated that ideally, personal research activity, for example, pedagogic or discipline research should, where possible, inform teaching. For many academics, being personally research active was important as academics who understood the research process were consequently better able to supervise undergraduate and postgraduate dissertations.
In summary, research was a broadly defined concept in the post-1992 university. Research, which included scholarly activity, was valued in its own right, for teaching and for supervising students and was an important determinant of academic identities. Academics were frustrated by the lack of allotted time for research and in order to create their ideal academic identity worked more intensively or extensively, that is, outside their normal working hours. It is now pertinent to discuss in more detail how the recent period of REF assessment has impacted on the academic labour process and academic identities.

4.5 The academic and the Research Excellence Framework (REF)

The NPM policy that has impacted most significantly on the academic labour process and academic identities, particularly in the pre-1992 universities, has been the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and subsequently the Research Excellence Framework (REF). The first RAE was held in 1986, and was followed by further assessments in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2001 and 2008. The assessment of research was renamed the Research Excellence Framework (REF) for 2014 and 2020.

At this current time, universities have received the results of the 2014 REF and are preparing for the next submission in 2020. The analysis below relates mainly to the impact of the research assessment exercises from 2008 to 2015. This time period encompasses preparation for the 2014 assessment, the 2014 results, the consequences and initial preparations for the 2020 submission.

4.5.1 Academics and the REF in the pre-1992 university

In general, academics in the pre-1992 university understood the university’s mission to obtain the highest possible research ranking as measured by the REF framework. It was recognised that the university marketed itself as a research intensive university and that research funding, as distributed by the HEFCE, formed a substantial component of university funding.
“Research matters but that’s partly because it is our badge, but also because it brings in cash” (Scott-pre1992)

In this sense, there was no divergence in views between the university management and the academic workforce. However, most academics viewed the REF as a deeply flawed process and argued it was a poor indicator of research activity within a university. Academics were openly critical of a process which only rewarded the publication of specific research outputs. However, in the main, academics were compliant and consented (Thompson & Smith 2010) to HEFCE’s method of assessing research output.

From an academic labour process perspective, although the RAE/REF changed the work of academics, academic workers offered little resistance. Perhaps academics believed that in the new marketized world of academia, they would personally benefit from the new structures. If this was the case, the university had succeeded in inculcating in academics the belief that it was their individual research, rather than the collective research of the department that was important. The university was able to use the RAE/REF to increase the individuation of academic work, which provides support for the increased individuation of academic work thesis put forward by the French sociologist Lallemont (cited in Musselin 2008) and Waring (2013).

However, it was not the REF per se which caused anxiety and insecurity amongst the academic workforce, but the process of its implementation within this university. Consequently, although academics were compliant with regard to meeting the university’s research aims, they provided some resistance to the threats of punishment and the damaging effects on individual academics.

“The University need to be clear that anyone who is excluded should not be punished because of the University’s strategic commitment to do well within the GPA scores” (Scott-pre1992)

In addition, the REF was used as a stick to beat up its academic workforce in the run up to REF 2014.
“I don’t think (pre-1992 university) dealt with it in a very nice way at all ... I don’t think they have heard of the carrot and the stick, they only understood the stick” (Beatrice-pre1992).

As related above, the defining moment, with regard to the impact of the REF on academics came in June 2013. An email was sent from university management to all academic staff, which included the following phrases:

“non-submission to the REF “will not, of itself, mean that there will be negative career repercussions for that person” (THE 2013).

However, it went on to state that non-submission is “clearly an important performance indicator” relevant to (pre-1992 university)’s needs, “for both financial and qualitative reasons”, to “reduce to a minimum the number of colleagues who are on teaching and research contracts but are not funded to do research” (THE 2013).

This email had the effect of increasing insecurity and terrified academics into believing that non-inclusion in the REF, would be punishable by the university transferring them to a teaching dominant contract.

“Absolutely terrified people, junior members of faculty in particular were absolutely scared rigid about this thing ...” (Lionel-pre1992).

“I feel the REF, from what I see and from talking to other people, is a damaging process. It creates stress, it gets people depressed. It makes people question their own self-worth. ... I think that academic identities and personal identities, because we work so much the two come together. They’re the one thing so you see people’s own self-worth, being questioned by this thing, this thing which is quite arbitrary and opaque” (Charles-pre1992).
The sentiments expressed by this academic, provides further evidence of the stress suffered by academics as a consequence of their work relations (Chandler et al. 2002, Berg et al. 2004).

This email had unintended consequences. The local management responded, but not in the way intended by senior management. As Collinson (2003) demonstrates, increasing insecurity in the workplace can lead to several alternative strategies in order to mitigate these insecurities. The department management made the decision to resist (Thompson & Smith 2010) this university threat and decided to “protect” the academics from being compulsorily transferred to teaching dominant contracts or from being performance managed.

“They wanted to stop people being performance managed, they wanted people not to be facing redundancy and they didn’t want people to go on teaching dominant [contracts]. So you know it was a very paternalistic view ...” (Keith-pre1992).

This was achieved by ensuring that all academics that fulfilled the REF criteria, 85% of academics, were included in the REF submission (Scott-pre1992). However, the results did not please the department or the university.

“just after the Christmas Party when we got the results it was fairly bleak to say the least” (Keith-pre1992)

“there was an expectation we would do pretty well and I think if you look at the academics around here we have got really good academics, I mean the output is pretty good but we didn’t play the game properly” (Keith-pre1992)

It was about playing the game (Hood 2006, Archer 2008), that is selectively submitting academics to the REF in order to boost the university’s research score, and consequently as local managers did not play the game as intended by university management, the REF ranking did not reflect the quality of research conducted at this university. In fact, the email appeared to have had a negative impact on the university’s
REF score. This university action confirms that “the intensification of workers’ material and symbolic insecurity … seems to be a predominant mode of ‘motivating’ employees” (Collinson 2003:541).

The minority of academics not included in the REF but employed on ‘research-dominant contracts’, were placed on unofficial ‘performance management’. They were required to provide details of their completed work, every six months to the local management who passed it on to university management. These academics did not receive feedback on their submissions and consequently assumed that "no news was good news", although the insecurity remained.

One academic was informed that due to her personal circumstances, she would not be included in the REF. Subsequently, she was informed that whilst the university understood why she was not included, she still had to fill out the “performance management” forms every six months.

“That’s probably what I mean about this insecurity because you are getting mixed messages … I think I am probably alright but, well actually nobody is alright actually” (Beatrice-pre1992).

In effect, the university management used the REF to create uncertainty and as an unofficial appraisal of individual academics.

For several of the junior academics, the REF was viewed as a steep climb up a mountain and they were not sure if they would reach the summit. The requirement for all academics was the same whether you were a junior academic or a professor: four 3 or 4* journal articles. Junior academics stated that there was insufficient time for them to reach this gold standard in six years. There was an acute awareness of the highly competitive nature of getting work published in a limited number of journals as well as the unfairness of a system which required the same output from a Professor as a junior academic.
"I honestly don't believe I'm at the standard where I can just churn out three or four 4* publications, I got lucky with one" (Charles-pre1992).

Some academics also expressed the view that the majority of 4* journals are quantitative and that most of the research in the department is of a qualitative nature.

“It is very much qualitative research that’s done here and that doesn’t tend to get in the highly ranked management journals” (Danny-pre1992).

Consequently, the pressure to produce and publish research, under the REF criteria, continued and junior academics were not confident about meeting the required criteria.

Academics interpreted the management's actions as “a weak attempt to terrorise everybody” (Lionel-pre1992) and this further antagonised the relationship between academics and their university. Some academics hoped that the recent change of Vice Chancellor would result in a change in the university’s stance with regard to research and the REF and that the previous stance would be discontinued. However, uncertainty remained as academics were unsure of how they would be judged for the next REF and this fuelled uncertainty about their future careers.

For many academics, the implementation of the REF was perceived as an attack upon their personal and academic identities. Although academics believed that the research which they conducted was academic work, this was not the view of the university. The university view of an academic was an employee who produced four research papers for the REF in six years. In addition, from an academic labour process perspective, the senior management asserted that academics were underperforming, that is, not producing the output that they had been paid to produce and consequently had to be disciplined, either by being performance managed or by a change in their contract.

With reference to this management action, two key features of core labour process theory are relevant: the contention that the labour process is continuously transformed by competition between producers and the consequent antagonism between capital and labour (Thompson 1990). The action by the university management can be interpreted as an attempt to increase control over the academic labour process in order for the university to be more competitive in the REF.
Furthermore, the university’s interpretation of the REF requirements impacted on the nature of the research conducted by academics, and in particular, where their research is published, which impacted negatively on the academic labour process and academic identities.

“the market for publishing has been massively distorted over the past couple of decades ....the over emphasis on journal articles... we ought to be embracing social media ...blogs and twitter and all of these things ...” (Lionel-pre1992)

The publication of books or chapters in books was not deemed as acceptable research by universities, although the REF guidelines do not preclude the inclusion of such publications (REF 2014).

“No-one publishes books anymore, because they’re not worth anything which is quite sad really. I think that is where government policy and the way the funding is distributed to universities has changed what we do” (Danny-pre1992).

This evidence supports the view that the REF and university strategies are leading to deleterious changes in the academic labour process. One academic emphasized the difference between the work you do for the university (publishing) and the work you may need to do to enter particular research networks, for example, publishing a chapter in a book. Another academic, whose research was situated within a European and increasingly global context, stated:

“there’s a kind of disconnect between the UK academics and the rest of Europe, ... people in the rest of Europe are happy to publish as widely as possible, in chapters, in a range of different journals, whereas we’ve always been told by our bosses you can’t publish there, it’s not worth anything, you need to get that into one of these select journals and that’s all we’re interested in” (Danny-pre1992).
The REF was viewed as a very damaging exercise in terms of producing research and for this research to have an impact on decision making in society. The institution’s interpretation of the REF requirements negatively impacted on how academics could fulfil their perceived role as academics. In addition, academic identities were under attack: there was a mismatch between the academics perceptions of their research role and the implementation of the university's strategy to attain the highest research ranking.

As a consequence, government policy on research, as interpreted and defined by universities, now determines what counts as research and where it can be published (Mingers & Willmott 2013), but more importantly what is valued as work. Only the publication of 3 and 4* journal articles is valued as real work. In view of the above detrimental impact upon the academic labour process, one senior academic stated:

“Get rid of the REF, why are we doing this to ourselves?” (Lionel-pre1992)

There are alternative ways of allocating research funds to universities that do not have such detrimental consequences for the academic labour force, for example, allowing the research councils to distribute all the funds (THE 2015). However, to reiterate the issue of concern, it is not the REF per se which causes adverse consequences for academics, but the interpretation of the REF requirements by university management and the competitive environment (Willmott 1995) which is perpetuated by its existence.

In discussing the impact of the REF on the academic labour process and academic identities, mention has been made of two types of employment contract: "research dominant (RDC)" and "teaching dominant (TDC)". The threat of a change in the employment contract impacts on the academic labour process, but just as importantly, the employment contract is a significant determinant of academic identities and consequently requires further explanation. The majority of lecturers are employed on RDC and are expected to undertake research, teach and perform some administrative duties. The TDC contract involves much less pressure to research and involves a greater teaching and administrative load than the RDC contract.
As outlined earlier, the university informed all academics that if they were not included in the REF they would be transferred to a TDC or they would be performance managed. This can be interpreted as an increase in senior management control (Amaral 2008), in order to ensure academics comply with the university research strategy. In addition, it would appear that the TDC was not for academics who were good teachers, but for academics who, in the university view, were poor researchers. The TDC was viewed as an inferior or second best contract by both the university and the majority of academics.

However, several academics who were not included in the REF voluntarily switched to TDC's. This could be interpreted as academics buying into the university system (Knights & Willmott 1989). These academics stated that they were happy to be employed on this contract as they could retain their work/life balance and/or it reduced the pressure on them to publish. One academic, who was already employed on a TDC stated that he would be "scared" and “you had to be brave” if you were employed on a RDC. Academics on TDC could still engage in research, but it was recognised that these academics may not be employable at another university and their promotion prospects may be diminished (Scott-pre1992).

With reference to their academic identities, most academics viewed the TDC as inferior to the RDC, although the actual terms of employment and pay scales were identical. Few academics were prepared to voluntarily switch contracts: their identity requirement was that they were researchers first and teachers second. Switching to a TDC, in terms of academic identity was perceived as an admission of failure both as a researcher and an academic and this is how an academic would be perceived by colleagues. An academic’s identity was determined not only by their perceptions of themselves but also by the perceptions of their peers (Watson 2008). Consequently the nature of the employment contract was an important determinant of academic identity.

In summary, although academics in the pre-1992 university were compliant and consented to the introduction of the REF, the department management resisted the methods of its implementation. From a labour process perspective, even though there was resistance, the implementation of the REF led to an increase in uncertainty and
employment insecurity for many academics. In addition, it led to unintended consequences for the university as local managers refused to play the game by the university's rules and this impacted on the REF score. The consequence of the REF for a minority of academics was that they were placed on performance management. In addition, junior academics experienced much anxiety with regard to whether they could meet the requirements for the next REF in 2020. The management action had a deleterious impact on both the academic labour process and academic identities. In addition, the REF requirements were changing the nature of research outputs which were not in conformity with the academic's ideal identity which required the widest dissemination of their research. Finally, the threat of a change in the nature of the academic contract, threatened to change the academic labour process and consequently academic identity.

4.5.2 Academics and the REF in the post-1992 university

Although research has been externally evaluated at this pre-1992 university since 2001, the university along with other pre-1992 universities had defined itself as a teaching institution. Academics were not actively encouraged to conduct research and there was no time or space made available for research activities.

“When I was first here they didn’t care less and there was no time given to it at all and they would pretend to be interested, but they weren’t interested” (Tom-post1992).

The results of the 2008 REF placed the university in the bottom quartile of universities with regard to the quality of its research output and therefore the university received a minimal amount of research funding (Donald-post1992). Consequently, the university decided to implement a new research strategy with supporting policies, with a view to improving its research profile (Donald-post1992). The university's new strategy and policies can be divided into two periods: from 2008 to 2014 and post-2014

From 2008 to 2014, the university’s research strategy had two strands, firstly, increasing its research focus and secondly, maximizing applied research income. Both
strands of this policy impacted on the academic labour process and academic identities. Academics outside the research centres were now allocated varying amounts of time for research. One academic who was included in the 2014 REF stated:

“.. now there is a lot more time available for you to do research, before there was virtually none, now there is a fairly substantial chance of your timetable being allocated to research if you are research inclined … I might have had nine modules to teach … now I am down to three and so that means there is a lot more time available for doing other things” (Tom-post1992).

There was clearly a positive impact on the academic labour process as academics were now encouraged to conduct research and allocated some time for this purpose.

With regard to improving research focus, the university attempted to encourage academics to work together around particular themes, which came to be called Grand Challenges (Appendix 4):

“they want … clusters and having critical masses and I have been close to being involved in critical masses but often the University changes direction in terms of research and policy and these research clusters … are very short lived … so I have been burnt twice.” (Walter-post1992)

In this case, the university's attempt to direct the focus of research led to academics spending time building up interest and enthusiasm for particular projects, only to find that the university then abandoned these themes and moved onto new themes. For many academics this led to an intensification of the academic labour process, but it also involved forming and then reforming academic identities (Henkel 2000) when the university changed the focus of potential research.

With regard to maximizing applied research income, academics within the Faculty research centre were required to generate applied research income to cover their costs as well as produce academic papers. However, academics outside the research centre were allocated an individual income target based on the average income generated by
an academic in their discipline in the UK. For most academics, the target was completely unrealistic. In addition, academics were required to make two bids for research funds a year, but with no time or previous experience and the competitive nature of the process, the majority of bids were unsuccessful.

“I think my target was supposed to be £30,000 to £35,000 a year or something like that” (Jim-post1992).

“Well I think we got a bit creative as well in our department because we started keeping track of everything so things like doing moderation… (for overseas partners) and then when you realised that nobody was getting anywhere near that target it stopped being that… threatening” (Trish-post1992)

The research income target was quietly forgotten after two or three years, when it was realised that the targets were completely unattainable. However, during the time they were operational, there was an atmosphere of fear and job insecurity as most academics did not meet their targets and feared that they would be put under performance management. The university management attempted to control workers and to increase work intensity by requiring academics to raise funds for research, as well as undertake their traditional roles.

For the REF 2014, the university submitted to only nine units of assessment (REF 2014) although it had submitted to sixteen units in 2008 (RAE 2008). As a consequence, many academics were forced to submit their work to an alternative unit or not at all.

“It ... resulted in some people being alienated and disenfranchised in many ways from the REF and I strongly believe disadvantaged the university as well in terms of the intensity ... the university did try and find places for people where they could ... but that weakened the submissions they put in … and we had good people who weren’t submitted as there was no unit of assessment for them ...” (Sandra-post1992).
Consequently, this decision by the university led to the re-creation of academic identities for some academics, whilst other academics were unable to attain their ideal academic identity. It was more important for the university to maximize its REF score than to ensure that academics achieved the appropriate recognition for their research.

In addition, since 2008, there has been increasing pressure on academics, originally appointed as teachers, to register for PhD’s, initially at an appropriate university, but more recently, at the home university. Some academics registered for PhD’s but others left the Faculty, exercising their mobility power to quit (Smith 2006). Again, the university strategy was to increase the number of academics with PhD's in order to hit a target which fed into a performance indicator for the university.

In summary, prior to 2014, the aim of the university was to raise its research profile and maximise applied research income. With regard to the academic labour process and on the positive side, research active academics were now allocated some time to conduct research. However, on the negative side, the requirement for all academics to raise applied research income and hence increase university revenue led to an increase in work intensity and increased job insecurity. The university's attempt to set up research themes that were often short-lived, could be interpreted as an attempt at identity control, which involved the forming and reforming of academic identities. In addition, the decision to submit to fewer REF units of assessment than in 2008 led again to academic identities being reformed or unrealised. When pressured to complete a PhD, some academics left the university.

Following the 2014 submission, the university adopted a new research strategy in preparation for the REF 2020 (Appendix 4). The objective of the new university strategy was to make a significant upward movement in the research league tables to complement its rise in the teaching league tables. The university earmarked £100m (Appendix 4) for this purpose: it advertised for a large number of researchers, established new research centres, set ambitious targets for PhD completions and created a large bureaucracy to support its aspirations. Within the Business faculty, two new research centres were to be the power houses for academic outputs, but they were also required to obtain funding from REF accredited funders. Unfortunately, some
academics did not have the same optimistic view of the university’s likelihood of success.

“the questions being asked by the institution and the priorities being put forward are so ‘out there’ in terms of their lack of understanding of research and the way it works, that it makes you question their knowledge in the sector, and the knowledge of what they’re doing” (Donald-post1992)

It is argued that the University adopted a managerialist strategy in order to attain its research objectives.

“the institution is very managerialist in terms of, its data driven, its metrics driven, we’ll adjust this metric by point two and that will move us up five places in the league table......that worked for teaching, we’ll do the same thing for research, then it’ll move us, but it won’t because research doesn’t work like that” (Donald-post1992).

In support of this managerialist perspective, several academics stated that the university was not interested in research per se, but merely as a benchmark to move up the league tables. Success in research was not celebrated and there was an absence of a research culture.

”it’s not interested in research for research’s sake, it’s simply trying to play the game to improve the research output measured in a way that will get it up the league tables...... they simply demand that you do X,Y, Z research wise and assume magically that this will happen without creating the correct environment for that to happen” (Mike-post1992).

Several features of the University’s research strategy could be cited to demonstrate its managerialist and target driven stance. Prior to 2014, the Faculty Research Centre had been required to cover its costs and did so by undertaking commissioned research. The new Faculty Research Centres are expected to obtaining research funds from particular research funders (that is, funders recognised by the REF), produce good quality
research outputs (3 or 4*) and become self-financing within two years (Donald-post1992).

“you need to prioritise research from RCUK, from charitable funders, from the EU, that’s where we want to see your money coming from, because it counts double in the REF... so we focus all our time on doing that, and if we don’t win, we don’t generate any income” (Donald-post1992).

Consequently, applying for funds from REF recognised sources may not be successful and therefore the centres will not be self-funding. Academics were therefore also required to apply for commissioned funding. The remit of the research centres presented challenges and tensions for the academics working within them.

“the university has got a contradictory message coming out really on one hand it is saying we must have quality outputs with the REF and then the second one is we need money and you can’t, sometimes the two go together but not always” (Sandra-post1992).

Academics were required to produce quality academic outputs, obtain funds from REF recognised sources and be self-financing, by undertaking commissioned or applied research. However, as demonstrated by Berg et al. (2004) it is not easy to convert applied research work to academic research papers.

One academic did not apply to work in the research centres as academics located in the Research Centres did not teach, apart from supervising PhD students.

“I consciously didn’t apply ... I believe in the importance of research and teaching ... also the fact that within my discipline it’s particularly important. I think this is where the institution possibly is going wrong, because if you look at all the red bricks, they do teach, all of them teach” (Jane-post1992)

It was important for this academic’s identity that she was involved in both research and teaching and consequently did not wish to work in a Research Centre.
In addition, in order to meet the research outputs required for the REF, academics are being told to co-author articles with their PhD students.

“only way I can do it ... use my PhD students and claim their work effectively by co-publishing ... effectively that’s what I’ve been told I need to do ... not giving me the space to develop independently as a researcher … it doesn’t feel quite right ... my role as an academic is to be doing that work, not getting other people to do it for me. But it’s, that’s not really what it’s about here anymore” (Donald-post1992).

Publishing with PhD students would entail the neglect of an academics own research interests and compromise academic identities. The university was again attempting identity regulation in order to hit research targets.

Furthermore, academics have also been instructed to submit to ABS journals only, ignoring the fact that research papers are judged on their own merit and without reference to their place of publication.

“you’ve got to get four journal articles at the right quality on the ABS list and then what you do with the rest of your time is up to you” (Donald-post1992).

As previously reported by Minger and Willmott (2013), the use of journal lists, for instance, the ABS list, can have a stifling and narrowing impact on the focus and development of research in a particular field of study.

In addition, the faculty appears to be attempting to maximize its research rating for the REF 2020 by making submissions under only two units of assessment: Politics and International Studies and Business and Management Studies. Although the faculty also includes social science disciplines, there will not be any submissions to social science units, and these academics are being asked to submit their research to politics and international studies journals.
“The problem we have with people trying to slot from social work, social policy into politics and international studies is the methodologies are different, the paradigms are different” (Sandra-post1992).

“the structures ... determines where people publish and so somebody who finds themselves not in a unit of assessment, basically has to reinvent themselves, to fit into a unit of assessment ..... you can’t just reject your academic identity of 20 years because the university says it is not submitting, … the REF is an artificial thing, the research I do is with real people and I want to make a difference to their lives, if I possibly can, raise the profile of those issues and I don’t want to be constrained by REF boundaries” (Sandra-post1992).

In essence, some academics, having spent up to twenty years developing a particular methodological perspective, are being told to reject their pre-existing academic identities and to adopt alternative identities. In the long-run, publishing in these journals may also be detrimental to the career of these academics.

In addition, academics outside the Research Centres were often not allocated sufficient time for research. One academic was informed when appointed, that his workload would be a 60/40 split between teaching and research. When he enquired about these hours, he was told by the Head of Department, that research did not matter for a career at this university and he was denied any research hours. He was unable to resolve this issue at Faculty level and decided to take it to the university’s Research Director. He was allocated the hours, but reprimanded by the Dean, for “going above her head” (Peter-post1992).

“it was signalled very clearly that if they have to, they can lower research allowances” (Peter-post1992)

Clearly, the faculty was able to withdraw research hours if academics were required for teaching.
So although academics who worked outside the Research Centres wanted to be included in the REF, there was uncertainty with regard to whether they would be given the time and space to produce research outputs. In addition, many academics stated that the faculty did not have a credible research culture and this created uncertainty with regard to academic identities. In addition, many academics outside the Research Centres have been informed that if they want to research, they must use their weekends and holidays. In addition, although all academics have varying nominal hours for research, these hours have been ‘found’ by reducing the hours allocated to teaching. For most academics, the actual number of hours spent in the classroom has not decreased although the research allowances have increased. Consequently, academics who perceive their role and academic identity to encompass research, must undergo intensification of their academic labour process.

Academics located within the Research Centres stated that the Faculty management did not understand the nature of research. Both of the Research Centres are located in open plan offices with inadequate space for all academics. Academics have to “hot desk”, even though they are not officially location independent workers. All desks have to be cleared at the end of day, talking is restricted and meeting rooms, often booked one week in advance, are to be used to discuss research issues. There are no single offices for Professors or Heads of Research Centres.

“...we’ve been put into another little office off an atrium, which is arranged in rows like a classroom effectively. There isn’t enough space for all of the people we’ve got, so if everybody turned up there wouldn’t be enough seats” (Donald-post1992)

These academics were not satisfied with their working conditions and felt this reflected the poor understanding of research and the lack of a research culture within the Faculty. Academics lacked an appropriate research environment, which was perceived as an affront to their academic identities and was interpreted as the actual importance which the Faculty attached to research.

In addition, although “seed corn funding” for research was available, it was not useful.
“if you get it, you can’t use it to buy yourself out of teaching ... so we get funding but we are not allowed to actually have the time to carry out any of this research which seems to be a bit nonsensical to me” (Mary-post1992).

In summary, in order for the university to maximize its score in the next REF exercise, a series of managerial initiatives have been implemented which involve work intensification and identity control, namely: directing academics to obtain funds from particular sources, setting up research centres for the purpose of producing research outputs, directing academics to research in areas which fit under the two units of assessment, directing academics to publish with PhD students and telling academics to only submit papers to ABS journals. In addition, academics outside the Research Centres are uncertain about the time available and therefore have to work more intensively or extensively if they want to be research active. Academics in the Research Centres experienced a poor physical environment and, to use a manufacturing analogy, were not provided with the tools to do their jobs.

4.6 Discussion

The first objective of this chapter is to analyse and evaluate academics’ perceptions of their role in a university.

In both universities, research or scholarly activity and teaching were the main roles performed by an academic. In the pre-1992 university, personal research was perceived as the most important role for an academic with teaching perceived as a second but supplementary role. In the post-1992 university, academics expected to be involved in scholarly activity which was broadly defined, but equal or more importance was given to teaching and the plethora of other roles which involved interaction between lecturer and student.

Given these perceptions of the academic role, it would be expected that the academic labour process would reflect these priorities. In the pre-1992 university, academics were expected to produce research outputs and to undertake teaching and
administrative duties as supplementary roles and this was reflected in the academic labour process. In the post-1992 university, the academic labour process was focused on teaching and administration, with much less clarity for the supplementary activity of personal research.

As a consequence of the above perceptions of the academic role, the ability to conduct research was an important generative mechanism for academic identity. If academics are not able to pursue their research interests as a component of the labour process then this had a negative impact upon how they viewed themselves and how significant others viewed them. As noted, the relative autonomy of academics to conduct research is constrained by the social structures within their university. These constraints differ between the two universities, time being an obvious constraint in the pre-1992 university.

*The second objective of this chapter is: in relation to research, to determine and assess the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities*

Having ascertained the academics perceptions of their role and consequently their academic identity in a university, it is pertinent to determine how academic identity has been affected by NPM policies. More precisely, it is important to identify the generative mechanisms which have led to the assaults on academic identity.

By critically evaluating the interview evidence and government policy documents, it is possible to show, that the implementation of the RAE and the REF into the social structures of the university have impacted upon the material interests of academics via the academic labour process. In turn, these changes in material interests or elements of proletarianisation (Derber 1983, Wilson 1991) have led to an assault on the symbolic resources which determine academic identities. How has this occurred and how does it compare across the two universities? Before moving on to discuss the generative mechanisms which have had causal efficacy on academic identities, it is useful to rehearse the meaning of proletarianisation.
Derber (1983) in discussing the proletarianisation of professionals makes a distinction between ideological proletarianisation, that is, “the appropriation of control by management over the goals and social purposes to which work is put” (ibid. 313) and technical proletarianisation, that is, the loss of control over the means of production (ibid.). However, Wilson (1991) divides proletarianisation into objective elements which are subject to empirical observation (pay, conditions, resources, discretion and routinisation) and the more subjective elements, which are related to changed class identification or a different ideological outlook (Wilson 1991: 251). In discussing the results of this study, reference will be made, as appropriate, to the distinctive types of proletarianisation which have most impacted upon the academic worker.

The changes that have occurred in the academic labour process for research have occurred as a consequence of changes in NPM policies, namely the introduction of the RAE and the REF, but they are also due to the increase in managerial control within universities to implement the new research policies. In discussing the proletarianisation of the academic worker, the following categorizations will be used: ideological proletarianisation, managerialism, conflict and compliance and work degradation.

It is argued, using Derber’s categorization, that academics have now ceded ideological control of their work. The RAE and the REF requirements as mediated through the university now controls what is classified as good research. The university has removed integrity and the sense of purpose from academics. Academics are instructed to submit their work to the highest ranked journals in the ABS list, even though this may not be appropriate for the research undertaken and is not important for REF submission. In the post-1992 university, where it had been decided to submit to only nine units rather than the 16 as in RAE 2008, many academics were not able to submit their work or were required to submit to an alternative unit of assessment. Prior to the research exercises, academics had decided what, when and where to publish their research, but they had now lost this autonomy. University management issued instructions to academics, based on what they believed would attain the highest rankings for the university.
Academics were subject to increasing levels of managerial control, which in the pre-1992 university manifested itself as threats to change the academics’ employment contract from RDC to a TDC. A change in employment contract is not only of material importance in terms of the academic labour process, but of symbolic importance in determining academic identity. As previously outlined, a TDC was perceived by both the university and academics as an inferior contract to the RDC. The majority of academics wanted to remain on the RDC as it was an important determinant of their academic identity. Within the post-1992 university, increasing managerialism, is manifested in the setting of explicit targets, including income and journal publication targets, for academics working in the Faculty Research Centres. This has led to work intensification for academics who attempt to achieve management targets.

The relationship between academics and the university demonstrates both conflict and compliance. In the pre-1992 university, the university view of the purposes of research and being research active diverge from that of academics. However, academics were compliant and they accepted the university view. They did not offer any resistance, even though the REF distorted the nature of research outputs, favouring journal publications over other research outputs and compromised academic research identities. In addition, producing four good quality academic articles led to an intensification of the work process and consequent stress, particularly for junior academics.

In addition, there were divergent views expressed with regard to the impact of academic research. In the pre-1992 university, the academic perspective with regard to maximizing the impact of their research was to publish it wherever or in whatever form it would reach the widest audience. The university interpretation of the REF did not necessarily support this view. Consequently, there was an underlying conflict between the academics’ view of impact and the university/REF view of impact.

In terms of compliance, in the pre-1992 university, all academics had been set applied research income targets. The vast majority of academics never achieved their targets although it did cause job uncertainty due to the appraisal process. These targets were unachievable for most academics and consequently most academics were not able to comply, but some academics did manage to feign compliance.
In addition, there is evidence of work degradation in both universities. There is evidence of work intensification in both universities, whilst the REF exercise in the pre-1992 university has resulted in increased stress and self-doubt for more junior academics. As a consequence, academics have been subject to proletarianisation, certainly in the ideological sense, but also in the technical or objective sense, particularly with regard to the increase in managerial control with the accompanying increase in conflict and compliance and the resulting work intensification.

Consequently, it is argued that the process of the implementation of the RAE and the REF have been the primary generative mechanisms for the changing research academic identities in both universities. The initial purpose of the RAE was to assess the quality of research conducted in a university however, it has now become an increasingly competitive performance indicator with the publication of the research results and the allocation of research funds. As a consequence implementation of the REF within universities has via the increase in managerialism, intensified the academic labour process and led to a further movement towards the proletarianisation of the academic worker. The tendency towards further proletarianisation of academic labour has had a detrimental impact on how academics view themselves and how they are viewed, namely, their academic identity.

Having considered the impact of NPM policies on research, it is now appropriate to examine the other major NPM policies which relate to teaching and the employment relations of academics.
Chapter 5

The academic as a teacher and managerialism

5.1 Introduction

The aim of this study is to assess the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities. This chapter will address the following objectives

i) to determine and assess the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities with respect to the teaching and administrative role
   and
ii) to determine and assess the impact of NPM policies on the other material and symbolic aspects of the workplace environment which have impacted on the labour process and academic identities.

The other material and symbolic aspects are those aspects which were articulated as important to academics in their workplace environment. These aspects can be broadly grouped as follows: the administrative role, the appraisal process, managerialism, the allocation of work and academic voice. The final section of this chapter will discuss the generative mechanisms through which NPM policies and the academic labour process have impacted on academic identities.

5.2 The academic as a teacher

The academic role of teacher has undergone significant changes in the past two decades. The changes which have had the greatest influence on this role can be classified as changes in the student body and changes in the management of teaching. However, before considering the impact of these changes, it is useful to consider the importance that academics attach to teaching in defining their academic identities.
In the pre-1992 university, teaching is the second most important role for academics, after research. Academics stated that teaching should have more importance attached to it, whilst some academics thought it was important to achieve accreditation from the HEA. However, teaching for academics on RDC’s contracts was always a secondary role. In general, academics had little to say about their teaching, apart from supervising PhD students which they found very rewarding. Even though tuition fees provided most of the financial resources for the university, the university only paid lip service to the importance of teaching and reinforced this lip service by not providing any incentive or reward for academics to excel at teaching.

“No-one is appointed to an academic job on the basis of their teaching ... teaching ought to have been more important to us than it has been ... and that’s entirely driven by the REF....which is pathetic and embarrassing and scandalous, because most of our income ... comes from teaching. That’s our bread and butter and we treat our bread and butter with contempt for the most part and it’s shocking” (Lionel-pre1992).

This echoes (Nixon 2001) who also signalled the mounting evidence of the deleterious effect on university teaching of the research selectivity funding mechanisms.

In the post-1992 university, academics expressed a real love of teaching and derived much satisfaction from their teaching role

“You know I love my job, I have got the best job in the world, I do, I love it” (Sarah-post1992)

Inevitably, academics expressed particular teaching preferences: some enjoyed teaching particular groups of students whilst others expressed a preference for undergraduate teaching.

Many academics discussed the link between research and teaching. For some academics in the pre-1992 university teaching provided the opportunity for them to pass on their research findings.
“at least make them think differently ... for the majority that won’t be the case. But, maybe just a handful, that’s about as much as you can do I think” (Lucy-pre1992).

However, academics recognised that their personal research would only ever make a small contribution to their teaching. For some academics, teaching signified control over their working environment, whereas publishing and obtaining research funds was subjective and dependent on luck (Louise-pre1992); in this sense, teaching provided more certainty than research.

In the post-1992 university, some academics emphasized the importance of a research background for good teaching (James, Sarah, Walter, Peter) whilst others emphasized their involvement with the HEA subject discipline network as the most positive influence on their teaching. A few academics discussed the negative impact of teaching on their research.

“I have 400 students who call on me and I am by nature quite helpful ...over the last two and a half years, I have taught six different courses from scratch” (James-post1992).

Consequently, there was a link between research and teaching, but they were not necessarily mutually reinforcing. A heavy teaching load often led to less time being available for research.

Academics in the pre-1992 university questioned the purpose of teaching in HE. Academics expected students to want to learn and to explore the subject matter of their degree, whereas their view of students was encapsulated in the phrase "What do I need to do to get a 2.1 or a 1st?" (Danny-pre1992). However, it was argued that we should not criticise students for their instrumentalism, as this was a consequence of a state which had reimagined the role of HE (Scott-pre1992). For most academics, teaching was something that had to be “done”: it was part of the job and paid their wages.
In summary, teaching was of secondary importance for academic identities in the pre-1992 university. Although tuition fees were the most important source of university revenue, career progression was determined by research and not teaching. In the post-1992 university, for historical reasons, teaching was the primary determinant of academic identities. There were links between research and teaching, but they were not viewed as mutually reinforcing. Whilst personal research made a limited contribution to teaching, the research skills of academics enhanced teaching quality. Teaching was a significant component of the academic labour process and was perceived to have a negative impact on the ability to conduct research.

5.3 Changes in the student body

Changes in the nature of the study body have had a significant influence upon the academic labour process and academic identities. Both universities have been subject to the same competitive pressures to increase surpluses by recruiting an increasing number of students and the impact upon academics in both universities has been broadly comparable. The increase in student numbers has been met by the admission of students with lower entry qualifications OFFA (2014) and an increase in foreign students.

Although the pre-1992 university has been subject to an increase in student numbers, it still retains a major focus on Distance Learning (DL). Campus based (CB) teaching has become more important, but DL teaching still provides a significant source of teaching revenue. Academics teaching DL students found this to be a rewarding and enjoyable experience. The DL students resided in a variety of locations within the Asian continent, studied part-time and were generally older than CB students. Academics found that DL students had “interesting things to say” and were able to take an active part in their learning (Beatrice-pre1992). Teaching DL students was an integral part of being an academic at this university and was viewed as an important determinant of academic identities.

The CB students were composed of home and foreign students, and were studying PhD’s, postgraduate and undergraduate courses. Some academics found teaching
undergraduate students demoralizing and actively avoided teaching them: student attendance at lectures was very poor and the students did not appear to be engaged with their learning. One academic was horrified when he asked students in a class, to re-read a 2000 word article and they attempted to do this on their mobile phone.

“some of them had read it and some of them hadn’t, but when I said look let’s read it again, there was only 3 of them .... but they all got out smart phones to read it on” (George-pre1992).

In the post-1992 university, academics commented on the changes to the home student body, particularly with reference to their attitude to learning, their ability and their general behaviour. Many students did not display any real interest in the subject they were studying and were likely to ask questions such as “What do I need to do to get a First?” The academics’ perception was that a much smaller percentage of students enrol on a course to enhance their knowledge and skills in a particular subject than in the past.

“... if you had asked me 20 years ago, … they wanted to be at University studying Economics I would have said probably 70% of the cohort and now I would say it is probably 40% of the cohort (Walter-post1992).

By increasing the student numbers and “digging into the [ability] distribution” (Mike-post1992), the average ability of students was now much lower, in respect of English, Maths and basic skills (Walter-post1992). This supports the findings of a recent OECD Skills study which found that English graduates in comparison with other OECD graduates had poor numeracy and literacy skills (OECD 2016:54). Academics stated that schools did not prepare students for self-directed learning and thinking as they were incentivised, via targets, to coach and spoon feed students to get them through A levels (Mike-post1992).

The fall in the ability of the students was evidenced by one lecturer:
“every 2 or 3 years ... I throw out stuff I have been teaching historically and sometimes find it quite scary as to the technical analysis I was doing 10 years ago that I wouldn’t dare do now, as it wouldn’t be so accessible to so many students ... although they have ironically better average A level grades on entry (Walter-post1992).

Although, academics still taught some very able and motivated students, the gap between the most able and least able students had increased (Mike-pre1992) and this presented challenges for academics as they now had to cater for a wider range of abilities (Lucy-post1992). According to the Office for Fair Access (OFFA), the expansion in home student numbers between 1998/99 and 2011/12 was driven primarily by an increase in students with medium and low entry requirements (OFFA 2014:14) which confirms the perceptions of academics in this study. Many academics commented on the generally poor behaviour of students, noting that they often had to act like school teachers in classes. Trish recounted a particular incident, which was symptomatic of the behaviour she encountered.

“I actually went to a table to talk to one student ... and another student sitting two chairs away from him just cut across me and started talking about what they were going to do later and this was not intentionally rude he had no awareness that what he was doing was wrong and I ended up having a, like a motherly, do you have any idea of what you have just done ....and he looked at me really surprised like no one had ever said that to him before” (Trish-post1992)

In both the pre-1992 and post-1992 university, the taught postgraduate student body consisted mainly of Chinese students who did not always possess the necessary English Language skills and often lacked the confidence to take part in class discussions, which was referred to as "the silent classroom" (Julia-pre1992). Academics were not concerned with the number of foreign students per se, but with the fact that they all originated from one country and continued to communicate with each other in their native language. Several academics in the pre-1992 university, had previously worked in European universities, where there were few "non-European" students and for these academics this was a different and challenging experience.
In addition, in the post-1992 university, the increase in student numbers has led to academics delivering the same lecture several times a week, as the university has an insufficient number of large lecture theatres. The increase in student numbers has also led to an increase in the size of small group teaching with up to 30 students in undergraduate classes and in the recent past, 60-90 students in postgraduate classes.

Apart from the poor English language skills of some students, academics identified significant cultural differences between home and Chinese students.

“there is more diversity, so that does have an impact on the way you can get your class to engage because some cultural groups are less interactive than others … but we haven’t been given any development about that and how to engage Chinese students who just sit there and won’t question the lecturer because of the authority …” (Sarah-post1992).

Consequently, whilst some academics were able to adapt to the changing nature of the student body, others clearly required more support and found the teaching experience very frustrating. This provides further confirmation for the work of Trahar (2014).

The recruitment strategy of this university along with many other universities is to recruit a substantial number of overseas students via the use of overseas agents and this has impacted on the academic rigour of some of the courses.

“they (overseas students) are cash cows, they are a key part of how the institution makes up the funding shortfall … if the Chinese bourgeoisie stop turning up then we have got some big problems” (Scott-pre1992)

“the Masters degrees now are not as high quality as our third year undergraduate programme” (Scott-pre1992)

Although this was not the case for all postgraduate courses, it was certainly applicable to some courses. In addition, although the overseas students attended lectures, they were not passionate about their studies.
“it’s when students are passionate and they care ... I feel myself coming to life ... I enjoy giving the lectures ... but if you are looking to the students to kind of give you a reward forget about it” (Charles-pre1992).

In addition, in both universities there was a continuing debate about the authenticity of the International English Language Test Scores (IELTS) of Chinese students and the authenticity of student coursework (Lucy-post1992). This would appear to be in line with the results of a study conducted by the THE which found that nearly two in three UK universities were setting English Language standards below the recommended level for undergraduate students (THE 23.08.2012). However, academics are assured by management that overseas students met the “minimum” English standards. In support of the academics’ evidence, the high plagiarism of overseas student coursework was highlighted in The Times (2016).

In response to the changing student body, academics adopted various coping strategies. Some academics put more information online, including videos (Trish-post1992) and/or they provide more lecturer input (Lynne-post1992), including devoting more time to overseas students:

“It can be frustrating at times and I feel for some of the home students who are waiting to see me as well…..” (Sarah-post1992).

Some academics responded by reducing the academic level of the teaching materials or taught mainly through numbers and diagrams (Walter-post1992), whilst others deliberately avoided teaching on postgraduate courses due to their low academic level (Mike-post1992). Many academics despaired at the low quality of some students’ work and felt it devalued the quality of the degree they themselves had obtained from the post-1992 university (Donald-post1992).

In the pre-1992 university, there was usually an air of despondency when teaching was mentioned. There were issues which needed to be addressed, but no real strategy to
address them. There was no incentive for academics to find out about their students and to improve the situation.

“We don’t quite know what to do about it, and I think partly we don’t quite know, because we don’t know enough about our students” (George-pre1992).

In summary, the changes in the student body can be categorised under two headings: changes in the attitude, behaviour and ability of home students and the cultural and language issues of increasing numbers of Chinese students. The increases in student numbers has led to work intensification but changes have also been made to the labour process as academics have reduced the academic rigour of their courses and/or changed their teaching style. The teaching role has been transformed and this has led to a reformation of academic identities.

Academics may previously have identified themselves as higher skilled workers in their roles as facilitators of learning in a specific subject discipline. This role is now supplemented with lower skilled work in the form of behaviour management and a reduction in the rigour of academic content.

5.4 Changes in the management of teaching

The second most significant influence upon the teaching role has been the change in the nature of management within the university. The increase in the number of students has been accompanied by an increase in managerialism within the post-1992 university. The specific managerialist initiatives include the introduction of the three semester year and online marking. The impact of these initiatives and other managerialist measures on the academic labour process will be discussed along with their impact on academic identities.

In the post-1992 university, the structure of the academic year has been changed to a three semester system (Appendix 5), in order to increase the number of starting dates for postgraduate students. This has impacted detrimentally on the academic labour process of academics as well as the learning experience of undergraduate students.
Academics expressed concern for two reasons. Firstly, students are taught in two consecutive semesters and although academics are informed they will only teach in two semesters, in practice, this is not always the case. Consequently, many academics are required to teach over three semesters and consequently do not have time for research and have limited time to take vacations. The second concern is that in order to accommodate three semesters during the academic year, there are no vacation periods for students. Consequently, undergraduate students are taught in two semesters, which run consecutively from late September through to the beginning of May. This puts undergraduate students under increased pressure to work continuously throughout this time and consequently this exerts additional pressure on academics to maintain target pass rates. Consequently, academics often run extra classes for students which results in work intensification.

Another managerial initiative which has been introduced is online marking which occurred without any pre-trial or consultation with academics. In addition, to adapting to a new system with little training, academics were also concerned with the impact on their health (staring at a screen for long periods of time) and the difficulty of marking online in a shared office or open plan office.

“It was very much dictatorial; get on with it, no questions…” (Sarah-post1992).

In addition, the university insisted on a two week turnaround time for marking student work, which resulted in compromising the quality of feedback to students.

“What I don’t understand is why we are willing to compromise on quality of feedback …” (Jane-post1992).

Some academics met the deadlines by minimizing the feedback on coursework, which may be termed conformist (Collinson 2003). The two week turnaround for online marking led to an increase in work intensification. Many academics were resistant (Collinson 2003), but that was often because there was no alternative, online marking and moderation could not physically be completed within the time frame set by the university management. This management initiative is evidence of increasing
managerialism within the university and the lack of consultation with academics. The policy was decided by a pro vice-chancellor who appeared to have an incomplete understanding of what the process involved. It was argued that it would make the university more competitive and the university needed to stay ahead of its competitors! Online marking reduced the administrative cost of collecting coursework and was more convenient for students, but there was no discussion of the possible negative impacts for academics and no pedagogic justification was provided. Managers were now making decisions which affected the teaching and learning process and consequently taking control away from academics.

There was further evidence of this increasing encroachment of managerial directives into areas once controlled by lecturers and pedagogical reasoning.

“What seems to matter is that the module is delivered over X number of weeks, all of the classroom time is filled up, the class is delivered in a particular way, there are module webs which are stuffed with bureaucratic documents about coursework and reading and about week by week planning and so on, so it’s all become very, very mechanistic … almost robotic in terms of how information is organised, how it has to be delivered and to some extent the sorts of people that they want to deliver it” (Walter-post1992).

There was also an increasing movement towards micro-management of the teaching process:

“… senior management … now attempt to display even subject expertise and are quite happy to provide direction and strategic change … in subject areas they know nothing about …. a number of them don’t come from scholarly backgrounds; they come from a sort of emerging public sector management approach which is about bean counting …” (Walter-post1992)

Furthermore, the teaching role now included a variety of non-traditional activities. Along with the inclusion of transferable and employability skills, many courses, in pursuit of internationalization, now included overseas visits for students “in order to
differentiate ourselves from other providers” (Susan-post1992). Academics were often pressurized to organise and take students on these overseas visits, usually in traditional vacation (research) periods. Again, this involved work extensification as there was no time allocation for such visits, which often included delivering lectures.

In summary, in the post-1992 university the pursuit of growth and increasing surpluses has led to the implementation of a three semester year, which has facilitated the recruitment of more overseas postgraduate students. This has led to increased work pressure on undergraduate students and consequently increased work pressure on academics to ensure that target pass rates are achieved, causing work intensification. There is evidence of increasing managerialism, via new control technologies (Deem et al. 2007) as evidenced in the target times set for online marking (with no academic consultation) which has resulted in work intensification. In addition, the delivery of teaching is now regulated by measurable parameters set by the university management. In addition, academics are pressurized to take on additional duties, usually during traditional holiday (research) periods. This work extensification, left little time for higher skill activities such as research, which has resulted in work degradation.

5.5 The academic as administrator

The third role performed by academics is that of administrator, usually course administration. In the pre-1992 university, all the interviewed academics held an administrative responsibility. A wide variety of reasons were given for taking on administrative roles, for example, to be more involved in courses, to reduce teaching load, to meet expectations or to help with career prospects. However, most academics did not define themselves by their administrative roles. Many academics expressed the view that in this university, you were not judged or promoted by your ability to teach or manage a course, but only by the quality of your research.

Interestingly, three interviewees at this pre-1992 university had experienced career setbacks because they had become "too involved” in administration, to the detriment of their research. They had, at the request and with the full support of their immediate managers, set aside their research for a period of time, in order to perform major
administrative roles. These academics stated that these administrative roles were an important determinant of their academic identities, but this view was challenged by the university. In order to conform to the university's view of an academic, these academics were pressured to recreate their academic identities. One academic opted to retain his existing identity and switched to a TDC, one academic left the university to build up his research portfolio and has now returned, whilst the third academic is being “performance managed”. Academics undertook administrative roles for the benefit of the university, which then punished them for reducing their research outputs.

Academics in this pre-1992 university, believed that systems and processes drove teaching and learning rather than pedagogical considerations, for example, there had been a change in the process for online marking and although the marking did not take any longer, accessing the marking was now a more lengthy process. There was far too much bureaucracy and sometimes it felt like the academics were supporting the administration rather than vice versa. Academics noted that carrying out administrative tasks was not a cost-effective way of using their time. Additionally, the performance by highly skilled academics of low skill activities is a degradation of their labour.

Within the post-1992 university, some academics were happy to include administrative duties within their roles, whilst some academics hated administration. However, all academics believed that they did far too much administration. Academics put forward two reasons for the excessive administrative burden: firstly, the university had complicated and bureaucratic procedures, see also Appendix 9, and secondly, the administrators performed too few of the administrative tasks. Academics implied that the Head of Administration protected his staff from completing any unnecessary administration. Again, as in the pre-1992 institution, academics expressed the view that the academics were supporting the administrators and not vice versa. As in the pre-1992 university, the performance by higher skilled academics of lower skill activities is a degradation of their labour.

In summary, academics recognise that performing administrative duties is an essential part of the academic role. Academic identities in the pre-1992 university were not determined by their administrative duties or roles, although it was recognised that some
administrative work was an essential component of an academic’s work. However, where academics had chosen to take on administrative roles and not conduct research, they had been punished.

Academics in the post-1992 university, which has become increasingly target driven, spend an increasing proportion of their time recording information for monitoring purposes. However, in contrast to the pre-1992 university, in the post-1992 university, for the past 20 years, promotion has been based on the ability to perform administrative duties, rather than on research capability (Walter-pre1992). Consequently, for academics with administrative roles, this was an important component of their academic identity.

5.6 The academic and managerialism

In examining the determinants of changes to academic identities, it is necessary to look back at how, the university and local management, have interpreted and implemented NPM policies in their university. In essence this establishes the workplace environment of the university. This study considers four material and symbolic aspects of the workplace environment: the appraisal process, managerialism, the allocation of work and academic voice.

5.6.1 Academic identities and the appraisal process

In 2001, the Rewarding and Development Staff (RDS) Initiative (HEFCE 2001) was introduced, with the aim of improving academic performance. It was argued that if academics were better managed their performance would improve (Waring 2013).

In the pre-1992 university, although academics generally viewed the appraisal process as a useful exercise in recording current achievements and objectives for the following year, it was viewed as very light touch. All academics filled out the necessary paperwork and it was discussed with their mentor; there was no assessment of performance, it was not linked to pay and neither was it used in any way to "discipline" academics.
There were contrasting views with regard to the efficacy of the appraisal system. The more senior academics stated that they felt valued by their colleagues and that they received very positive informal feedback from senior management. They did not look to the appraisal system for an indication of their self-worth or identities.

“I feel valued but not evaluated” (Julia-pre1992).

However, junior academics viewed the appraisal process as important for creating their academic identities. They were unsure about the quality of their academic performance or if that performance had been correctly appraised. Although immediate colleagues and their students recognised the quality of their work, the appraiser did not necessarily know what they actually did or what their roles involved. Academics had a perception of their academic performance, which may or may not have been effectively communicated to the appraiser and consequently the appraiser may not necessarily have a real understanding of their performance.

In this sense, the appraisal system did not provide junior academics with the guidance, feedback, recognition or reward which they sought for the work performed. It is important to junior academics, in terms of forming their academic identities, that they received feedback and recognition of work done (Archer 2008, Fitzmaurice 2011).

Although academics at this pre-1992 university were expected to conduct research, teach and perform some administrative duties, they were appointed and promoted only on the basis of their research capabilities, rather than for their teaching or administrative capabilities.

“… we have these three areas, teaching, admin and research. Although you hear it in the university, that there’s rewards for the first two, I’ve never seen rewards for people who excel at the first two… only if you excel at the last one do you even move up the ladder … And I’m not talking about money, I’m talking about actual reward, like recognition for work that you do, that will help with your promotion” (Charles-pre1992).
Students also completed module evaluations of teaching, which were passed on to course teams, but they were not used to evaluate individual teaching performance.

“If you look at student feedback on modules for example, you can’t really use that to judge the individual” (Lionel-pre1992).

As a result, module evaluations could not be used in a negative or a positive way to evaluate the teaching performance of an academic. However, as previously illustrated undertaking administrative duties and failing to meet the university research targets could lead to performance management.

In summary, the current light touch appraisal process at this pre-1992 university, which was not linked to pay, incentivised academics to prioritise their research activities, rather than their teaching or administrative responsibilities. The primary role of academics in this university is to conduct research, that is how they identified themselves and are identified by significant others. However, the appraisal process fails to provide junior academics with the feedback required to confirm their academic identities.

The appraisal of academics is significantly different in the post-1992 university. In this university all academics are required to complete an appraisal form (Appendix 6) and evidence the successful completion of their current objectives and then to outline their objectives for the forthcoming year. Academics specify a minimum number of objectives over a range of areas, with minimum targets against which performance is assessed. The appraisal form is discussed with the appraiser and the academic is assigned a provisional grade, although this grade is not communicated to the academic. The grades are: unacceptable, improvement required, development required, strong and excellent. These grades are then reviewed by a panel where the grade may or may not be agreed. If the grade is strong or excellent, the academic is awarded one increment on the pay scale. However, if the academic’s salary is within the “contribution zone”, then the academic must receive an excellent rating in order to receive a pay increment (Appendices 7 & 8).
How did academics view this process?

“it’s a bit of a game and it’s a game that you have to know how to play... and your line manager has to kind of know how to play the game” (Lucy-post1992)

“those people that seem to spend a long time filling in forms and think about everything that they have done ... seem to do better than those who just get on with their jobs ... I know there are people who have spent a week filling in their form .. I have had (forms) ... which are 30-50 pages ... they write their (appraisal) every week” (Sandra-post1992)

“No thought has ever been put into the problems associated with measuring academic performance it’s just assumed you can do it” (Mike-post1992)

Many academics viewed the appraisal process as a form of control

”… HR became rather than a supporting part of management in this University they were driving, they were at the wheel and I found that very uncomfortable ... I know HR staff generally talk about academics in a very contentious way ... unmanageable and uncontrollable bunch of weirdo’s ... has led to this very, very tight framework…” (Trish-post1992)

In addition, the appraisal process is based on individual effort, and is evidence of the individuation of academic work (Waring 2013). This is despite the view that most measurable outcomes are team rather than individual outcomes. Academics also stated that being excellent did not necessarily lead to an excellent appraisal.

“I think that it is unfortunate that staff who do a huge amount of work are never credited for the fact that they do the work and they perform very well” (Mike-post1992).

As academics are appraised with reference to module evaluation questionnaires (MEQs) which are completed by students and module pass rates, academics are
incentivised to maximize student satisfaction and module pass rates. Consequently, the MEQs are “completely useless” (Mary-post1992) as an indicator of teaching quality.

“so what ...you get ... in the current system is what the economics literature calls distortion misalignment of incentives, to hit the target you can do things that actually don’t improve the organisation ... or are actually to the detriment of the objectives of the organisation” (Mike-post1992)

There was a “fear of the MEQs” as the results were included in appraisals (Linda-post1992). One academic tried a simulation game with first year students and received a poor MEQ score as “they couldn’t see the point of it”.

“… this MEQ … will be red flagged and then I will have to put a response together, my boss will speak to me it about and then (the Associate Dean) will want to know about it .. if you get poor student satisfaction … you will be accountable. … I am going back to the old school, I am doing a lecture and a seminar with case studies and I am not going to try anything new in the module next year” (Sharon-post1992).

Consequently, academics were less likely to be innovative in the classroom or to take risks because they could not risk student dissatisfaction (Mary-post1992).

The MEQs were completed during lectures under the supervision of an administrator and this indicated a lack of trust in academics. Academics are "no longer assumed to be public spirited altruists" (Le Grand 1995:149). Some academics viewed them as a “personality test” (Linda-post1992).

The appraisal process appeared to have two interrelated negative consequences on academic identities: academics were de-motivated and did not feel valued.

“They (other academics) tell me they have got excellent … I … think well what have you done over the academic year that is different to me, you haven’t done
any more than me so why are you getting excellent… it just gets a bit de-motivating because of the inconsistency, favouritism” (Sarah-post1992).

This is what Derber (1983) called “managerial patronage”. For many academics, the appraisal process was deeply de-motivating. Another academic who received a “strong” appraisal result contacted her line manager:

“you need to give me some feedback then if you think my performance is average and I have done all these things, tell me where I can improve. So he said “oh you know I think it’s just that you didn’t provide enough detail, you should really provide a lot more evidence” (Lucy-post1992).

Academics who received an excellent rating also believed that the system was unfair. One academic who has always worked very closely with another colleague stated:

“ last year, for example, Geraldine worked her socks off, I got an excellent, she got a strong ... and that’s all about her completion of her (appraisal) form ...She didn’t sing her own praises enough” (Mary-post1992).

Academics are rewarded for writing about their work, rather than for actually performing the work. In addition, the majority of academics were not “excellent” under the appraisal system and consequently the majority of academics did not feel valued. This finding was supported by the Staff Survey Results 2014 for the Faculty whereby only 46% of staff felt valued (Appendix 9). In addition, the appraisal process could not be used developmentally as no academic would declare that they had weaknesses or development needs. (Lucy-post1992).

For some long-serving academics the appraisal process made no difference to their perceptions of their ability or sense of self, that is, their academic identity.

“I use the same form year after year and I just change a few numbers and a couple of words” (Tom-post1992)
Such a response could be indicative of performativity or economy of performance (Stronach et al. 2002), which can be termed resistance as academics refuse to fully participate in the process or assign any importance to it.

One final example serves to illustrate how the appraisal system was used by a line manager.

“ I brought in €650,000 for my research project and my line manager said it wasn’t part of my job and therefore I only got strong that year ... I wasn’t on a research contract ... “ (Sandra-post1992)

The appraisal process could be used vindictively, as it was not a transparent process and there was no appeal. In addition, it encourages short-termism.

“you might spend a year writing a bid, you might spend six months reviewing it so you have got no income for a year and then you are put down as improvement required ... but if I went and did a load of teaching I would be fine” (Sandra-post1992)

An academic with an income target, can hit the target by teaching or by writing a bid and obtaining funds in the long-term. However, in order to meet short-term targets, the academic would choose teaching over bid writing, but in the long-term, writing a successful bid would be more beneficial to the academic and the university (Sandra-post1992). The annual appraisal process may therefore have a negative impact on research output and obtaining research funds and therefore a deleterious impact on academic identities.

In summary, the appraisal process was a “game” of performativity and academics had to know how to play the game. The academic's rating was based on how well the form was completed and not how well the academic had actually performed. Academics engaged in identity work, which created a persona or reputation which was based on some notion of what significant others wished to view (Watson 2008). The appraisal
process ensured that academics were torn between economy of performance and ecologies of practice (Stronach et al 2002).

For most academics, the appraisal process led to work intensification in order to meet corporate objectives. It incentivised academics to take actions to meet management targets, for example, with regard to meeting target pass rates and target MEQ scores. These targets are used as a form of management control, to ensure that academic objectives are aligned with corporate objectives. However, the process seriously distorts the incentive structures for academics and leads to unintended consequences.

5.6.2 The academic and management

There are two avenues through which management may impact upon the academic labour process and academic identities. The first avenue is when managers manage academics and the second avenue is when academics become academic-managers. The evidence presented relates to both avenues and to both universities.

When discussing management in the pre-1992 university, it is important to distinguish between university management and local management. Following the REF 2014 experience, academics were not motivated by the threatening style adopted by university management. However, the university now had a new Vice Chancellor and academics were hopeful that positive changes would occur. The new Vice Chancellor would no longer be referring to “performance management” but to “career enhancement” (Keith-pre1992). However, all the academics had a positive view of local management who adopted an informal style and were accessible (Louise-pre1992). Local managers had a positive influence on the academic labour process as they provided a buffer which protected academics from the worst excesses of the university management. This was exemplified in the local managers' response to the university threats to make academics redundant or transfer them to a TDC if they were not submitted to REF 2014.

Senior academics expressed the view that junior academics were now more surveyed than when they had first entered the academy. This view was supported by the
evidence provided by more junior colleagues. In addition, junior academics were
expected to publish in good journals and were allowed very little time to learn.
Academics are regarded as underperforming if they do not publish four 3 or 4* articles
in the allotted time.

With regard to working within the structures created by management, one senior
academic stated:

“my experience has been that you can work within structures, you can be
creative you can find holes and warrens, gaps in which you can do all sorts of
interesting work” (Scott-pre1992).

The question that needs to be asked is “Why is it necessary for academics to negotiate
these hurdles and obstacles in order to fulfil their role as an academic?” There is strong
evidence of increasing managerialism at this pre-1992 university at senior level.
However, local management resisted the demands of university management, by
adopting a collegiate approach to managing their colleagues.

With reference to the post-1992 university, there were several levels of management
but there was little difference between the management style of the university and the
management style at the faculty level. One academic related why she had chosen to
become an academic-manager at a lower level.

“I went for the Deputy Head role because I had had enough of being
mismanaged ... that was my main motivator ... trying to do something about
managing my colleagues and working with my colleagues in a way that was
more collegial and less driven by HR processes” (Trish-post1992).

Another academic stated:

“I took the role on  to prove that I was more of an all-rounder than some
colleagues thought ... you get standing because of a role title ... visible signal
that you’re important to the system ... in a minor way” (Walter-post1992).
In the first case, the academic stated that poor management drove her to apply for the manager role, which may be perceived as an indicator of the previous style of management which had relied on adherence to HR protocols. This was supported by evidence from the Staff Survey 2014 (Appendix 9). Bryson & Barnes (2000) also found that poor management and its encroachment were causes of concern for academics. In the second case, the academic attempted to re-create his external academic identity in the eyes of his peers and other managers, that is, to undertake identity work.

In general, academics in the post-1992 university did not express positive views with regard to the university or local management. The implementation of the appraisal process and online marking as already discussed, are indicators of the managerialist stance of university management. However, over time and as the Faculty has increased in size, there is reduced contact and a growing divide between faculty management and academics.

“I think there is a real void and perhaps the void is getter bigger between our level and the Dean ... (Mary-post1992).

This may because of the poor communication between academics and management although some academics viewed this as a deliberate management strategy.

“the level of communication from senior managers to academics is appalling and there is none ... this is a deliberate strategy that we are deliberately kept in the dark ... so staff don’t cause trouble, tell them the minimum amount they need to know” (Mike-post1992).

In addition, one Head of Department decided that there would no further department meetings and that any issues should be raised individually with the Associate Heads of Department. However, poor communication was also highlighted as a problem within the Faculty in the university staff survey of 2014 (Appendix 9). There appeared to be a deliberate attempt by senior managers in the Faculty and even some department
managers to create a distance or divide between themselves and the academic workforce, which included reduced communication. There was a tendency towards a "them" and "us" attitude by management.

In addition to the lack of communication, academics were also concerned about the lack of consultation on matters which directly concerned them. Again, online marking was a management initiative which was introduced with no consultation. Another example of a lack of consultation was the decision made by Faculty management in 2015 to merge three departments. Not only were the three departments merged, but over 60 academics were relocated from shared offices to one open plan office in another building. Academics were informed of the decision in a meeting, a few weeks before being relocated (Sarah-pre1992, Jane-pre1992, Sophie-pre1992, Julia-pre1992). This event was related by many academics and demonstrated the increasingly managerialist and dictatorial style of Faculty management.

However, the open plan office raised some interesting issues regarding academics' attempts to maintain their academic identities. In this open-plan office, manager-academics were located in one specific area.

“Yes, eight of them are in one area and they are cordoned off by cabinets and something else, so they are seen as the elite ... I was printing something off today from the photocopier and Clara came along and said “I’m going to pull rank, I need to use the photocopier” ... she was joking, but she was serious, so they are seen as very much the elite in there” (Sarah-post1992).

This particular manager-academic’s identity had obviously been threatened by being placed in an open plan office with her more junior colleagues and her attempt to maintain her academic identity was to “pull rank” on a colleague. This could be interpreted as the Veblen effect, where an individual’s behaviour is motivated by a desire to feel better than another individual (Friedman 2004). The new office is referred to as “the call centre” as the desks are in rows and there are many office rules.
Many academics felt that the faculty management were “incompetent” if “well meaning”, poor people managers and acted unethically.

“the complete lack of management, the obsession with performance targets, the lack of praise of staff, the way we are treated as human beings .... the treatment of students in clearing, holding rather than just declining them, which I found disgusting” (Mike-post1992).

In addition, academics also asserted that they did not feel valued, trusted or respected by management.

“I do not think we get enough respect from our management ... we are not valued, they do not show that they value us” (Peter-post1992)

Academics also cited the multiple permissions which were required to attend a conference as an indication of the lack of trust and this was supported by evidence from the Staff Survey 2014 (Appendix 9). As expounded by Trow (1996) and Amaral et al. (2008) the implementation of micro-management controls demonstrates a parallel loss of trust.

In summary, the evidence suggests that the implementation of management policies in both institutions has resulted in a deterioration in the academic labour process and had a negative impact on academic identities. In the pre-1992 university, university management adopted a threatening management style with regard to the REF, which increased uncertainty amongst academics. In this case, local management resisted the management threats in order o minimize the negative impact on their colleagues.

In the post-1992 university, the university management have introduced major initiatives, such as online marking without consultation. This conforms to the managerialist ideology of allowing the managers to manage; without interference from workers. In addition, local managers have replicated the managerialist style of university management. Local management have deliberately distanced themselves from academics via poor communication, lack of consultation, refusal to hold meetings
and have treated academics with a lack of respect and trust. This is evidenced by the merging of three departments and the wholesale physical movement of academics without any consultation. This led to a significant deterioration in the physical working environment of academics and the resources available to undertake their work.

5.6.3 The allocation of work

The major determinant of the academic labour process and academic identities is the work of academics and how that work is allocated to academics. Academic work, in both universities, is allocated to academics via a work allocation model (WAM), with hours allocated for particular teaching duties, administrative duties and research. Academics, in both universities, stated that the WAM is currently reasonably transparent, although this has not always been the case.

In the pre-1992 university, although the WAM is transparent, it does not accurately represent the actual work which is undertaken. It is apparent that the model underestimates the hours required for teaching, but overestimates the number of hours required for administrative roles. Consequently academics volunteered for administrative roles in order to ensure that they had a manageable teaching load and therefore time for research.

In addition, it is noted that although an academic spends at least 50-75% of their working time on non-research activities, these activities, including teaching are “not important” for job security, promotion or academic identities. An academic’s job security, contract and promotion prospects appear to be based solely on research which usually accounts for 25-50% of their allocated workload.

In the post-1992 university, academics also expressed the view that the WAM used in the Faculty did not accurately reflect their actual workload. In fact, the workload module is changed on an annual basis by the Associate Dean without any consultation with academics or unions. Management are not required to consult with academics when introducing a WAM (UCU 2009).
“I think the 200 hours I get off teaching now was what you got if you committed to the REF, whereas before it was less … but it made absolutely no difference at all as my teaching hasn’t changed … they are sort of pretend hours, in that teaching is virtually the same” (Tom-post1992).

In addition to research, teaching and administration, academic work includes work that is required and undertaken, but for which there is no recognition, both in terms of job security or career progression, for example, office hours. However, there is also another category of work undertaken by academics, which given the output orientated performance indicators of new public management, may be labelled as invisible labour. The extent of “invisible labour” will differ between individual academics.

“...I’m constantly looking at emails ... or thinking of new papers or worrying about papers or talking to colleagues or something like that. I can’t show this to a boss or say “I’ve spent a week ... crunching numbers for a paper for which there is no significance in the variables, therefore there is no paper therefore there’s no output” (Charles-pre1992).

As demonstrated above, labour becomes invisible once it is not measured (Willmott 1995). Consequently the writing of references, answering student emails or talking to students outside the classroom have no allocated time, are not measured and are therefore invisible labour. In addition, where academics have a pastoral role, emotional labour (Hochschild 1983), which is particularly relevant when students want to discuss personal issues, is also invisible and cannot be measured or monitored.

In summary, academic work, in both universities was allocated using a transparent, but inaccurate WAM. The nominal allocation of hours for particular roles did not necessarily correspond to the proportion of time spent on that role and consequently academics were incentivised to act accordingly. In addition, in the post-1992 university, although academics spent the same or more hours in the classroom over time, the number of nominal hours allocated to teaching on the WAM was reduced. Consequently, it appeared that academics had been allocated more hours for research than in the past, although in reality this was not the case. Consequently, over time this
has resulted in work intensification. In addition, many roles performed by academics could be classified as invisible labour, for which there is no allocation of hours, although these roles were important for academic identities.

5.6.4 Having a voice and the general working environment

Many academics expressed concern with regard to changes in their working environment. The two major changes discussed by academics related to the loss of the opportunity to participate in decisions which directly affected their work and the deterioration in their general working environment. The recent THE survey (2016) on The Best University Workplace also asked a question about academic voice.

In the pre-1992 university, the department had a large number of committees which were chaired by senior members, but which were attended by academics depending on their roles. There was also a staff meeting every month which was open to all academics to attend. Consequently, academics at this university stated that they were able to participate in the process of decision making. However, Charles recounted his experience of taking part in short-listing candidates for interview.

“I’ve spent a couple of days at selection interviews and all these things and selected CV’s but people that we’ve put forward and we’ve voted through ... weren’t invited to interview, whereas people we hadn’t mentioned were. So it was very much just a window dressing exercise and from now I’m not even going to waste my time” (Charles-pre1992).

In this case, the academic stated that although he was involved in the decision making process, the decisions made by him and other academics was ignored. At the end of the day, the lead Professor in that area made the decisions.

In the post-1992 university, over the past 20 years, the number of committees and meetings had been considerably reduced and there are few opportunities for academics to be involved in decisions which affected work. In addition, academics stated that even when they were able to voice their opinions; it was not heard and not acted on.
Academics stated that all decisions are made centrally and then cascaded down to academics via the tiers of middle and local managers. One manager-academic stated that he had a voice, but only because of his current role.

“It’s a privilege I have now that I won’t have when the role ends ... so yes I have had a voice, I didn’t have that voice prior to the role ... I suspect I won’t have it once the role ends.” (Walter-post1992).

Another manager-academic felt constrained by what she could say in meetings.

“If I challenge and say things which are outside of what are the current discourses we are allowed to use ... so if you say things that are too far outside of that then you are no longer a good fit, so you won’t be there for very long ... (but) if you go along with it too much and adopt that language then there’s going to come a point when you think like that as well” (Trish-post 1992).

This adds further support to the emergence of a whole new vocabulary of management-speak in universities (Ball 2003). Another academic who was a member of the teaching and learning committee stated:

“I express a few views ... I don’t really think they are listened to, I think basically whoever runs those committee meetings has got their own performance targets and whatever you say is not going to get in the way of them doing whatever they need to do to hit that target ... so from the outside world it might look like there is a process for staff to express their views but in reality they are completely ignored” (Mike-post1992)

The recent THE (2016) *The University Workplace Survey* also found that 54% of academics stated that they did not have a voice in their university.

In addition, academics are increasingly under surveillance (Knights & Willmott 1989, Mather & Seifert 2014). Academics are expected to attend open days, but their participation is monitored.
“the way the open days are run, its torture... we are told what we need to do exactly, we’re being reviewed whether we are saying the things, we’re told to lie. No, I am not going to, there is a limit … there was a person … and he was going to the presentations and sitting through them and evaluating them. A formal external person to evaluate the presentations … Sorry I didn’t do my PhD for that … and I’m afraid I don’t feel comfortable trying to sell a product” (Peter-post1992).

Although Peter did not object to participating in open days, he did object to being told what to say and being observed. This provides evidence of the control technologies (Deem et al. 2007) currently in operation, to ensure that the "correct" image is portrayed (Amaral et al. 2008). As the university is in a competitive market, it has to demonstrate that it is better than competitors and this involves the university ensuring that academics adopt the ethos and marketing identity of the university (Musselin 2008) which it does by identity regulation.

With regard to the general working environment, the physical space for academics has deteriorated over time. At best, all academics and even professors share an office with one or two other academics or at worst are in an open plan office with 60 other academics.

“We haven’t got enough office space, we haven’t got a reception, it’s not a professional working space for research; external facing research” (Sandra-post1992).

One academic also commented on the reduced level of collegiality.

“I thought that the culture within a University and education environment would be far more collegiate … increasingly the culture … is beginning to mimic what happens in a private sector organisation and hence that that is something that I dislike” (Mike-post1992).
This provides evidence of the increasingly competitive environment within the university which has permeated down from the university management.

Sarah, a lecturer in HRM, stated:

“I teach Performance Management and I’m telling my students about how to motivate staff … and I’m working for an institution that does none of these things. Everything that is wrong with management and motivating staff and managing people, it’s exactly what we do in the institution and I find that quite incredible” (Sarah-post1992).

This suggests that the policies being pursued in this university are not necessarily the policies adopted in the private sector to motivate employees. It would appear that managerialism borrows selectively from the private sector.

To summarize, it would appear that as a deliberate policy within the post-1992 university, academics are increasingly been denied the opportunity to take part in any decision making which affects their work. The role of academics is to conduct research and to teach students, however, increasingly, due to the encroachment of the managerialist ideology, the processes by which these roles are enacted is being removed from the control of the academic. This is a degradation of the work of academics. In addition, the adoption of a managerialist style of management, where managers have no awareness of the nature of academic work, has led to a deterioration in the academics' physical working environment and the academic labour process, as well as their academic identities.

5.7 Discussion

The first objective of this chapter is to determine and assess the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities with respect to the teaching role.

The importance of teaching to academic identity differs between the two universities. The major determinant of academic identity in the pre-1992 university is research,
teaching is of secondary importance. Whilst for academics in the post-1992 university, teaching is much more important in determining academic identity. This may be surprising given that both universities are subject to the same government policies. However, using a critical realist perspective, it is apparent that academic identities as related to teaching are generated by the mediation of government policies through the pre-existing social structures within the two universities. As already noted, the historically determined context within which academics work is important for academic identity formation.

A major concern of these findings is the lack of importance which is given to teaching in the pre-1992 university. Although academics devote at least half of their time to teaching and most of the university revenue is derived from student fees, there is no recognition or reward for this role in terms of promotion or improved career prospects. Consequently, academics are not incentivised to be ‘good teachers’. This is not to imply that these academics are not ‘good teachers’, however there is evidence to suggest that students are not attending classes and academics do not know their students. However, from the perspective of forming an academic identity, it appears that although academics devote a significant proportion of their time to teaching, this has a minor influence on how they see themselves. This can be confusing for junior academics, who are attempting to form their academic identity at the beginning of their career and are looking for validation of the work that they are performing.

The second theme of this chapter relates to the change in the student body. The evidence would suggest that this has led to increasing ideological proletarianization of the academic worker, in a number of ways. Both the pre-1992 and post-1992 universities have experienced massification over the past two decades. Initially, the increase in student numbers was met by recruiting less well qualified home students, but this has since been supplanted by a massive increase in overseas students, mainly from China. Apart from Oxbridge, academics do not interview or select their prospective students. In addition, all English universities, apart from Oxbridge, use foreign agents who are paid on commission to recruit foreign students (The Telegraph 2013). Whilst an increase in foreign students into the English HE system is to be
welcomed from a macroeconomic perspective, it has not been without costs for both academics and students.

How has this increased proletarianisation of the academic? Academics do not have control of the conditions under which their services are marketed and they do not have control of the goals and social purposes of the teaching service which they provide. In these two institutions, academic workers do not interview or select the students which they will teach. They are not able to use their knowledge and expertise to decide whether a student would be suitable or would benefit from studying their discipline. In addition to being exposed to a different educational system, some of the Chinese students have inadequate English language skills. Academics can choose to disassociate themselves from the fact that there are differences between students, which Derber (1983) refers to as ideological desensitization or they can attempt to accommodate and even incorporate cultural differences which can be termed ideological cooptation (ibid.). Ideological cooptation has led to academics producing additional teaching resources and reducing the academic rigour of the courses which they teach. However, it is not possible to compensate for deficiencies in English language ability.

In terms of academic identities, it is necessary to ask the question, what is the role of an academic in a university? Is the role of an academic to award qualifications to foreign students who may only possess an elementary knowledge of the English language and who may have read very little beyond their lecture notes? The integrity of academics has been threatened by the expropriation of their academic values and their sense of purpose. Increasingly, academics are producing and delivering a service to some foreign students, to which they place little value. Academics have lost ideological control of both to whom they provide their services and also the nature of the service which they provide, particularly in relation to foreign students. This is a consequence of the universities’ imperative to maximize revenue and from a critical realist perspective, this generative mechanism has had a detrimental impact on academic identities.

In addition, as a consequence of the changes in the student body, academics have also been subject to a degree of technical proletarianization. The increase in student
numbers, has led to larger class sizes, with more students to support and this has led to work intensification. The role of a teacher is no longer to facilitate learning in a particular discipline, but in relation to home students, it also involves behaviour management and providing remedial support for basic English and numeracy skills. These are lower level skills and not commensurate to the higher knowledge level skills possessed by an academic. Consequently, academics have also undergone technical proletarianization, via work degradation, which has led to a detrimental impact on academic identities.

Increasing managerialism has also impacted on academic identities. The post-1992 university has imposed some significant changes to the management of teaching in order to maximize revenue and become more competitive. The three semester year and online marking have both led to work intensification. Due to the increased pressure on undergraduates, academics are now also required to run extra revision classes. Academics who teach over two semesters have experienced a condensed and intensified workload which has been exacerbated by the two week marking deadline. In addition, some academics are required to teach in all three semesters and consequently find it difficult to find any time for research or vacations. There is also evidence of an increasingly mechanistic approach to teaching which has led to an increase in the routinisation of the teaching process.

In terms of the impact on academic identity, it is clear that that academics have continued to lose control or autonomy over the teaching process and have also experienced work intensification. It is noteworthy that there has been an increasing encroachment on the teaching process in the light of the view that “managers cannot actually do the teaching and research…. so top down approaches … are bound to be problematic and resisted (Dearlove 1997: 66). This view is still relevant today, but it has not prevented management from incrementally taking control away from academics. In addition, academics are increasingly being required to undertake additional low skill activities, such as escorting students on foreign visits. These changes have increased the tendency for both technical and ideological proletarianization and have been important determinants for the reforming of academic identities.
Administration is the third major role performed by academics. However, academics in the main view administration as a lower level skill and bemoan the amount of administration which they undertake. However, in view of increasing managerialism, particularly in the post-1992 university, with its requirements for data, target setting and monitoring, this is unlikely to be reduced. More worrying is the situation in the pre-1992 university where academics are punished for undertaking administrative roles. In this small random sample of academics, three academics had been affected by these decisions. There are contradictory messages emanating from such management decisions that have led to a confusion of academic identities for the concerned academics.

From an academic identity perspective, in the post-1992 university, administrative duties had differing material and symbolic importance. For most academics, administrative duties were viewed as a lower skill activity which detracted from teaching duties, but for some academics it was of symbolic importance and led to career advancement. Within the pre-1992 university, administrative duties were undertaken by all academics, but for some academics it led to career derailment and a negative impact on their academic identity. The intermeshing of administrative duties with existing social structures within the universities led to the generation of alternative academic identities.

*The second objective of this chapter is to determine and assess the impact of NPM policies on the other material and symbolic aspects of the workplace environment which have impacted on the labour process and academic identities*

Although both institutions were subject to the 2001 RDS Initiative, it was implemented differently in the two universities. In the pre-1992 university, the formal appraisal process was "light touch" and did not affect pay or the employment contract; however, there was also an informal appraisal process which was instigated by the university management in relation to the REF. Whilst the senior academics appeared to be happy with this light touch approach and did not look to the appraisal process for their reward, this was not the case for more junior academics. Junior academics, in order to form
their academic identity wanted more feedback than was currently provided and therefore struggled with forming a satisfactory academic identity.

The appraisal process operated very differently in the post-1992 university. The formal appraisal system which was introduced in 2008 includes targets for various performance criteria and is linked to pay. For many academics, there was an incentive to game the performance targets by reducing the rigour of academic content and to spoon feed students. Academics viewed the process as a game which involved lengthy form filling with the rating outcome determined by what your wrote and not what you did. The process was not viewed as a good indicator of performance. In addition, not only did the targets lead to work intensification, the process impacted negatively on academic identities. For the majority of academics, the appraisal process did not re-affirm their academic identities, it questioned them.

The purpose of the appraisal process which is linked to pay is to increase control over academics and their labour process, but also for financial purposes, by exerting increasing control over the cost of labour. For example, although the pay scale for a Principal Lecturer has nine points, in practice, unless an academic obtains an excellent grade their pay is restricted to the first four points. Consequently, there is a huge pressure on all academics to work more intensively and strive for an excellent rating, but as already stated, the actual quality of your work does not determine the grading. There are a large number of hurdles, both written and unwritten, to overcome to achieve an excellent rating.

The appraisal system has a major impact on academic identities at this university. The default outcome for most academics is “strong”. From a symbolic perspective, this is an indicator to an academic about the value of their work to the university. Identifying an academic as "strong" does not lead academics to feel valued and this is further evidenced in the findings of The Staff Survey 2014, which highlights 'staff not being valued' as an area for improvement (Appendix 9-Q2.10). Consequently, academic identities are negatively impacted by the generative mechanism of the appraisal process in this university which signals to academics that they are not valued workers. This is
further exacerbated by the material consequences of the appraisal process, namely the effect on pay, which further reinforces this negative signal for academic identities.

With regard to the university management in the two universities, both institutions have adopted an increasingly managerialist stance towards the academic workforce. However, in the pre-1992 university, local managers adopted a collegiate and protective approach towards academics under their charge. It is pertinent to recall Dearlove (1997) who espoused the view that innovating universities depend heavily on middle and lower levels of management to reconcile the entrepreneurial drives of central leaders with the drives of disparate academic groups (Dearlove 1997:69).

However, in the post-1992 university, partly due to the appraisal process, lower level managers replicated the behaviour of university management. A deliberate attempt was made by local management to put a dividing line between them, including university management, and the academic workforce. This was evidenced by the poor communication and the deliberate avoidance of any consultation between local managers and academics. University management decisions were dictated down through local managers to academics, without negotiation. There was no opportunity for conflict, only compliance.

What has been the impact on academic identities of this increase in managerialism? This style of management implies that management have no respect or regard for the views of academic workers. There has been a deliberate attempt to avoid any form of consultation with academic workers over issues which have a major impact on their working environment. Academics have lost control or autonomy over their working environment and this has negatively impacted on the academic labour process. Not only do academics not feel valued, there is clearly a loss of trust in academics’ ability to make any meaningful contribution to the management of their working environment. Managerialist decision making, from a critical realist perspective, has supplied the generative mechanism for the loss of trust which has led to the continuing ideological proletarianization of the academic and its consequent negative effect on academic identity.
The allocation of work, in both universities, is undertaken via a WAM. Evidence from both universities suggests that the allocation of work, using such models does not accurately represent the actual time required for each activity. As one academic explained, they are "pretend hours". In addition, the WAMs do not include all academic activities and there is evidence to suggest that an increasing amount of "invisible labour" is undertaken for which there is no allocation of hours. Given the increasing number of students and the accompanying increase in administration and the change in the student body, it is inevitable that academics have been undertaking additional activities for which there is no additional recompense. As a consequence, there has been an intensification of the academic labour process.

Finally and very importantly, the loss of voice which is commensurate with the loss of autonomy has been a major casualty of increasing managerialism within universities. Fortunately, at this present time, academics in the pre-1992 university still retain some rights to express their views and to have them taken into consideration. However, this is not the case in the post-1992 university. Academics, as already detailed, are not consulted about decisions which will directly affect the academic labour process. There are very few formal mechanisms in place for academics to voice their views on academic matters. Any meetings which are attended by manager academics are conducted using a managerialist discourse to which there is no alternative discourse. The loss of voice is an important indicator of the ideological proletarianisation of the academic worker.

The university is run as a business corporation (Waring 2013), with no requirement to consult the workers or involve them in decision making. Moreover, not only is the academic denied their own voice, they are under surveillance to adopt the voice of the university, which is indicative of an attempt by the university at identity control. As academics are denied a voice, they are unable to express any dissent, even when there is a serious deterioration in their physical working environment. The lack of respect for academics by management was evidenced in their treatment of academics as units of resource which could be relocated at the will of management. From the critical realist perspective, academic identities have been dented by the ideological proletarianisation of the academic via the loss of voice which has been deliberately generated by
university management. In effect, loss of voice is used as an effective means of control, by reducing the opportunities for the public expression of any dissent with regard to management policies.

In conclusion, this chapter has discussed how the implementation of NPM policies in these two universities has resulted in an attack on the material interests of academics via the academic labour process, which has resulted in the generation of technical proletarianisation. There is evidence of some low level resistance, but in the main, academics have not been able to resist and have been forced into compliance. In conjunction, these managerialist policies have also witnessed an attack on the symbolic resources of academics, which has generated ideological proletarianisation of the academic worker. As a consequence, academics have been forced to reform their academic identities in acquiescence of these policy changes.
Chapter 6
Conclusions

6.1 Introduction

This study focuses on academics, their experiences of work and their academic identities. Over the past three decades, the HE sector in the United Kingdom has been subject to a series of policy initiatives which have dramatically transformed the sector, such that it is barely recognisable as the sector that existed during the post-war period, from 1945 to 1979. The policy initiatives, which began in the early 1980s and which have continued to the present day, have involved a departure from the post-war period of neo-corporatist public management and a movement to neo-liberal public management, namely, NPM.

The focus of this study was to consider how NPM policy initiatives have impacted on academic labour today. This was achieved by undertaking an examination of the experiences of academics in two different types of university, under the conceptual frameworks of labour process theory and academic identities. In this way, the impact on the material interests and symbolic resources of academics are revealed within the institutional contexts of their universities.

The main aim of this final chapter is to consider the importance and implications of these findings at the present time and then to consider the possible future implications of these results for the academic workforce and HE. This chapter begins by restating the aims of this study and providing a brief summary of the findings. It then reaches some conclusions and notes the limitations of this study. Finally, there is a discussion of the likely implications for academics of REF 2021 and the Teaching Excellent Framework (TEF).

6.2 Restatement of aim and findings

The principal aim of this study is to present: A comparative analysis of the work experience of academics and academic identities. This was set against the backdrop of
the NPM which have been successively imposed on the university sector over the past 30 years. In order to achieve the aim of this study, a number of objectives were put forward and these objectives will now be addressed.

The first objective is to analyse and evaluate the academics’ perspectives with regard to their role in a university.

Academics in both universities identified themselves as privileged workers as they were doing a job which they enjoyed: they valued the autonomy of their job, the flexibility of their role and their ability to research in their chosen area.

Academics in the two universities presented different academic identities which were determined by the emphasis of their academic role. Academics in the pre-1992 university identified themselves as researchers but with teaching as a secondary role, whilst academics in the post-1992 university identified their major role as teaching with scholarly activity, which may include personal research and support for students. Academics in the pre-1992 university valued the collegial nature of their work, whereas work was viewed as an individual endeavour in the post-1992 university. Although the binary line between these two different types of institutions was abolished over 20 years ago, there is still a noticeable difference between academic identities between the two types of universities.

Most previous research has either concentrated on the pre-1992 universities or findings have been collated from pre and post-1992 universities (Wilson 1991, Miller 1991, 1995, 2001, Halsey 1992, Bryon 2004, Henkel 2000, Waring 2013). However, this study has noted that the differences in the roles of academics in the two types of institutions are still pronounced and therefore the formation of academic identities are determined by the context specific generative mechanisms within their university.

The second objective was, in relation to research, to determine and assess the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities.
The academic labour process, due to the increasing encroachment of managerialism has ensured the continuation of the commodification (Halsey 1992, Willmott 2005) of academic labour, via the production of journal articles and increased work intensification via the requirement for four high quality journal articles. This has been the experience for both junior and senior academics, but it has been more stressful for junior academics who are required to meet the same number of high quality research outputs. In addition, academics not submitted to the REF were threatened with a change to their employment contract. This caused academics to question their academic identities.

The academic labour process and academic identities have also come under attack in the post-1992 university, given its recent impetus to raise its research profile or more accurately to move up the research league tables. Research hours have been created by reducing the hours for teaching, although teaching has remained unchanged. To maximize its REF score, the university decided to only submit to nine units of assessment, consequently all academics have to fit into these units. This led to a loss of autonomy for some research active staff. In addition, academics are required to seek funds from particular source and publish with PhD students. Consequently, due to a change in management objectives, academics whose identities had previously been determined by teaching, were now being encouraged to recreate their academic identities as teachers and researchers. Some academics experienced a loss of autonomy as they were no longer able to make their own decisions about their research and this resulted in a diminution in their academic identities.

*The third objective was to determine and analyse the impact of NPM policies on the academic labour process and academic identities, with respect to the teaching role*

The teaching identities of the academics in the two universities were very different. In the pre-1992 university, apart from DL teaching and PhD supervision, teaching is something which has to be done in order to finance research. Although teaching provided most of the revenue and academics spent a significant proportion of their time teaching, there was no recognition of this role by the university. There was no incentives to be a good teacher and being a good teacher did not enhance promotion
prospects. Research and obtaining a high REF score were the main drivers for this university and this was communicated very clearly to academics via management actions and inactions with regard to teaching and learning.

In the post 1992 university, academic identities were centred on the teaching and pastoral role, rather than the research role. Given the importance of teaching to academic identities, the dumbing down of courses, the poor behaviour and/or the poor English language skills of students had a significant negative impact on academic identities.

The two major changes to the teaching in the recent past has been the change in the nature of the student body and encroaching managerialism. As a consequence of government policies, which encouraged universities to increase their recruitment of domestic students to meet government targets and to become more competitive internationally, there has been an increase in the number of home students and an increase in foreign students, mainly from China.

The increase in student numbers has led to work intensification in both universities. There is also evidence that the changed nature of the student body has led academics to reduce the academic rigour of their courses. In the post-1992 university, the three semester system has been implemented to further increase the number of students and the management of teaching is now more strictly regulated with policies and directives which amount to micro management of the teaching process. The loss of autonomy with regard to the teaching process and the lack of control over student recruitment and the ceding of this control to management, has led to ideological proletarianisation which has been the generative mechanisms for the reforming of academic identities.

The fourth objective was to determine and analyse the impact of NPM policies on the other material and symbolic aspects of the workplace environment which have impacted on the academic labour process and academic identities.

As Henkel (2000) recognized, after academic discipline, the working environment is the second most important factor in determining academic identities. As the findings of
this study demonstrate, the institutional environment in both universities has become increasingly managerialist.

In 2001, the RDS Initiative was launched, but was implemented differently in the two universities. Whilst the pre-1992 university, instituted light touch appraisals which were not linked to pay, the post-1992 university adopted a target driven appraisal process which was linked to pay. In order for academics to be rewarded with a pay increment, they had to demonstrate, amongst other objectives, the achievement of target module pass rates and target scores for module evaluation questionnaires. As a consequence this led to gaming of the targets which could include dumbing down courses, spoon feeding students and marking generously. Whilst, some managers would argue this is not the case, the evidence: the national inflation of undergraduate degree classifications (HESA 2016)) and the poor skill levels of English graduates (OECD 2016) would support this contention.

In addition, to the above negative impacts on the quality of HE, it is argued that this managerialist initiative had the desired effect of controlling academic labour to achieve the targets set by management to meet their own objectives. With the persistent threat of performance management or pay implications, academics were forced to consent to the requirements of the appraisal process. This led to work intensification and an increase in stress. The appraisal process also led to a deleterious effect on academic identities as it led academics to question their role in a university. Is the role of academics to facilitate learning and enquiry within the university or is it to ensure that management performance targets are achieved for the external reputation and marketing of the university?

Another managerial initiative, which now operates in universities is the WAM. Whilst presenting the image of fairness and transparency, it is used to increase work intensity. Notional hours are allocated for designated teaching duties which do not accurately represent the work effort involved. In the post-1992 university, over time these notional hours for teaching have been reduced with no commensurate reduction in actual teaching duties. Consequently, research hours can then be inserted or additional duties added resulting in work intensification. The WAM creates a facade of fairness,
but it does not recognise much invisible work and is manipulated to increase work intensity.

The loss of autonomy and the increasing loss of control of the labour process is most marked in the post-1992 university. The deliberate removal of committees and meetings where academics were able to voice, even influence decision making, has led to a loss of voice. Academics are not consulted nor do they have any influence over how their work is performed. This supports Waring (2013) who also noted that there had been an erosion of structures from which academics had previously derived their voice.

Managerialism is a dogmatic and non-inclusive management ideology, management are not required to and indeed do not consult workers. These findings are in agreement with the recent THES (4 Feb 2016) survey on university workplaces which reported that only 39% of academics felt that they had a voice in their university. Managerialism, which is increasingly encroaching on universities is based on the belief that generic management based on performance indicators and targets is equally applicable in the provision of both public and private services. Consequently, even in the knowledge sector of universities, where it could be argued that some individual creativity might be desired, academics are treated as units of resource to produce the specified output of research papers, maximize NSS targets and award students good degree classifications.

6.3 Where are we now?

There are several conclusions which can be reached from this empirical study. Although efficiency was originally the driver of NPM policies in HE, the evidence suggests that targets, league tables and published information for reputation purposes are now the drivers for management ambitions. Given that universities can now charge £9000 in student fees, it is argued that funding and efficiency are now less important than managerial objectives of moving up the REF and NSS league tables.
Managerialism is not in retreat, it continues to encroach into many more areas of the academic role. The concern is that managerialism is having a deleterious impact on the academic labour process and academic identities as evidenced above. Whilst neo-liberalism is a free market ideology, New Public Management is an amalgam of several ideologies which has resulted in a bureaucratic and centrally target driven view of how public services should be provided. The ideology of managerialism is a representation of how NPM policies are implemented within the institutional setting of a university. As evidenced in this study, it is the implementation of NPM policies within a managerialist university environment which is negatively impacting upon the academic labour process and academic identities. There is no resistance or negotiation of NPM policies, managerialism ensures that policies are implemented to maximize university revenue and university reputation, with scant regard for the academic or their academic identities.

Secondly, following on from the encroachment of managerialism into universities is the impact not only on academics but on the actual quality of HE provision. As previously discussed, the academics' view of the purpose of research is not completely in alignment with the REF interpretation. Academics in this study wanted their research to make a difference and for it to be made as widely available as possible. Although the REF does incorporate impact via case studies, the grading is mainly determined by the academic papers submitted. Although the REF was designed to indicate the quality of research within a university, it has now interpreted as a league table for university research and university reputation. Consequently, universities have every incentive to game the REF, that is, to manipulate their research outputs in order to obtain the highest league table position. Given the possibilities for gaming, the REF is not necessarily a reliable indicator of the quality of research in a university. For an academic who views research as innate enquiry and "making a difference" this can create identity conflicts.

The second output of HE is the provision of education to students at a Higher level. However, the quality of the output produced by the HE sector is now being called into question. The NPM policies which champion competition and growth have led to an increasing number of students graduating with good honours degrees and masters’
degrees. In order to increase their financial surpluses, universities have sought to increase the number of students enrolled on their courses. This began with the recruitment of lower ability home students and was followed by an increase in foreign students who may not possess the requisite English Language skills. As universities do not generally provide adequate remedial support for these students, the only way to maintain or increase the number of students with good honours degrees, is to reduce the academic rigour of courses.

Due to the individualization of academic performance, the poor performance of students is perceived by the university as poor performance by the academic. The appraisal process views the individual academic as responsible for not hitting performance targets. Consequently, as performativity is pervasive and academics are required to meet appraisal targets, they are incentivised and have consented to reduce the academic rigour of courses, which has led to credential inflation. The NSS, which is a publicly marketed indicator of student satisfaction, is also used by university management as an indicator of performance for academics.

This study would suggest that academics have offered very little resistance to the encroaching tide of managerialism and its impact on academic identities. The battle has been lost in the post-1992 universities. However, in the pre-1992 university there is some evidence of resistance at the local management level. Of more concern, particularly in an academic environment, is the almost unquestioning acceptance and implicit consent to the current managerialist discourse. This is indicative of a managerialist discourse which has been very successfully embedded into the management of universities. The “old-fashioned” and “out of date” views with regard to the purposes of universities have been pushed aside to make room for the modern corporate view of a university, whose foundations are no longer learning and enquiry.

This study is significant as its findings demonstrate the fundamental changes which have occurred to the provision of HE in England. It provides a signal that the academic labour process and academic identities are increasingly being controlled by university management, to meet managerial objectives. This study is also significant given the
impending introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) which is discussed below.

6.4 Reflections and limitations

This research was prompted by my perceptions that things had changed at my place of work. I had been an Economics lecturer in a post-1992 university for over twenty years and had been involved as a staff representative in various faculty meetings and was now subject to an appraisal process. Academic life was changing and the changes could not be explained by government funding cuts. I was curious, had anyone noticed or considered what was happening to academic work. Hence my journey began.

Having carried out this study, there are some caveats or limitations to the results and discussions that have been put forward. Firstly, all the interviewed academics were on permanent contracts. A serious limitation of this study is that hourly paid or part-time temporary academics were not included. In addition, I purposefully limited my interviewees to academics whose major role involved research and/or teaching, with no or minor management responsibilities. The sample was chosen in order to hear the voices of academic workers and not managers. The views expressed with regard to management are expressed by academics who teach and/or research and not by managers. This may be viewed as a limitation of the findings.

Secondly, although one pre-1992 and one post-1992 university were chosen for this study, it is not suggested that these findings are necessarily representative of the changes in the academic labour process and academic identities in all pre-1992 and post-1992 universities. Certainly, academics at Oxbridge and some other universities cannot be represented by these findings. However, it is very likely that academics in other pre-1992 and post-1992 universities may have had similar workplace experiences.

Thirdly, in an ideal world and with more time, more interviews could have been conducted, particularly in the pre-1992 university. However, it became obvious, after the majority of the interviews had been conducted, that saturation point had been reached. Although both universities had a large number of academics, many of them
were newly appointed and therefore would have had insufficient time to fully experience the work relations in their university.

6.5 The Future for Academics

Having considered the current situation of academics it is important to look ahead and to consider how the academic labour process and academic identities may be affected in the future. The two major roles of academics, namely, research and teaching are likely to experience some turbulence following the current review of the REF (REF 2021) and the introduction of the TEF (TEF 2016a) which is currently in the House of Lords. Their possible impact on academics will now be discussed.

Following REF 2014, Lord Stern was asked to chair an independent review of the REF (Stern 2016). The report, published in July 2016, sought to address the costs and burdens, distortions and negative and perverse incentives (Stern 2016:11) of REF 2014. It put forward twelve recommendations or principles for the forthcoming 2021 research exercise. Following this report, in December 2016, the four UK research councils released the Consultation on the second Research Excellence Framework, which took into account the principles of the Stern report (HEFCE 2016). Several of the Stern recommendations impact directly on the academic and will now be discussed.

The first recommendation made by the Stern Report is that "all research active staff should be returned to the REF" (Stern 21016:19), rather than academics being selected by their institution. The second recommendation is that there should be a minimum (possibly zero) and a maximum (possibly six) outputs, with an average of two outputs per academic. The aim is to prevent individual academics who may not have four outputs from being excluded from the REF given that it can have a detrimental effect upon their career. This is to be achieved by decoupling individual academics from outputs as it is the university research performance and not that of the individual academic which is being assessed.

The Stern recommendation reflect the practice adopted at the pre-1992 university by local managers, that is, all academics who met the criteria of four 4* articles were
submitted. However, the opportunity for institutional gaming remains and is predicated on the definition of research active academics. The consultation document suggests that HESA data is used to determine research active academics. However, in view of the importance of REF for university reputation, it is not beyond possibility that university management will seek to change the contractual arrangements of their academic staff, in whatever way is necessary, to maximize their REF score.

The Stern Review recognised many of the consequences of the REF 2014 submission which have been highlighted in this study: highly selective submissions; exclusion of academics who do not fit the university selection strategy; choosing safe topics and short-termism in designing and conducting research and problems with career choices, progression and morale (Stern 2016:11,19). In addition, it further confirms the findings of this study, that is, that being required to submit four outputs disadvantages early career researchers and researchers who seek flexible career structures for other and personal reasons (ibid.16). Consequently, it is recognised that the process of implementation of the REF requirements at the institution level has generated a negative impact on academic identities.

Some academics expressed concern with regard to the ‘impact’ component which was introduced for the first time in REF 2014. Stern (2016) recognises the importance of impact and makes three recommendations related to impact. The recommendations include that the link between the number of case studies and academics submitted is relaxed and that a minimum of one case study is submitted for each unit of assessment. In addition, each institution should submit institutional level impact case studies. Case studies should still be linked to research of reasonable quality, but case studies could also be linked to “research activity and a body of work” (Stern 2016: 23) and impact should be more broadly interpreted. This issue was of particular concern to academics in the pre-1992 university who were not able to demonstrate the impact of their work as impact was so narrowly defined. This should have a positive impact on future academic identities.

Although the consultation process is not complete, it is possible to reflect on the possible consequences for academics of a revised REF 2021. It seems likely that
academics who were previously disadvantaged through non-inclusion may now find their outputs included and this will certainly lead to a positive effect on academic identities. The recommendation to include all research active academics is to be commended, but given the evidence provided in this study, it is likely to lead to a flurry of management activity with regard to the nature of academic contracts. This concern is raised in the consultation document (HEFCE 2016:10). If this occurs, this will negate the more positive outcomes of Stern’s recommendations and will lead to a further deterioration in academic identities.

The proposed introduction of the TEF is also likely to impact on academic identities. As this is the first time, teaching has been assessed in this format, there will be, as there was with the RAE and REF, many unintended consequences and this is likely to impact most profoundly on academic labour. The government has stated that the purposes of the TEF are: to provide better information for prospective students, raise esteem for teaching, recognise and reward excellent teaching and better meet the needs of various stakeholders (TEF 2016b:7). The aspects of teaching quality which will most directly affect academics are teaching quality and student outcomes and learning gain (ibid.22). The metrics with regard to teaching quality and academic support will be sourced from the NSS, whilst information with regard to 'non-continuation' will be sourced from HESA data.

The requirements for the TEF indicate that universities will be further incentivised to 'game' the NSS as its importance has now increased and consequently there will be increased pressure on academics to ensure that students fill out the surveys accordingly. In addition, there will be increased pressure on academics to ensure that students are allowed to continue on their course, that is, that they do not fail components of their course. Given the findings of this study, academics will be pressured to reduce the academic rigour of their courses or to mark more generously. It is likely that academics will be held individually responsible for the failure of students on their courses, even though they have no control over the quality of the students admitted to the university.
With reference to the pre-1992 and post-1992 universities in this study, the impact of these two new initiatives are likely to be different. The current proposals for REF 2021 are likely to have less impact on academics at the pre-1992 university than the post-1992 university. Whilst the pre-1992 university submitted 60% of their academics, the post-1992 university submitted less than 20% of their academics to the business unit of assessment C19 (REF 2014). The difference in their grading was only one point. Consequently, depending on the final REF requirements, and in order to maintain their research rating, the pre-1992 university could decide to change the contractual arrangements for a large majority of its academic staff.

With regard to the TEF, the post-1992 university is already very target driven and consequently the pressure on academics to meet the likely requirements is likely to be much less than in the pre-1992 university. The NSS 2015 results for Business courses indicate that the pre-1992 university was in the bottom 20%, whilst the post-1992 university was in the top 20% of universities. The pre-1992 university has concentrated on research, whilst teaching has always been a secondary consideration for academics. It is likely that in order to ensure good metrics, but not necessarily good teaching, pressure will be exerted on academics to raise the NSS scores by whatever means possible. Ideological and technical proletarianisation is likely to continue as is the deleterious impact on academic identities of these government measures.

An exploration of the impact of REF 2021 and the TEF on the academic labour process and academic identities are the obvious areas for further research.

6.6 Final thoughts

Finally, while exploring the existing literature with regard to the academic labour process, it was revealing to discover how changes in the academic labour process as a consequence of NPM policies had begun to be documented as early as the mid 1980s. Although the financial imperatives are no longer dominant, the pace of neo-liberal reforms has continued unabated. In addition, the adoption and continuing pervasiveness of the managerialist ideology has finally led us to Braverman's conclusion that:
“...almost all of the population has been transformed into employees of capital”
Almost every working association with the modern corporation or with its imitative offshoots in governmental or so-called non-profit organizations, is given the form of the purchase and sale of labor power” (Braverman 1974:404).
## Appendix 1 – Interview Participants

### Interviewees in Post-1992 University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Years employed in university</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Included in REF</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Professor*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish</td>
<td>PL*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>PL*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Studying for PhD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Studying for PhD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Studying for PhD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Reader*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>PL*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Returner</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Interviewees in Pre-1992 University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Years employed in university</th>
<th>Included in REF</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Professor*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>SL*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lionel</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Returner</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

* These academics also had some management responsibilities

1. All names have been changed from the original names

2. L = Lecturer
   - SL = Senior Lecturer
   - PL = Principal Lecturer
   - TF = Teaching Fellow

3. Senior Lecturer (SL) in Pre-1992 university = Principal Lecturer in Post-1992 university
   - Lecturer (L) in Pre-1992 university = Senior Lecturer (SL) in Post-1992 university
Appendix 2 - Interview Questions - Semi-structured interviews

Subject area: Years in Business School: Years in university: 
Gender: 

**General questions**

1. What is your role as an academic?
What is the nature of the work which you do?
e.g. research, teaching, mixed, management
How your time is roughly divided up between these roles? Has this changed over time
and why? Is this your choice?
(what defines you as an academic?)
How do you view the relationship between research and teaching?
2. Why did you embark on an academic career?

**Questions on Research**

1. How important is research to you in your personal identity as an academic?
2. Have the recent changes in research policy impacted upon your research choices,
   agendas and pattern of research careers?
3. To whom or what, in your work, is your first allegiance? or from where do you take
   your identity? How do you see yourself as an academic?
4. What have the recent policy changes on research meant for your academic freedom,
your academic values, academic reputation and self-esteem?
   (inclusion in REF - impact on career, job security, etc.)
5. How have these changes in the research environment been introduced and
   implemented in your subject area?

**Questions on Teaching**

(Major changes in HE have included: Massification, marketization, changed purpose of
HE transferable skills, semesterisation, module evaluations by students, NSS, etc.)
1. To what extent has your teaching been affected by any major changes in the
   university?
   Teaching group sizes - lectures and seminars?
   Views of current student cohorts - were they different 10 years ago?
How are they different?
How has this impacted on how and what you teach?
Student as consumer - student expectations /lecturer expectations?
Impact of semesterisation?
Impact of curriculum organisation e.g. modularisation (issue in 2000) and semesterisation, module evaluation questionnaires, NSS
2. How have these changes (to teaching) been introduced and implemented in your subject area?

**Administration** - bureaucracy - to what extent does it define you and your role?
1. Does the amount of administration you do detract or enhance your identity as an academic?
2. How much control do you have over the amount of administration which you undertake?

**Management of academics**
(academic appraisal linked to pay, NSS, module evaluation questionnaires)
1. Appraisal - how does it operate? How useful is it? Does it empower you to do your job better?
2. Do you have a voice - where can you express your views? Do you feel there are adequate opportunities for you to express your views?
Has this changed over time?
3. What do you feel about the management of your organisation? Does it enable you to perform your job better and/or to a higher level of satisfaction?
4. How much control do you have over the **type of work** that you do and the **way** that you do that work? Has this changed over time?

**Concluding section - Quality of your working role**
1. To what extent does your work as an academic now resemble what you thought you would be doing when you started your career?
2. To what extent are you satisfied with your work situation?
3. Are there any changes which would improve your working environment and consequently allow you to view yourself more positively in your role as an academic?
Appendix 3

Participant Information Sheet for Interviewees

Research Project 2015

The aim of this research is to explore the nature of the changes in academic work and the implications for academic identity of the new public management policies in HE. You have been chosen to take part in this study as you are an academic who works at one of the two institutions in this study. You do not have to take part in this study, your participation is entirely voluntary.

You will be asked to participate in an interview with the researcher. The researcher will ask you questions which are related to your work as an academic at your university. The questions will not be related to your discipline area, but more concerned with your perceptions of being an academic and the work that you do. The interview will be recorded and then transcribed.

You will not be asked to answer any personal questions and there are no known risks associated with this research.

If you decide to take part, but wish to withdraw at any point before or after the interview, then you are free to do so. The interview will be conducted with complete confidentiality and anonymity. Your name, your institution or any other details which would make it possible to identify you, will not be included in the research findings. The names of the interviewees will only be known to the researcher and will not be made known to any other person.

You will be provided with a transcript of the interview, to ensure that it has been accurately transcribed, before it is made available for use in the research findings. All recordings and transcripts will be destroyed once the dissertation has been examined.

This dissertation proposal has been reviewed by my supervisor:

Dr Glynne Williams
Management School, University of Leicester
Email: g.v.williams@le.ac.uk

The contact details of the researcher are:
Peri Yavash,
Coventry Business School, Coventry University
Email: p.yavash@coventry.ac.uk
**Participant - Informed Consent Form**

**Summary of research project:** The aim of this research is to explore the nature of the changes in academic work and the implications for academic identity of the new public management policies in Higher Education.

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the participant information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at anytime without giving a reason.

3. I understand that all the information I provide will be treated in confidence

4. I understand that I also have the right to change my mind about participating in the study for a short period after the study has concluded (August 2015)

5. I agree to the interview being recorded as part of the research project

6. I agree to take part in the research project

Name of participant: ...........................................................................................................

Signature of participant: ...................................................................................................

Date: .....................................................................................................................................

Name of Researcher: Peri Yavash

Signature of researcher: .....................................................................................................
ABOUT RESEARCH AT XXX

As an ambitious and innovative university, we’re investing an initial £100m into our new research strategy, ‘Excellence with Impact’. Through original approaches from world-leading experts, we’re aiming for our research to make a tangible difference to the way we live.

xxx University is already known for delivering research that makes a significant contribution to a number of global challenges. Our research centres focus on a range of real world issues including sustainability, disease prevention and innovative engineering. Our new strategy will build on these successes, strengthen our position as an innovative university and will enable us to apply fresh and original approaches to key research challenges.

Explore our newly launched research centres…

- Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience
- Centre for Applied Biological and Exercise Sciences
- Centre for Business in Society
- Centre for Communities and Social Justice
- Centre for Dance Research
- Centre for Flow Measurement & Fluid Mechanics
- Centre for Low Impact Buildings
- Centre for Manufacturing and Materials Engineering
- Centre for Research in Psychology, Behaviour and Achievement
- Centre for Technology Enabled Health Research
- Centre for Mobility & Transport
- Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations

Research is also conducted in the following areas. Updates on these areas will follow.

- Art, Design, Media and Performance
- Computing
- Mathematics

In the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise, almost two-thirds of our submitted research was rated as international, internationally excellent, or world-leading standard. We are continuing to build on this success in collaboration with businesses, external funders, students and the wider community. We have entered a range of research to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014, view our set of extremely positive REF results and further information about our submission.

As part of our work during REF2014, our Grand Challenge Initiatives focused our research efforts on seven key global issues which explored the following: Sustainable Agriculture, an Aging Society, Low Carbon Vehicles, Integrated Transport and Logistics, Low Impact Building, Digital Media and Human Security.

This is publicly available information. Extracted from university website on 4 January 2017.
## Appendix 5 – Post-1992 University Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>PG Semester-style</th>
<th>UG Semester-style</th>
<th>UG Long Thin</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>UG Condens'd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/09/16</td>
<td>8 M5 M5 M5 M5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/16</td>
<td>9 M5 M5 M5 M5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/09/16</td>
<td>10 Induction S S</td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/16</td>
<td>11 T1 P1 T1 T1</td>
<td></td>
<td>T1 T1 T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/16</td>
<td>12 T2 P2 T2 T2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T2 T2 T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/10/16</td>
<td>13 T3 P3 T3 T3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T3 T3 T3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/16</td>
<td>14 T4 P4 T4 T4</td>
<td></td>
<td>T4 T4 T4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/10/16</td>
<td>15 T5 P5 T5 T5</td>
<td></td>
<td>T5 T5 T5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>16 T6 P6 T6 T6</td>
<td></td>
<td>T6 T6 T6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/16</td>
<td>17 T7 P7 T7 T7</td>
<td></td>
<td>T7 T7 T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/11/16</td>
<td>18 T8 P8 T8 T8</td>
<td></td>
<td>T8 T8 T8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/11/16</td>
<td>19 T9 P9 T9 T9</td>
<td></td>
<td>T9 T9 T9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/16</td>
<td>20 T10 P10 T10</td>
<td></td>
<td>T10 T10 T10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/16</td>
<td>21 T11 P11 T11</td>
<td></td>
<td>T11 T11 T11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/12/16</td>
<td>22 S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/12/16</td>
<td>23 S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/17</td>
<td>24 S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/17</td>
<td>25 E R E E E E</td>
<td></td>
<td>E E E E E E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01/17</td>
<td>26 E R E E E T13</td>
<td></td>
<td>E E E E E T13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/01/17</td>
<td>27 T1 T1 P1 T1 T1</td>
<td></td>
<td>T1 T1 T1 T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/17</td>
<td>28 T2 T2 T2 T2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T2 T2 T2 T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/17</td>
<td>29 T3 T3 T3 T3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T3 T3 T3 T3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/02/17</td>
<td>30 T4 T4 T4 T4</td>
<td></td>
<td>T4 T4 T4 T4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/02/17</td>
<td>31 T5 T5 T5 T5</td>
<td></td>
<td>T5 T5 T5 T5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/02/17</td>
<td>32 T6 T6 T6 T6</td>
<td></td>
<td>T6 T6 T6 T6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/17</td>
<td>33 T7 T7 T7 T7</td>
<td></td>
<td>T7 T7 T7 T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/17</td>
<td>34 T8 T8 T8 T8</td>
<td></td>
<td>T8 T8 T8 T8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/03/17</td>
<td>35 T9 T9 T9 T9</td>
<td></td>
<td>T9 T9 T9 T9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/03/17</td>
<td>36 T10 T10 T10</td>
<td></td>
<td>T10 T10 T10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/17</td>
<td>37 T11 T11 T11</td>
<td></td>
<td>T11 T11 T11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/17</td>
<td>38 S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/04/17</td>
<td>39 S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/04/17</td>
<td>40 S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/17</td>
<td>41 E E E E E E</td>
<td></td>
<td>E E E E E E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/17</td>
<td>42 E E E E E E</td>
<td></td>
<td>E E E E E E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/05/17</td>
<td>43 P1 T1 T1 T1</td>
<td></td>
<td>T1 T1 T1 T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/05/17</td>
<td>44 P2 T2 T2 T2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T2 T2 T2 T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/05/17</td>
<td>45 P3 T3 T3 T3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T3 T3 T3 T3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/17</td>
<td>46 P4 T4 T4 T4</td>
<td></td>
<td>T4 T4 T4 T4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/17</td>
<td>47 P5 T5 T5 T5</td>
<td></td>
<td>T5 T5 T5 T5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/17</td>
<td>48 P6 T6 T6 T6</td>
<td></td>
<td>T6 T6 T6 T6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/06/17</td>
<td>49 P7 T7 T7 T7</td>
<td></td>
<td>T7 T7 T7 T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/17</td>
<td>50 P8 T8 T8 T8</td>
<td></td>
<td>R T8 R T8 R T8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/17</td>
<td>51 P9 T9 T9 T9</td>
<td></td>
<td>R T9 R T9 R T9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/07/17</td>
<td>52 P10 T10 T10</td>
<td></td>
<td>R T10 R T10 R T10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/07/17</td>
<td>1 P11 T11 T11</td>
<td></td>
<td>T11 T11 T11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/17</td>
<td>2 S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/17</td>
<td>3 S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S S S S S S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/08/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/08/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/09/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resit Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitored Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent study period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easter (Sunday April 16th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Induction week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear buffer between UG and PG boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Start of teaching
- E: Assessment Period
- R: Resit Period
- MS: Monitored Study
- S: Independent study period
- Christmas
- Easter (Sunday April 16th)
- Induction week
- Clear buffer between UG and PG boards

**S2**
- Add/Rem in class resits w/c: 20/05/17
- UG resits only
- PG only
- PG course dates continue for a 12 months period

**S1**
- PG resits only, inc. Add/Rem
- PG only
- PG course dates continue for a 12 months period
Appendix 6 - Appraisal Form for post-1992 university

Development and Performance Review 2015/2016
Principal Lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Reviewee:</th>
<th>Job Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Reviewer:</th>
<th>Job Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period covered by this review:</th>
<th>Date of review:</th>
<th>FTE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 1 Sept 2015</td>
<td>To 31 August 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your review will incorporate a discussion with your manager about your **individual achievement of objectives and your personal development**. Managers have been trained in the DPR process and further information is available on the Staff Portal.

Your review begins with a look back over the last year, covering performance against your objectives, and the Capabilities you have demonstrated.

Importantly, your review also looks to the future, identifying priorities, specific individual objectives, development needs and career aspirations.

The aim of your review is to maximise and align your personal performance and growth with that of the University.

Both reviewee and reviewer should make notes on parts 1 and 2, in preparation for the review. In particular both parties should give some thought to future objectives. It is also helpful to let each other know, before the review meeting, any specific aspects either of you wish to discuss.

DPR guides for Reviewers and Reviewees have been prepared to accompany this form, and should be referred to as required. This includes help with preparing for your review. All the relevant documents are available on the HR Staff Portal using the following link:

(deleted)

If you require any assistance in obtaining these documents or have specific requirements (e.g. large print format) please contact your HR Business Partner or the Learning and Development Team on ext:
1.1 Contribution Review.

This section is for you to review and comment on your performance against your SMART objectives and the associated capabilities during 2015/2016, which will then be discussed with your manager at your review meeting.

The capabilities describe the behaviours which underpin effective performance in your role and describe 'how' you went about achieving your objectives. The core capabilities are:

- **Leadership** – Taking responsibility for the performance of self and others in the context of the University's stated priorities, goals and plans
- **Business Development** – An income-generating orientation which seeks out new opportunities in the form of knowledge, collaboration and market demand both nationally and internationally.
- **Teamworking** – Working with and through others to achieve personal, faculty, School and University goals
- **Service & Quality** – Delivering high quality service to a culturally diverse organisation. Developing the most effective and efficient systems and processes for the delivery of high quality services
- **Creativity & Innovation** – Creating and embracing new ideas, solutions and techniques, critiquing assumptions and creating opportunities in the context of being a global University.

For posts of Principal Lecturer Capability Group 2 applies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development and enhancement of Teaching and Learning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewee comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied Research Objective:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewee comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Leadership:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewee comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team and Personal Professional Development Objective:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewee comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual SMART Objective:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewee comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual SMART Objective:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewee comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual SMART Objective:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewee comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual SMART Objective:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewee comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual SMART Objective:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewee comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer comments on performance and related capabilities:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Personal Development  This section is for you to review your Personal Development activity during 2015/2016.

Comment on learning and development activities undertaken, knowledge and skills acquired, plus how you have been able to apply them. **If you have been working on any of the relevant areas of Capability for your role this year, include a summary below.**

Comments:
## 2.1 Key Objectives and capabilities for the period ahead 2016/2017 – Principal Lecturer

This is the grade where greater specialisation would be permitted allowing academic staff to develop particular personal strengths, in line with the Corporate Plan. Accordingly, the DPR process will assess performance on evidence presented against the following:

- The development and enhancement of Teaching and Learning
- Achievement in Applied Research
- Academic Leadership at Department/School/Faculty/University level

In this section you should agree with your manager up to a maximum of 8 objectives. These should reflect the balance of Teaching and Learning, Applied Research and Academic Leadership, appropriate to the needs of your Faculty/School/Department and own career trajectory. You should also identify the key capabilities which will contribute to achievement of the objectives. Capability Group 2 applies. Refer to the DPR Guide for more information on the Capability Framework.

### Development and enhancement of Teaching and Learning:

A Principal Lecturer will be expected to demonstrate achievement against at least two of the following criteria each year. If a Principal Lecturer is specialising in Teaching and Learning they will be expected to demonstrate achievement against all these criteria.

- **The XXXX Course to deliver:**
  - x% Student Satisfaction
  - y% Completion
  - z% Positive Destination
- The above measures are set individually at course level to reflect appropriate improvement.
- Evidence of rating of teaching performance, assessment, and academic support for all categories of student as excellent or outstanding.
- Design and implementation of innovative and successful new courses which recruit to target nationally and/or internationally, and evidence of effective leadership of curriculum development or wider student experience in School/Faculty/University.
- Evidence of successful application for external funding for research into learning and teaching, or curriculum development, or related policy as principal applicant.
- Evidence of national standing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual SMART objectives and associated capabilities</th>
<th>Resources/support needed</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Applied Research Objective

Principal Lecturers will be expected to demonstrate achievement against at least two of the following criteria each year. If a Principal Lecturer is specialising in Applied Research they will be expected to demonstrate achievement against all these criteria.

- Applied Research Objective – Using the University’s Applied Research Strategy as a guide, you should identify, in discussion with your manager, which of the listed AR profiles best fits your own contribution, and set an objective that reflects one or more of the typical outputs appropriate to that profile.
- Evidence of success in obtaining (major) applied research project or contract as principal applicant or team leader or the equivalent in performance-based fields.
- Contribution to knowledge exploitation in the University.
- Evidence of success in leading or helping to build a strong Applied Research Group or Centre including mentoring of less experienced colleagues and the acquisition of funding for the Group or Centre. Or the equivalent for an external network, group, consortium or community of practice as appropriate.
- Evidence of national standing in the discipline, field or community of practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual SMART objectives and associated capabilities</th>
<th>Resources/support needed</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Academic Leadership:

Principal Lecturers will be expected to demonstrate achievement against at least two of the following criteria each year. If a Principal Lecturer is specialising in Academic Leadership they will be expected to demonstrate achievement against all these criteria.

- Evidence of academic leadership exemplifying best practice, and which has contributed to an important development for the Department, School, Faculty or University, or to a major improvement of its systems, procedures and processes.
  The development may relate to the Coventry campus or to partnerships elsewhere in the UK or overseas.
- Successful handling of responsibility for one or more of the following:
  - People and financial resources.
  - Development and/or delivery of a major teaching programme where the Principal Lecturer can demonstrate a direct influence on implementation of best practice, innovative teaching methods and content or improved student outcomes. The teaching programme can be for overseas delivery or for delivery elsewhere in the UK.
  - Student recruitment, or retention, or academic or pastoral support in a Department/ School / Faculty with evidence of improvement compared to benchmark data. This can include development of activities designed to support the personal development of students and enhance their employability, e.g. through enterprise and entrepreneurship.
  - Quality enhancement, quality assurance, or for successful re-accreditation by external professional body.
- Applied research in a Department/School/Faculty including implementation of plans for/ following REF

- Development and successful handling of relationship as ‘account manager’ for key external partner or community of practice network giving direct and significant benefit to the University, School, Faculty or Department. The partner may be based in the UK or overseas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual SMART objectives and associated capabilities</th>
<th>Resources/support needed</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team and Personal Professional Development Objective: Individual SMART objective and associated capabilities

Personal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual specific SMART international/cultural objective and associated capabilities</th>
<th>Resources/support needed</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual SMART objective and associated capabilities</th>
<th>Resources/support needed</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual SMART objective and associated capabilities</th>
<th>Resources/support needed</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2 Career Aspirations
Either within your current role, or, if appropriate, other career routes within the University. This section is an opportunity for you to discuss your personal aspirations so that any appropriate development or support can be considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Aspirations</th>
<th>Resources/Support needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Additional Support
Do you need any additional support to enable you to achieve personal objectives and development plans? (e.g. support for a disability or long term health condition) If so, please detail this below and note the action to be taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources/Support needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

**Summary – Reviewer’s comments**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary – Reviewee’s comments**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signed – Reviewer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Signed – Reviewee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Signed – Reviewer’s Line Manager**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments – Reviewer’s Line Manager**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planned date of Interim Review meeting**: / /  

*Reviewer: Please keep a copy of this form before submitting to Human Resources, Thank You*
Personal Development Action Plan for Staff

Name of Reviewee:
School/Faculty/Service:

Using the information from the sections on your DPR forms, you should summarise your personal development priorities in relation to:
- Key Objectives for the year ahead – Refer to section 2.1 of your DPR form
- Capability development priorities – Refer to section 2.2 of your DPR form
- Development to support career aspirations – Refer to section 2.3 of your DPR form and include relevant CPD/specialist/academic development

This record will be forwarded to Human Resources to inform learning and development provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills / Knowledge Development Area</th>
<th>Actions Needed to Achieve Development</th>
<th>Resources / Support Needed</th>
<th>Impact on Objectives / Capability</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Capabilities Grid for a Principal Lecturer

## Academic Group 2

### CAPABILITY

#### Leadership
Taking responsibility for the performance of self and others in the context of the University's stated priorities, goals and plans

- Reviews current practice internally and externally, makes recommendations and takes action to improve School programmes and research activity.
- Assesses and negotiates the resources needed for delivery of programmes or for undertaking research.
- Mentors and supports others in the uptake of good practice and promotes innovation.
- Provides constructive and culturally sensitive feedback to others in order to improve performance.
- Anticipates problems and identifies solutions before a situation becomes a crisis.
- Understands own cultural position and how it influences behaviour.

#### Business Development
An income-generating orientation which seeks out new opportunities in the form of knowledge, collaboration and market demand both nationally and internationally.

- Proactively seeks out major national and international funding opportunities on a regular basis.
- Develops business cases and proposals aimed at securing funding for internationally significant research.
- Is active in networks and attends events where funding opportunities are published, regularly monitors these for opportunities.
- Shares knowledge about funding opportunities and bodies with others and helps them to make bids.
- Identifies and involves relevant people in order to design and deliver income-generating activities.
- Represents the University externally to build the global reputation of the School, Faculty and University.

#### Team Working
Working with and through others to achieve personal, department and University goals

- Makes time to work with colleagues, including those in partner institutions, to help them develop their own performance.
- Gets involved in interdisciplinary and cross-boundary initiatives.
- Develops teams that achieve results in teaching, learning and applied research.
- Works with people to resolve conflicts in a positive and culturally sensitive way.
- Doesn't wear blinkers - looks outside their immediate environment and recognises the links between their activities and those across the
Service & Quality (SMART CAMPUS)

Delivering high quality service to a culturally diverse organisation. Developing the most effective and efficient systems and processes for the delivery of high quality services

- Takes account of wider concerns in making choices and decisions.
- Communicates quality and service requirements and mentors/supports others in their achievement.
- Develops ongoing quality and service measures, undertakes measurement and makes adjustments to practice in response to feedback.
- Analyses feedback from module leaders and others to assess consistency and deliver improvement activity.
- Volunteers for and undertakes roles relating to quality assessment and enhancement.
- Questions standards and practices in own team to achieve service improvement.
- Actively champions process improvement across internal and external functional boundaries.
- Promotes the use of appropriate technology within teaching and research activities.
- Considers the impact of change on the diverse stakeholder group involved

Creativity & Innovation

Creating and embracing new ideas, solutions and techniques, critiquing assumptions and creating opportunities in the context of being a global University.

- Challenges and gets others to challenge the status quo in order to improve.
- Identifies and acts on opportunities bought about by change.
- Researches widely and identifies future needs introducing change where appropriate.
- Translates complex ideas into forms that others can understand.
- Makes links between their own area of expertise and that of others to create new possibilities.
- Encourages and supports others to be open to new ideas and to see situations from many perspectives.
- Encourages a shared approach to problem solving between teams across the School, Faculty, University and partners.
Appendix 7 - How pay is determined using the appraisal rating system

### Staff within Standard Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Pay Impact</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U – Unacceptable</td>
<td>No increment</td>
<td>Individuals receiving this rating, where an improvement action plan has already been initiated, will NOT receive an increment. Development will be linked to an Improvement Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR – Improvement Required</td>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>Individuals receiving this rating who are already on the highest salary point of the Standard Zone will NOT receive an increment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR – Development Required</td>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>Individuals receiving this rating who are already on the highest salary point of the Standard Zone will NOT receive an increment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S – Strong</td>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>Individuals receiving this rating who are already on the highest salary point of the Standard Zone will NOT receive an increment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Excellent</td>
<td>Increment + Poss. Merit</td>
<td>One increment and recommendation of one off merit payment. Individuals receiving this rating who are already on the highest point of the Standard Zone will automatically move into the Contribution Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O – Outstanding</td>
<td>Double Increment</td>
<td>Recommendation of two increments. Individuals receiving this rating who are already on the highest salary point of the Standard Zone, (or, in the case of a double increment, the point immediately below the highest), will automatically move into the Contribution Zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff within Contribution Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Pay Impact</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U – Unacceptable</td>
<td>No increment</td>
<td>No incremental movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR – Improvement Required</td>
<td>No Increment</td>
<td>No incremental movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR – Development Required</td>
<td>No Increment</td>
<td>No incremental movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S – Strong</td>
<td>Possible Merit</td>
<td>No incremental movement but possible recommendation of a merit award to reward specific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Excellent</td>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>Recommendation of one increment, provided not already on highest point. If on highest point already, can still be recommended for a merit payment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O – Outstanding</td>
<td>Double Increment</td>
<td>Recommendation of two increments. Individuals already on the highest salary point of the Contribution Zone will not receive any further increment but may be recommended for a merit award, or, if on the point below the highest, will receive one increment and a recommendation of a merit payment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8 – Pay scales to show standard and contribution zones for lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Point</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>Gross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8029</td>
<td>7 pt 29 6 pt 29</td>
<td>£31,083.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8030</td>
<td>7 pt 30 6 pt 30</td>
<td>£32,013.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8031</td>
<td>7 pt 31 6 pt 31</td>
<td>£32,964.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8032</td>
<td>7 pt 32 6 pt 32</td>
<td>£33,954.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8033</td>
<td>7 pt 33 6 pt 33</td>
<td>£34,959.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8034</td>
<td>7 pt 34 6 pt 34</td>
<td>£36,009.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8035</td>
<td>7 pt 35 8 pt 35</td>
<td>£37,083.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8036</td>
<td>7 pt 36 8 pt 36</td>
<td>£38,190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8037</td>
<td>7 pt 37 8 pt 37</td>
<td>£39,333.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8038</td>
<td>8 pt 38 8 pt 38</td>
<td>£40,530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8039</td>
<td>8 pt 39 8 pt 39</td>
<td>£41,718.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8040</td>
<td>* 8 pt 40 8 pt 40</td>
<td>£42,963.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8041</td>
<td>8 pt 41 8 pt 41</td>
<td>£44,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8042</td>
<td>8 pt 42 8 pt 42</td>
<td>£45,570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8043</td>
<td>8 pt 43 8 pt 43</td>
<td>£46,935.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8044</td>
<td>8 pt 44 8 pt 44</td>
<td>£48,336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8045</td>
<td>8 pt 45 8 pt 45</td>
<td>£49,782.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8046</td>
<td>8 pt 46 8 pt 46</td>
<td>£51,267.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8047</td>
<td>8 pt 47 8 pt 47</td>
<td>£52,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DELPHI POINT GRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELPHI POINT</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8044</td>
<td>9 pt 44 8 pt 44</td>
<td>£48,336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8045</td>
<td>9 pt 45 8 pt 45</td>
<td>£49,782.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8046</td>
<td>9 pt 46 8 pt 46</td>
<td>£51,267.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8047</td>
<td>9 pt 47 8 pt 47</td>
<td>£52,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8048</td>
<td>9 pt 48 8 pt 48</td>
<td>£54,384.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8049</td>
<td>9 pt 49 8 pt 49</td>
<td>£56,007.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8050</td>
<td>9 pt 50 8 pt 50</td>
<td>£57,684.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8051</td>
<td>9 pt 51 8 pt 51</td>
<td>£59,409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8052</td>
<td>9 pt 52 8 pt 52</td>
<td>£60,306.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KEY

- **Standard Zone**
- **Contribution Zone**

Grade 7 = Lecturer

Grade 8 = Senior Lecturer

Grade 9 = Principal Lecturer
Appendix 9 – Extracts from Staff Survey Results for Business Faculty 2014
(Survey included academic and administrative workers and was conducted by an external organisation)

To identify the areas for improvement in the Faculty, all the agree/disagree questions are ranked according to the values assigned to each question.

Values are assigned to each response i.e. Agree = 4; Tend to Agree = 3; Tend to Disagree = 2; Disagree = 1 (scores are reversed for negatively phrased questions). Values for each participant’s response are added together to generate an overall question score. It is possible that two questions with the same aggregate percentage may have different question scores, so one may appear as an area of strength or improvement while the other does not.

Those questions generating the most negative values i.e. with a score below 2.50 are listed below.

Workload and bureaucracy
Q3.3 I feel that too many approvals are needed for routine decisions* 1.64
Q11.5 I have to work very intensively* 1.68
Q3.2 I feel the University is trying to reduce the level of bureaucracy 1.96
Q11.6 Different groups at work demand things from me which are hard to combine* 2.08
Q11.7 I have to neglect some tasks because I have too much to do* 2.21
Q1.4 I have unrealistic time pressures* 2.33

Change and change management
Q17.9 Generally, more could be done to help staff prepare for and cope with change* 1.89
Q11.4 Staff are always consulted about change at work 2.12
Q17.5 When changes are made at work, I am clear how they will work out in practice 2.18
Q17.8 Generally, there is too much local change for change’s sake* 2.31
Q17.6 Generally, change within my Faculty/School/Service is managed well 2.38
Q17.2 In my opinion recent changes have been well communicated 2.40
Q17.7 Generally, change within the University is managed well 2.47

Communication and co-operation
Q14.8 There are effective channels for staff to feed their views upwards in the University 2.11
Q14.7 On the whole, the different parts of the University communicate effectively with each Other 2.13
Q14.6 Communication between senior management and staff is effective 2.34
Q15.8b I feel there is good co-operation across teams in Faculties/Schools/Services 2.36
Q14.3 The amount of information I receive makes it difficult for me to get on with my job* 2.41
Q14.4 I know where to find information about important decisions made at the University 2.44

Senior management
Q3.1d The University Senior Management Team listen to and respond to the views of frontline staff 2.24

Feeling valued
Q2.10 I feel valued by the University 2.44
### Question Block 14: Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Tend to Agree</th>
<th>% Tend to Disagree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14.1 I receive information in a timely way</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.2 The information I receive is straightforward and I understand it</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.3 The amount of information I receive makes it difficult for me to get on with my job</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.4 I know where to find information about important decisions made at the University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.5 On the whole, communication in the University is effective</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.6 Communication between senior management and staff is effective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.7 On the whole, the different parts of the University communicate effectively with each other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.8 There are effective channels for staff to feed their views upwards in the University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.9 A better internet/staff portal would help improve communications</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: The sum of the total responses throughout this report may not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.]
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