

International Journal of Applied Public Sector Management

Volume 1 Issue 2

'New Professionals' - Mainstreaming or Marginalisation

Lynne Gornall and Dr Brychan Thomas

University of Glamorgan

ISSN 1742-2655

Abstract

The shift from teaching to learning in HEIs, together with changing sources of funding for innovation, have had important implications for staff roles. 'New Professionals', the staff whose posts exemplify these changes, have a variety of backgrounds – academic, library, IT, media services, staff develop, 'projects', and many can be regarded as occupying 'hybrid' roles which cross traditional job boundaries. Such roles may be regarded as at the heart of much higher educational thinking today, yet after a decade of HE change, it is not entirely clear that these posts or people are at the heart of their institution. Indeed, anecdotal evidence suggests that whilst the rhetoric may place such work at the 'centre' of the organisation, the contractual and status position of many of these staff is more likely to be at the margins of the HE labour market.

Keywords:

New Professionals, Teaching, Learning, Hybrid Roles

The findings reported in this paper were originally presented at the ALT99 interactive session with the aim of seeking the views, suggestions and comments of the participants. ALT members could be regarded as at the forefront of 'new T&L professionalism', but what the acknowledged characteristics of this group might be was up for discussion. The session offered the opportunity to engage in and help shape an emerging area of research.

Introduction

Previous work on the emergence of 'new professionals' working in Higher Education (HE) teaching and learning (Gornall, 1999) suggests that their role is central to the kinds of change signalled in university and Higher Education Institutions (HEI) mission statements. However, their own contractual and organisational position may remain somewhat more tenuous than such 'centrality' may suggest. The picture though is a complex one, of on the one hand, 'academic' – experienced staff in long-term permanent posts and on the other hand, staff from a variety of backgrounds growing into or being appointed to new Teaching and Learning (T&L) positions, on a variety of contracts, posts and conditions. The 'snapshots' we will be looking at in this paper highlight, it is argued, a system in transition. They also indicate areas of change in contemporary HEIs, the nature and extent of which is under review and even un-represented in current data sources on HE staffing.

An initial survey conducted in 1998, and published earlier this year (ibid) suggested that organisational restructuring to take account of wider HE changes was leading to the establishment of new sorts of posts (job titles), teams and departments in the period since 1991. Reasons given by the staff concerned fell into two general categories: project funding/funding opportunities and changes in staff or student needs (including from the outcomes of organisational restructuring). As we indicated earlier, however,

some of this change, which led to a higher profile for key actors, was also accompanied by considerable staffing and employment uncertainty.

Anticipating ALT99, a new survey pilot was devised as a precursor to a much larger research study. A questionnaire on 'HE staffing', designed to elicit individual occupational data, was circulated on e-mail lists in electronic/Web returnable format. The results were presented at ALT99 in what was a lively and interactive session, and, together with feedback and discussion from participants and additional data received (n=75), forms the basis of the present paper.

Work in Higher Education

The 'casualisation' of academic staff is already well advanced in the UK, according to one Vice-Chancellor (Newby, 1999); 'contract' staffing, it is argued, represents the flexible, 'piece-working' labour force (Chitnis & Williams, 1999). By this, we understand, the writers refer to the growth of fractional, temporary and fixed-term posts in HE, as opposed to permanent and 'tenured' staffing, and nearly half of all lecturers currently work part-time (ibid) although, in some ways, this "casualised" market, has historically been exemplified in research-based employment (Narfhe, 1997). One quarter of HE staff are contract research staff, usually full-time but also short term, and the number increased by 5,000 posts (9,000 to 14,000) in the two years from 1994-5 to 1995-6 (Chitnis & Williams, 1999). Moreover, the great majority of research-based staff (94.2%) are on fixed term contracts - i.e. between six months and three years - a figure which is rising, and increased between 1995 and 1998. The greater concentration of research in the 'old' university sector also means that there is a much higher incidence of fixed term staffing in these institutions - 50% of all academic/research/research-related posts in 'old' HEIs are currently on fixed-term contracts according to Hart (1998), compared with 15% of staff in the 'new' (post 1992) university sector (ibid).

If we take HE 'academic' fixed term posts as a whole, some 38.5% of all academic staff in 1994-5 were on fixed term contracts, according to Chitnis and Williams (1999), increasing to 41.1% in 1996-7, a very large proportion, although most of them (90%, ibid) are also full-time. By the late 1990s, these authors commented, approximately half of the academic staff working in British universities were on contracts that were either fixed term, or part-time or both, with numbers of 'contract' and 'established' staff almost the same (ibid). The proportion of women on fixed-term contracts is also significantly higher than men across all grades (Hart, 1998), and new entrants to the profession were overwhelmingly on such posts - 92% of 21-25 year olds, compared with only 13.1% of 51-55 year olds on fixed term academic posts (Chitnis & Williams, 1999).

Given that employment structure and practice in HEIs are changing in the shift to a more "comprehensive higher education" (Newby, 1999), the context for and implications of these changes are of no small interest to Learning Technologies professionals, since anecdotally, much of the innovation in

current teaching and learning has been project-based with temporary, contract staffing as the norm, supported by external learning.

Four dimensions of these changes merit our attention, which we will look at briefly here, and are shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Dimensions of change

Structural – the patterns and types of labour profile in an occupational sector and its movement

Contextual – the texture of professional relationships, groups and structures within HEIs as organisation (the 'ecology' of the workplace)

Experiential – individual career paths and experiences of change, together with interpretations and explanations of what is taking place (both organisational and global levels)

Strategic – the external/organisational interface, drivers, policies, agencies and their mediation by senior HEI staff.

Structural Dimensions of HE Change

In the previous section, we looked at 'change' in relation to the changing contractual basis of academic posts, 'fixed term' versus 'permanent' contracts, and so on. But perhaps those categories of posts - academic, lecturing - are themselves changing; there are some indications of this in the statistics.

Firstly, full-time academic posts in the UK HE are reducing. Comparative figures for totals of HE and research staff for teaching and research staff for 1995/6 (111,458) and 1997/8 (110,487) show that full time academic staff in HE are going down, based on the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) figures (Resources, 1995-6,1997-8).

Secondly, many apparent 'research' posts are nothing of the sort, but teaching and innovation-related employment arising out of teaching and learning development. New project workers, for example, are often appointed to Research Assistant (RA) and even Research Fellowship (RF) scales, a factor which may misleadingly inflate the true extent of 'research' in HEI staffing

figures. As Chitnis and Williams (1999) comment, many research projects employ casual staff directly onto a project. It also means that teaching and learning development activity is under represented in the figures. In the official figures which separate out 'teaching' and 'research' figures then, we cannot assume that people called 'researchers' are only doing research, or even doing research at all. Ask any TLTP project manager!

Thirdly, there is a lack of information about 'cross boundary' posts and non-standard contract staffing in HE. Figures for different groups of staff are collected and published in different places. HESA thus contains data on academic (teaching and research, including clinical) staff, though there 'is very little monitoring (and) few reliable statistics' on part-time staffing (Chitnis & Williams, 1993). Hart (1998) reports Natfhe estimates of 19,000 part-time hourly paid staff in the 'new' university sector alone, with only those on 25% or more of a full-time post counted in official statistics by HESA. Staff in 'academic-related' and other sorts of post (library, IT/technical, and so on) are reported elsewhere from teaching and research staff, despite the fact that they are often also engaged in 'new professional' teaching and learning work, and thus it is difficult to get an accurate picture of 'teaching and learning' employment in HE at the current time. Moreover, one suspects that most HEIs themselves do not record the information in a way, which tracks the changes.

Fourthly, at the same time as full-time academic posts are decreasing, the proportions of posts not funded by the host HEI are increasing. A comparison of non-HEI funded and HEI funded posts shows non-HEI funded posts for 1995-96 (33,557) and 1997-98 (34,570) going up and HEI funded posts for 1995-96 (77,901) and 1997-98 (75,917) going down (HESA statistics, Resources, 1995-96 and 1997-98).

This will not surprise members of ALT, many of whose departments in teaching and learning have most probably been at least partially resourced and funded externally through one of the national programme initiatives.

Contextual Dimensions of Change

The overall balance in HE then, may be shifting from what Scott (1995) calls a 'core' of professors and lecturers to that of 'support' staff, student counsellors, marketing and recruitment specialists. For Chitnis and Williams (1999), it reflects a model of *'permanent staff rather than a type of profession at the core, surrounded by a larger number of temporarily employed individuals'*. Newby (1999) links these shifts to the ramifications of new technologies. Changes in higher education, he argues, made possible by developments in ICT and digital broadcasting, are having profound implications for the structure and function of the academic profession. There seems to be a general consensus about the combination of factors associated with this:

- Expansion of overall student numbers
- Reduction in unit funding
- Marketisation ("customer" focus)
- Changes in governance+ in academic contracts

- Growth in project-based funding
- Role of IT resources for delivery
- Student diversity arising out of greater access to HE

Labour market theorists like Claydon (1995), view employment changes as linked to changes in technology and markets, where organisational structures need to be *"adapted ... so that excess labour is not carried"* and institutions are able to adjust *"the size and mix of labour inputs"* depending on demand and changes in demand (Claydon, 1995). The ramifications of this are to produce a core of permanent workers in the organisation, with a 'flexibilised' outer group on the periphery, on fixed-term and temporary contracts. Over time it is argued, these may simply move from contract to contract (serial employment on projects), 'flexibilised' and fixed-term, or move towards the core, gradually occupying established permanent posts. We shall need a longer time-scale to identify these particular patterns in current UK HE, but our surveys of learning technologies staff suggest that at the 'core' of many teaching and learning units is a group of well qualified, established staff on permanent posts. There is a trend however for recently established departments (1999 on) to employ more flexibly, and on a variety of contracts. Beneath these are large mixed groups of fixed-term, temporary and permanent staff, comprising those with traditional and 'new' job titles and roles. They include staff on technical, academic-related, research, academic and project administration posts, working side-by-side in teaching and learning support and development teams, as noted in the next section.

For HE managers, the ability to be able to respond to changing circumstances as well as financial constraints, makes flexibility in employment very desirable (Chitnis & Williams, 1999). Thus, the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP) regards fixed term contracts as beneficial, providing institutions with *"a flexible workforce and a constant stream of fresh ideas, expertise and knowledge"* (Nafthe, 1997). Such 'flexibility' however might be at odds with the need to place sustained innovation and development at the heart of the HEI mission. As Chitnis and Williams (1999) comment, *"wider labour market studies cast some doubt on the extent to which widespread casualisation is in the best long term interests of employing enterprises, especially where high levels of knowledge, competence and commitment are required. The claim that part time and temporary employment is essential to provide sufficient flexibility to meet changing client demands thus needs to be examined carefully"* (ibid).

The teaching and learning staff we have described as the 'New Professionals' (see definition in note 1) in the system, and who have taken part in this survey, have detailed their experiences, which we link to the patterns of changes considered here. Further aspects of their employment are examined in the next section.

Experiential Dimensions of Change

Many of the individual stories (some modifications have been made to preserve anonymity) of the T&L 'new professionals' will be readily

recognisable to readers of ALT-J. Questions about the current department, when and why it was created, about colleagues and the individual's role, were asked, and the replies show striking experiences of sustained and sometimes profound change:

- "Our unit was part of QA now HR; the rest of the SD group are T&L"
- "Dept has been in and out of existence several times. Current incarnation started 1997"
- "Originally an offshoot of learning technology..."
- "Converged unit 1996, now restructured; I can draw on several teams..."
- "We used to be two separate bits then merged two years ago. Will separate again soon!"
- "We lost computing but kept training. We do AV and develop teaching materials for the web"
- Started as a TLTP project then absorbed... now spun off as T&L"
- "I was an admin assistant and now author the web pages for the Intranet"
- "Was in staff devt., which has now split, and I'm the new head of T&L"

Of 55 responses, 37 of the departments were created in the last 9 years (i.e. since 1990), with most of these (25) created in the last one to four years. 12 were more longstanding, established for some ten to twenty-five years. Some of the names of these new units are noted in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Department Titles (examples)

<p>Learning Centre Learning and Teaching Unit Centre for Educational Development Flexible Learning Centre for Learning and Teaching Learning Resources Support Learning Development Centre Distance Education Unit</p>
--

The job titles of the 'established professional' and the 'new professional' post holders are shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3: 'Established Professional' and 'New Professional' post holders – Job Titles

'Established Professionals'	'New Professionals'
Administrator Senior Lecturer Technician Head of Department Librarian IT Support Officer	Faculty Webmaster Educational Technologist Head of Learning and Teaching Deputy Director of Flexible Learning Educational Technology Programme Leader Information and Training Officer Learning Development Manager Learning Technologies Co-ordinator Teaching Fellow, ICT Flexible Learning Manager Head of Learning Technology Services Curriculum Development Manager Director of Lifelong Learning Faculty CAL Officer Senior Lecturer in Learning Technologies Project Officer Director of Teaching and Learning Support Project Manager Learning Technologies Adviser Multimedia Technology Manager

It is clear from the survey data that many in the new T&L units have non-traditional contracts, job titles and conditions of employment. They are also fairly new, as detailed below.

When asked when the respondents' post had been created, of 55 responses, 41 had been created since 1990, 50% of these in the last three years (i.e. since 1996). Interestingly however, many of the post holders were on permanent and full-time contracts - 35 permanent and 20 temporary (includes fixed term and secondment). Their salaries were on salary scale rather than fixed point - 5 fixed salary and 50 salary scale.

This is probably because the respondents were largely in the higher status range, who had changed role from academic posts and taken that 'tenure' with them. This is also supported in research commissioned by Natfhe - the higher the grade, the more likely staff were to be on a permanent contract (Batten & Skinner, 1997). But it does mean that the next phase of enquiry needs to look closer at the contracts and employment of their colleagues, who appear

significantly to be part of a more 'flexibilised' workforce. They were largely on academic and academic-related contracts, as follows:

- 25 academic (senior lecturer, principal lecturer, HoD on academic scale)
- 12 academic related
- 5 support contracts
- 5 administrative/professional/management
- 4 on research related
- 1 other

The titles of colleagues are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Colleagues' Titles

Learning Development Tutor
Subject Adviser
Information Manager
Distance Learning Adviser
L&T Development Officer (media, web, training)
Media Producer
Educational Technologist
Learning Technologies Co-ordinator
Training Manager
Web Developer
Technical Author

In the survey details of the types of post of others in the respondents' area were asked for, and examples of colleagues' contracts are shown below:

- 'permanent academics, temporary research assistants, permanent admin staff, several developers funded by income generation'
- 'all full time and continuing – some academic some admin'
- 'all academic-related'
- 'some ex-academics plus others on temporary contracts, and permanent admin'
- 'all permanent and full time'
- 'all permanent academic, some academic-related (with same job title), some temporary academic'
- 'all APTC and permanent – job titles being finalised'
- 'one manager is permanent, two are seconded, project workers are temporary, permanent admin, assistants and secretaries, materials editors and lecturers'
- 'all academic-related and mostly permanent'
- 'a head and a secretary, both on APTC'
- 'mixed, depends where they were prior to merger; new posts all on 2 year temporary'
- '3 year contracts; academic-related and research assistants as needed'
- 'all on renewable 5 year contracts'
- 'we're all mostly full time and all permanent'
- 'the academic is on a 3 year contract, the admin person is permanent but part time is here on secondment'

- 'recent restructuring has resulted in all groups and jobs being redefined. I do not know final definitions (job titles) are...'

Clearly from the survey, staff appointed to a similar post may find themselves on different types of contract and terms and conditions – academic, APTC, research, administrative, academic-related – depending on the institution, the history and context.

Strategic Aspects of Change

Henkel and Kogan (1996) have discussed ways in which the internal working of HEIs are affected by external pressures, including those of central government. In turn, institutions, they claim, are *“co-opting external funders, and strengthening their currency in the institutional and student market place [and].. are internalising new norms, as boundaries become more fluid and the institutional mission more powerful”* (1999).

From their study of nine HEIs, Henkel and Kogan found that institutional responses to external opportunities were affected to a large extent by their existing status and background - *“the lower the status, the more change is concerned with recruiting external support”* and that in responding to external pressures, the largest and oldest institutions tend to strengthen existing faculties rather than to redirect policies from the centre; there was, they argue, a *“spectrum of vulnerability”*, so that more vulnerable HEIs tended to display stronger leadership (1990). Higher status organisations then were more concerned with maintaining their academic lead, while *“less confident’ HEIs were more likely to “assess” sources of external support, and to change their offerings accordingly”* (Henkel & Kogan, *ibid*).

We noted earlier the growth of non-institutional funding in HEIs to pay for staff posts. We would argue that HEI staffs' success in attracting external resources has funded much innovation as well as supporting many of the new T&L contract posts. These changes have been noted by HE managers, agencies and staff organisations alike, and indeed, it is likely that 'extra' sources of funding have been used by policy-makers and agencies directly to 'incentivise' change in HE. But the changes, particularly in academic employment structures, are areas whose implications are still to be addressed, according to Altbach and Davis (1999). Meanwhile, perhaps things are just moving on: Newby, and employer, claims that academic culture has *“lagged behind the changes in the structure and organisation of higher education and learning”* (1999), with academics *“aware only of declining comparative salary levels, increasing staff/student ratios, and increasing pressures on time to deliver high quality”*, while entrepreneurial organisations such as the University of Phoenix in America operate not with academic staff *“in the conventional sense [but].. a retinue of 'course assistants' whose functions include a conventional tutoring role vis a vis the students, but who also offer assistance to students in navigating their way around the multiplicity of courseware offered over the Net”*. The evidence from our survey points to this trend in the UK and the 'birth' of many departments and posts as being outcomes of (a) restructuring and (b) new funding.

New and 'Old' Professionals

So all agree that HE work is changing. Moreover, existing HE teaching staff are generally unhappy with their current lot. A survey of 500 lecturers in the 'new' University and College sector (Batten & Skinner, 1997) found far more negative than positive comments about how jobs have changed in recent years, with one fifth saying there were no job prospects unless they moved away from teaching. Certainly the questionnaire returns received from staff in 'conventional' teaching posts and departments in the survey underlined this. There were some career and personal stories to tell here too (as Batten & Skinner (*ibid*) found), case studies about the experiences and pressures of change. Two further interesting features arise from the data on current HE lecturing roles however, (a) that dissatisfaction arises in particular from the reduction in time spent directly with learners (Batten & Skinner, 1997), and (b) that issues around 'distance learning' developments per se surprisingly perhaps, hardly feature in perceptions of factors affecting current change at all (*ibid*) by lecturing staff.

The Dearing Commission (NICHE, 1997) looked at issues of changing roles and patterns of HE work, noting that staff involved in T&L (which are defined as 'new professionals') were more likely to leave their post than established staff on permanent contracts, even though they often reported a greater satisfaction (Gornall, 1999). More recently, the BETT committee received "*a large number of submissions on issues raised by the employment of part time and fixed term staff*" (Chitnis & Williams, 1999), while the newly-formed Institute for Learning and Teaching (ILT) is having to take account of the implications of changes in teaching and learning, in particular, the eligibility for membership of groups like learning technologists and ALT members. Participants at the ALT conference workshop were certainly unsure as to the wider applicability of membership for learning support and development staff. Ironically, staff who have left conventional teaching for non-traditional 'T&L' posts wondered if they would be able to qualify, now they no longer 'have' courses and students to provide 'frontline' evidence.

The outcomes not only of these discussions but of new practices and procedures will illustrate the way in which strategic (policy-led) change, which is directed towards particular outcomes, aligns with the kinds of structural change (change in patterns and organisation of work) which we have been concerned with here. There is the issue, for example, of the possibility of a gradual replacement of current, 'established', T&L academic post holders (identified in the previous but one section) by temporary contract post holders. In this scenario, there will certainly be movement and flexibility, but this may also create instability and a lack of continuity, whilst failing to capitalise on the new professionals' skills base. We know that newer and younger staff are more likely to be on fixed term or temporary contracts (Chitnis & Williams, 1999) and also that there is a higher turnover of these groups with desired skills (NCIHE, 1997), so the potential for 'marginalisation' rather than 'mainstreaming' of T&L change, and of the role of its post holders, is clearly indicated.

Concluding Remarks: Ways Forward

'Change' of course, involves more than one set of discourses. Undoubtedly, the insecurity of contract working and the temporary nature of sources of funding have informed the current status of teaching and learning employment patterns. We saw this in the spirited discussion conducted in the ALT workshop on status differentials, salary levels, scales and conditions of employment in 'T&L' posts, and on the names, nature and types of different HE contracts.

The areas which we see as providing a constructive and forward-looking basis for examining new professional work in HE are (a) the 'ecology of work' approach to organisations (EFIFWC, 1990), which examines the impact of new forms of work on employment relationships, and (b) Kogan's (1999) 'interfacial working' concept which, though not developed from the T&L professionals' point of view, indicates an area for theoretical development and one which looks fairly relevant to the 'cross-border' nature of much of the territory of 'new T&L professionals' work. In addition, (c) in the context of external funding as a driver of change in this area, we have seen how collaborative partnerships to access new sources of funding and cross-sector HEI teams, organised around joint projects, have led to the development of supra-institutional T&L groups and networks. Common in research groups, these are an 'emergent feature' in the teaching and learning arena, although a moment's thought about ALT members' affiliations, projects, journal topics, collaborative authorships, and conference workshops, will affirm it.

We thus need to develop what might be termed an 'innovative metric' or ways of recording, tracking and benchmarking structural aspects of teaching and learning change. HESA publications and probably even HEI returns, have not really encompassed some major employment changes in their structural reporting. Thus, this 'strategic' dimension of change is one to pursue in this research, in interviews with Personnel and Staff Development heads as well as through a closer examination of the staffing who make up the 'T&L' teams themselves.

Professional bodies meanwhile are negotiating for greater security of employment for contract research staff (see NATFHE, 1997; CUCO, 1997) overwhelmingly, as we have noted, on fixed term contracts. We would predict that 'teaching and learning' employment will tend towards something more like this model, with a continuing decline in permanent, full-time institutionally-funded core posts. But whether we speak of 'casualisation' and 'structural marginalisation', or of 'flexibility, innovation and opportunity', there is certainly evidence of a new culture of people, departments and groupings in the making. Such 'interfacial' co-working, in supporting learners, and in developing and organising supporting technologies, materials and processes, also suggests important new areas for teaching and learning innovation research. These non-traditional posts and units are not yet encoded in much official reporting and yet are part of what most agree is a very significant change movement. Following Goodson (1992) and others' work on teachers, we need to begin to tell their stories, and this includes the structures, contexts

and conditions of working life for 'new professionals'. As Illes (1999) observes, the "pull" of subject disciplines, with their contrasting professional loyalties and affiliations (she likens them to ancient 'guilds'!), can be a divisive force in education, whereas the transformation of organisations around student-centred learning, suggests the need for new, perhaps more 'ecological', metaphors, which emphasise interdependence and community. Whether we wish to adopt or contest this imagery, it would be appropriate for such a dialogue to take place.

Note 1

'New Professionals'

- 'Professional' because they are discipline-based or specialist background
- 'New' because role applied to HE T&L in changed strategic context – perhaps from new funding opportunities

Some 'new professional' characteristics, include:

- Non-traditional job titles
- Contract and conditions of employment may vary from the norm
- Job crosses role boundaries
- Rarely 'teaching/lecturing' or formal responsibility for assessment
- Involved in innovation, development, where the focus is on learning (context, materials, delivery, assessment modes)

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Lucy Byrne and Andrew Mortimer, University of Glamorgan, for assistance with the questionnaire design and construction. Professor Brian Davies of the University of Cardiff and Professor Chris O'Hagan of the University of Derby made helpful suggestions about the questionnaire and Dr Stephen Gorard (Cardiff University) about the final draft article. The interchange of ideas and personal experiences by participants attending the ALT99 workshop is acknowledged with gratitude, as are the data returns from colleagues on the various e-mail lists, who assisted the research by completing a questionnaire. We are grateful to Ron Cobley and the University of Glamorgan for ongoing support of the research.

References

- Altbach, P, and Peterson, PM, eds (1999) Higher Education in the 21st Century: global challenge and national response, IIE Research report no. 29, April.
- Batten, L, and Skinner, M, (1997) The Lecturer's Job, A survey of Conditions of Service in New Universities and Colleges of Higher Education, commissioned and distributed by NATFHE, Crossbow Research, August 1997.
- Becher, T. (1984) The Cultural View, in Clark, B. (ed), Perspectives on Higher Education, University of California Press, Chapter 6, pp.165-198.
- Becher, T, and Barnett, R, (1999) The Reshaping of the Academic Curriculum in the United Kingdom, Chapter 3, pp.92-106 in Innovation and Adaptation in Higher Education: the Changing Conditions of Advanced Teaching and Learning in Europe, Gellert, G. (ed), Jessica Kingsley, London, HE Policy Series, no. 22.
- Campion, M, and Peters, O, (1996) Responses to Labour Market Theories and Distance Education: Post Fordism: not a poison either!, Open Learning, Vol. 11, No.1, February, p.41.
- Chitnis, A, and Williams, G, (1999) Casualisation and Quality: a study of the issues for quality in teaching and research raised by employment of part time and fixed term staff in UK Higher Education, Inst. of Education, University of London, published by Natfhe.
- Claydon, T, (1995) Human resource management and the labour market, in Human Resource Management: a contemporary perspective, Beardwell and Holden (eds), London, Pitman.
- Conway, M, (1998) Academics and Administrators: Competitive Collaborators? Journal of Institutional Research in Australia, Vol. 7, No.2, September, pp. 26-35.
- Crossthwaite, E, (1996) Working in HE: the staff experience, SRHE conference, Cardiff, Dec.
- CUCO (1997) Flexible Working in Universities and Higher Education Colleges, CUCO/SCOP/CVCP, CVCP, London, April.

EFILWC (1999) Ecology of Work conference (announcement), Communique, Newsletter of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, April, No. 3, p.1.

Gellert, C, (1999) The Changing Conditions of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, Introduction, pp9-30 in Innovation and Adaptation in Higher Education: the Changing Conditions of Advanced Teaching and Learning in Europe, Gellert, G. (ed), Jessica Kingsley, London, HE Policy Series, No. 22.

Goodson, I, (ed) (1992) Studying Teachers' Lives, Routledge, London.

Gomall, L, (1999) 'New professionals', change and occupational roles in higher education, Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, Vol. 3, No.2, pp. 44-49, Summer, Taylor and Francis, London.

Hart, A./Natfhe (1998) Casualisation: fixed term statistics, Branch Circular, November.

Henkel, M, and Little, B, (1999) Introduction, Chapter 1, pp.9-21 in Changing Relationships between Higher Education and the State, Henkel, M. and Little, B. (eds), Jessica Kingsley, London.

Henkel, M, and Kogan, M, (1999) Changes in Curriculum and Institutional Structures: Responses to Outside Influences in Higher Education Institutions, Chapter 2, pp.66-91 in Innovation and Adaptation in Higher Education: the Changing Conditions of Advanced Teaching and Learning in Europe, Gellert, G. (ed), Jessica Kingsley, London, HE Policy Series, No. 22.

HESA (1998) Resources of Higher Education Institutions 1997/98, Higher Education Statistics Agency, Cheltenham.

HESA (1996) Resources of Higher Education Institutions 1995/96, Higher Education Statistics Agency, Cheltenham.

Illes, L, (1999) Ecosystems and villages: using transformational metaphors to build community in higher education institutions, Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, Vol. 21, No.1, pp.57-69.

Kogan, M, (1999) Academic and Administrative Interface, in Changing Relationships between Higher Education and the State, Henkel, M, and Little, B, (eds), Jessica Kingsley, London, Chapter 14, pp.263-279.

McInnis, C, (1998) Academics and Professional Administrators in Australian Universities: dissolving boundaries and new tensions, Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, Vol. 20, No.2, pp161-173.

NAPF (1999) The Flexible Labour Market: implications for pensions provision, National Association for Pension Funds, London, 5 myths of jobs and careers, in The Guardian, 14 Aug.

Natfhe (1997) Commentary on the Concordat on the Career Management of Contract Research Staff in Universities and Colleges, May.

NCIHE (1997) Higher Education in the Learning Society, Dearing Report, London, HMSO.

Newby, H, (1999) Higher Education in the twenty-first century - some possible futures, Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, Vol. 3, No.5, Winter, pp.106-113.

Scott, P, (1995) The Meanings of Mass Higher Education, SHRE/OU, Buckingham.

Shattock, M, (1997) The managerial implications of the new priorities, Higher Education Management, Vol. 9, pp.27-34.

THES (1999) The Times Higher Educational Supplement Trends Section, iv-v, 24 September.

Teichler, U, (1999) Higher Education and Changing Job Requirements, a comparative view, in Changing Relationships between Higher Education and the State, Henkel, M, and Little, B, (eds), Jessica Kingsley, London, Chapter 4, pp.69-105.