Teaching-only Academics in a Research Intensive University: From an undesirable to a desirable academic identity

Submitted by Abel Zvamayida Nyamapfene to the University of Exeter

as a thesis for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Education

March 2018

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature: ……………………………………………….

Abstract

Teaching-only academics now constitute a significant proportion of the academic staff in UK higher education. This thesis is a three-part study in which I sought to contribute to a more indepth understanding of the teaching-only academic role. I did this through an investigation of the career trajectories, perceptions, work-related experiences and academic identity constructions of teaching-only academics working in a research-intensive institution in the UK. In the first part of the study I carried out a systematic review of the literature on teaching-only academics in the UK, Australia and Canada. In the second part of the study I investigated the virtual identity of teaching-only academics at the UK research-intensive institution. I did this by undertaking an analysis of how these teaching-only academics self-represented and projected themselves on their institutional webpages. In the third part of the study I carried out a life-history analysis of senior teaching-only academics in the engineering faculty of the case study institution. A principal finding from this thesis, which is collaborated across all the three parts of the study, is that the teaching-only academic role is a non-homogeneous role comprising individuals who come from different backgrounds, have followed different career trajectories into the role, and have different academic identities. Findings from this thesis also suggest that whilst teaching-only academics were introduced as an institutional response to the demands of the RAE/REF, the very act of creating the role has further exacerbated the separation between research and teaching, and between undergraduate and postgraduate teaching. Specifically, undergraduate teaching within the case study engineering department now tends to be the responsibility of teaching-only academics, with research-and-teaching academics increasingly focussing on research and postgraduate teaching. This separation has implications for research-led teaching, particularly in research-intensive institutions. The thesis also reveals that despite the pre-eminence of research, teaching remains important within the university, and individuals on the teaching-only academic role are able to accumulate substantial, and valued, teaching-related academic capital. This capital, in turn, is enabling them to secure and advance their positions within the same institution, and to pursue career advancement through seeking employment in other higher education institutions.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

This work would not have been possible without the support of so many colleagues and friends, including my supervisors, research participants, work colleagues and family. All of you have left an indelible mark on this work, and I'm so grateful to you all.

First and foremost, I am very grateful to my supervisors for your selfless guidance and support throughout the six years that I worked on this thesis. To Dr Nigel Skinner and Dr Lindsay Hetherington, thank you so much for your support, guidance and encouragement in the early stages of this work. And to Dr Deborah Osberg and Professor Rob Freathy, thank you so much for guiding me through the final stages of the thesis. Were it not for your attention to detail, and those critical, incisive questions that you raised at each stage of the writing process, I may never have undergone the essential transformation into passable social science doctoral material.

I would also like to express my gratitude to all the research participants who contributed to this study. You all gave up your valued time to share your experiences and personal lives with me, and I'm so much indebted to you.

To the Integrated Engineering Project team at UCL, Professor John Mitchell, Emanuela Tilley, and Dr Kate Roach, I'm so grateful for the academic, emotional and collegial support that you gave me throughout this journey.

To my family, Tarisayi, Shingai and Taona, thanks so much for being with me all the way. In particular, thanks so much for all the enthusiastic conversations we shared at the dinner table as we all tried to get our heads round Bourdieu's theories and how they might apply to this study and to our own personal and professional lives. This thesis is as much about you as it is about me.

Finally, I give thanks to the Lord God Almighty for granting me the grace and favour to embark and complete this thesis.

List of Tables

List of Figures

List of Figures

List of Abbreviations

AUT	Association of University Teachers
BIS	Department for Business Innovation & Skills
DfE/DfES	Department for Education / Department for Education and Skills
HEA	Higher Education Academy
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HESA	Higher Education Statistics Agency
PGCE	Postgraduate Certificate in Education
RAE	Research assessment exercise
REF	Research excellence framework
REF2021	The research excellence framework scheduled for the year 2021
SoTL	Scholarship of teaching and learning
TEF	Teaching Excellence Framework
The UK	The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Chapter One – Introduction

The purpose of this thesis was to investigate the perceptions, work-related experiences and academic identity constructions of teaching-only academics working in a research-intensive institution in the UK and to chart the evolution of the teaching-only academic role in that particular institution. At the time of the research, to my knowledge, no comprehensive work had yet been undertaken to study and document teaching-only academic perceptions and work experiences in the UK. Similar work to the one reported in this thesis has focussed on research-and-teaching academics, but not on teaching-only academics. Examples of such work include studies on academic transformation by Henkel (2005, 2007) and Bryson (2004), as well as studies on academic identities within universities by Sikes (2006), Archer (2008), Clegg (2008), Fitzmaurice (2011), and Skelton(2011; 2012a; 2012b).

In the study that I report in this thesis, I extended the work undertaken in these studies to focus on the social backgrounds and career trajectories of teaching-only academics, and how these interact with the institutional environment to shape their professional identity, perceptions and attitudes towards their careers. In addition, I also explored the cultural and structural constraints within institutions that shape the teaching-only academic role.

In this introductory chapter I provide justification for why I undertook this research on teaching-only academics within a research-intensive institution. To put a context around the study, I start off by charting the recent growth and current extent of the teaching-only academic phenomenon within UK higher education. I then give an overview of the current UK higher education environment, in the process highlighting the necessity for studying the teaching-only academic role at this point in time. Following this, I state my research questions for this study, after which I conclude the chapter with an outline of the thesis.

1.1 The rise of the teaching-only academic

The teaching-only academic category is a comparatively recent phenomenon in UK higher education. Its emergence highlights the increasing diversification and specialisation taking place within the academic role. Traditionally, it has generally been taken as given that the academic role is a composite role comprising teaching,

research and service (Blaxter et al. 1998). However, in recent years the academic role has become increasingly fragmented to the extent that those expected both to teach and research are now tending towards being the minority (Locke 2012; Macfarlane 2011).

Several factors have been cited for the disaggregation, or, as Macfarlane (2011) terms it, the unbundling of the academic role. One of these factors is the increased emphasis on accountability and attainment of performance targets for institutions, academic departments and individuals alike, which, in turn, is leading to a diversification of both the research-and-teaching function (Locke 2012). Another factor is the move from an elite to a mass higher education system, as seen by the tenfold increase in UK student numbers over the past four decades (Bryson 2004).

As a result of these changes, teaching-only academics now constitute a significant proportion of the academic staff in UK higher education institutions. To put this into perspective, the Association of University Teachers (AUT) reports that out of the 148,275 people holding academic positions in the academic year 2003-4, 20% were employed on a teaching-only basis (AUT 2005). By 2009-10, the percentage of teaching-only academics had risen to 25.5% of the UK academic workforce (HESA 2011a), with this proportion falling slightly to 25.2% in 2012-13 (HESA 2014). As of the academic year 2015-16, the proportion of teaching-only academic staff was 26.1% of all academic staff (HESA 2018).

This growth in the numbers of teaching-only academics appears to be part of an international trend within the developed countries. For instance, Probert (2013:2) reports that Australia is witnessing "a consistent upward trend in the number of academic staff being reported to the Australian Government Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education (DIISRTE) as 'teaching-only'", with their number reaching a total of 3 489 in 2012 from a total of 1 787 in the year 2009. These numbers exclude the much larger numbers of teaching-only academics employed on a temporary or sessional basis. Even in Canada where teaching-only academics are also predominantly employed on temporary or sessional contracts, there is also a clear trend towards an increasing proportion of teaching-only academics amongst those academics employed on a full-time basis (Vajoczki et al. 2011).

1.2   Defining teaching-only academics

The UK Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) defines teaching-only staff as those "whose contracts of employment state that they are employed only to undertake teaching" (HESA 2011a). This definition differentiates these academics from teaching and research academics, whom HESA defines as academic staff whose "contracts of employment state that they are employed to undertake both teaching and research."

For the Canadian situation, Vajoczki et al. (2011:3) define teaching stream academics as "those individuals holding a full-time faculty appointment as designated in collective agreements, agreement memoranda and/or policy manuals as teaching-only, teaching-stream, teaching-track, etc. and for whom responsibilities are limited to teaching, teaching-related activities, teaching-related research and service." Unlike the HESA definition, this only includes academics who are employed full-time on a permanent or fixed term basis.

In Australia the term "teaching-only" is strictly used to refer to those academic staff who are reported as such by their institutions to the Australian Government Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education (DIISRTE) to distinguish them from those who are actively engaged in discipline-based research in addition to teaching (Probert 2013). In recent years, however, Australian universities have further sub-divided the role into three categories, namely education-focused, teaching-only, and teaching-intensive (Flecknoe et al. 2017). The education-focused category is used to denote those academics whose roles require them to demonstrate leadership through teaching excellence, pedagogical innovation, and scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). The education-focused category has specifically been developed to elevate the status of education within universities, and is in contrast to the teaching-only and teaching-intensive roles which are characterised by heavy teaching workloads which leave little room for scholarly research, and which are characterised by poor career progression prospects (Probert 2013).

For the purposes of this dissertation, I have used the term "teaching-only academic" as an all-encompassing label to denote all those on academic contracts, whether part-time or full-time, which require them to engage in teaching and teaching-related

activities, including teaching-related research and service, and which do not oblige them to undertake discipline-based research.

1.3　Overview of higher education in the UK

One approach to categorising UK universities is to categorise them by their inception date. According to this categorisation, UK universities can be classified as pre-1992, post-1992, and post-2004 (Locke and Bennion 2009). Pre-1992 universities include the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge as well as the universities that were established at the end of the nineteenth century and in the 1960's. Post-1992 universities are the former polytechnics that gained university status in 1992, whilst the post-2004 institutions are the specialist institutions and colleges of higher education that gained university status in 2004. Pre-1992 universities are sometimes referred to as the "old universities" whilst post-1992 and post 2004 universities are collectively referred to as the "new universities".

The introduction of new universities is a response to the pressure on universities to become mass-education systems. According to Dearlove (2002) the percentage of 18 year olds entering university rose from less than 8% in 1960 to 30% in 1995. This percentage is growing, to the extent that as of the academic year 2015-16, the proportion of young people in England aged 19 and below who entered higher education for the first time had increased to 43% (DfE, 2017). This has increased pressure on university funding as government funding for universities has not kept pace with the rate of increase of student numbers (Brown and Carasso 2013).

To ensure that standards do not fall, the quality of teaching is periodically assessed by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), and since 2017, through the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) as well (BIS 2016). Similarly, the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), and its successor, the Research Excellence Framework (REF), is used to evaluate research quality in university departments and to allocate research funds accordingly (HEFCE 2012). These measures have ensured the shift of university administration from a primarily collegial system to one that is more managerially oriented (Dearlove 2002; Henkel 1997; Kok et al. 2010). According to Deem and Brehony (2005) the managerial approach being adopted by universities is characterised by an emphasis of management above all activities, and includes employee performance monitoring, including self-monitoring, attainment of financial

and other performance targets, public auditing of quality, and the imposition of external accountability through such mechanisms as league tables, target-setting, benchmarking and performance management. Deem and Brehony have termed this form of university administration "new managerialism".

Through the adoption of new managerialism by universities, academic activity is now subject to performativity, whereby the productivity of an individual or an organisation is assessed against defined measures and targets (Ball 2008). According to Breen (2007), performativity reduces an individual's personal and professional worth to an identification of the actions and activities that an individual can do as well as the degree of competence with which the individual is able to carry out the identified tasks and activities. However, other authors, for example Kolsaker (2008) and Kok et al. (2010) feel that the views presented by Breen are overly pessimistic and that academics in general have adapted to, and have come to accept, increased managerialism as the new reality in higher education. Nevertheless, in my opinion, how individual academics, particularly teaching-only academics, have come to adapt to performativity and managerialism in higher education is still subject to further research.

UK universities are also categorised as research-intensive or teaching-intensive. Drawing from the Carnegie Foundation (2001) definitions of doctoral/research-extensive and doctoral/research-intensive universities, Taylor (2006) characterises a research-intensive university as one that is involved in pure and applied research, delivers research-led teaching, has a breadth of academic disciplines, has a high proportion of postgraduate research programmes, has a high level of external income and has an international perspective. In general, the old universities have greater involvement in research activity compared to the post-1992 universities, and the majority of them meet Taylor's characterisation of a research-intensive university. Amongst the pre-1992 universities is the Russell Group of universities. This is a self-selecting group of universities that seek to distinguish themselves from the rest of the other universities through excellence in research as characterised by Taylor.

1.4   The research-teaching nexus in UK universities

It is widely acknowledged that teaching remains a poor cousin of research in higher education. The UK government acknowledged as much in a white paper on the future of higher education (DfES 2003:19):

> Teaching has for too long been the poor relation in higher education. Promotion for academics is based largely on research excellence, rather than teaching ability. There is no respected and defined separate professional career track for higher education teaching in its own right.

As the operations of the universities increasingly come under public scrutiny, attention to teaching is increasing. For instance, in 2003 the UK government, in its review of the future of higher education in the country, noted that

> effective teaching and learning is essential if we are to promote excellence and opportunity in higher education. High quality teaching must be recognised and rewarded, and best practice shared (DfES 2003:7).

As part of this increased scrutiny of university teaching, in 2011 the government mandated that publicly-funded higher education institutions in the UK should publish annual data on their performance in widening participation, student retention, learning and teaching outcomes, research output and employment of graduates (HESA 2011b). This, together with the emergence of league tables that rank programmes taught in different institutions, has had the effect of taking out the evaluation and control of academic programmes from academics and placing it into the public domain.

These government attempts to improve the quality of university teaching have recently culminated in the introduction of the TEF. This is a performativity measure for learning and teaching aimed at providing "clear information to students about where the best provision can be found and to drive up the standard of teaching in all universities" (BIS 2016).

However, concomitant with moves to improve the quality and status of teaching in UK universities, there have also been moves to assess and monitor the quality of university research by means of an academic peer research quality assessment exercise, the RAE (HEFCE 2012). The primary purpose of the RAE was to determine the distribution of research funding amongst higher education institutions. Given the reduction in per capita funding to universities, this made it very important from the perspective of participating institutions.

The first RAE was undertaken in 1986, and further exercises held in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2001 and 2008. The RAE has now been superseded by the REF, the first of which was completed in 2014, but the objective remains the same: to evaluate the quality of research in UK higher education institutions for the primary purpose of facilitating the selective distribution of funds for research by UK higher education funding bodies.

However, the selective nature of this distribution has resulted in research funding being concentrated in particular institutions and disciplines (Locke and Bennion 2011). A direct consequence of this selectivity has been the introduction of a new dichotomy in higher education, namely the classification of individual academics, academic departments, and even universities as "research-active" or "research-inactive" primarily on the basis of their ability to attract research income, and particularly on their evaluation through the RAE/REF (Locke and Bennion 2011). This is in contrast to the period between the end of the Second World War, in 1945, and the introduction of the RAE/REF, in 1986, during which "all academics were contractually obliged to engage in some sort of research and scholarly activity, … and all universities had a more or less equal right to funding council research monies on the grounds of the historic unity of teaching and research" (Harley 2000:550).

To maximise their chances of getting high RAE/REF ratings, institutions are selectively entering the research outputs of their academics for assessment. A market for "research–active" academics, i.e. those academics whose research is deemed to be of high quality for the purposes of inclusion in the RAE/REF, has therefore ensued (Harley 2002).

The RAE/REF has therefore had the unintended consequence of widening the schism between research and teaching, with the result that across all institutions, research is now much more highly esteemed than teaching. For instance, following an analysis of the impact of the 1992 RAE exercise on 14 Geography departments in both old and new universities in England and Wales, Jenkins (1995) concluded that the main impact of the RAE had been to encourage both departments and individual academics to prioritise research activities over teaching activities. A similar survey carried out by the British Educational Research Association and the Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers to assess the impact of the 2008 RAE exercise on Education departments across all the four countries constituting the UK - England, Wales

Scotland and Northern Ireland – also revealed that the RAE had a negative impact on non-research academic activities, in particular teaching (Oancea et al. 2010). This is despite the effort of the UK government, through the Higher Education Academy (HEA), to improve the status of teaching in all higher education institutions.

Largely because of the impact of the RAE, a significant number of academics in both old and new universities no longer perceive the academic profession as a homogeneous community of scholars. Rather, they increasingly see the profession as comprising an elite sub-group of research active academic high flyers, with the other sub-group comprising non-research active "teaching drones" (Harley 2002). At the individual level, the primacy of research over teaching plays out in the relative rewards to be obtained by engaging in either activity. For instance, the UK government has observed (DfES 2003:51):

> In the past, rewards in higher education – particularly promotion – have
> been linked much more closely to research than to teaching. Indeed,
> teaching has been seen by some as an extra source of income to
> support the main business of research, rather than recognised as a
> valuable and high-status career in its own right. This is a situation that
> cannot continue. Institutions must properly reward their best teaching
> staff; and all those who teach must take their task seriously.

The disparity between these roles is increasingly being formalised, with academics now being recruited directly to either research-and-teaching roles, or to teaching-only roles (AUT, 2005). According to Brennan et al. (2007), this is largely due to the prevailing "national policy of concentrating research spending on 'centres of excellence' which has seen the growth in numbers of teaching-only academics in some institutions." However, despite the rise in teaching-only contracts, there is still ambivalence towards the teaching-only academic role within research-intensive institutions.

Krause (2014) explored whether or not academic staff at three Australian public universities perceived themselves as part of a teaching community within their discipline. Her findings suggest that whilst interviewees saw themselves as members of disciplinary research communities, notions of discipline-based teaching communities were weak or non-existent in the three universities from which the

interviewees were drawn. Rather, interviewees tended to see teaching as "just a task that we perform", and academics within the same department often held disparate views regarding teaching and this led to the formation of "factions and boundaries" within departments that prevented disciplinary teaching communities from taking root. In addition, earlier research by Menon (2003) suggests that teaching-focused and research-focused academics held divergent views on the aim and mission of higher education in society, with research-focused academics more likely to have less faith in the value and usefulness of higher education for individual students, as well as being also less likely to emphasise the role of higher education in the professional preparation of students in comparison with their teaching counterparts.

1.5 Being a teaching-only academic in a research culture

The university started out in the 12th and 13th century as a teaching institution for the training of the elite, a task that had been the preserve of religious institutions, and teaching was to remain the primary activity for academics up to the 19th century institutions (Perkins 1972). Any research undertaken by academics during this period was primarily aimed at informing their own teaching. This continued until the 19th century when research became an institutional enterprise that universities had to undertake. In time, research became an important vehicle for securing access to funding and for both institutional and individual recognition.

With the advent of the Second World War, the research function of the university greatly increased, and the aftermath of the war has been characterised by continued growth of both research and teaching (Tight 2010b). Specifically, since the end of the Second World War, university teaching has transformed from being a preserve of the elite to being a mass education system, whilst research has become an important funding stream for universities. The growth of both functions has led to increased academic workloads. However, a meta-analysis of post-war surveys on academic workload and academic preferences suggests that despite this increased workload, academics still subscribe to the view that individual academics should be involved in both research and teaching (Tight 2010a). A survey of twelve heads of department at a pre-1992 university in the north of England by Rowland (1996) also came up with similar findings.

The expectation by academics to teach and to conduct research in the field of their expertise has been so widely ingrained in UK higher education to the extent that teaching-only academics were once widely deemed unworthy of the name 'academic' (Oxford 2008). Consequently, the advent of the teaching-only academic has been met with some criticism within higher education, and this criticism has been from both institutions and academics.

From an institutional perspective, research status has been, and remains, a key selling point, especially in the fiercely competitive international student market (Probert 2013). This is because international university rankings, which play a significant factor in attracting students, are overwhelmingly influenced by institutional research strength. This factor has led to a situation where no university is willing to say that its focus is primarily on undergraduate education (Probert 2013). Here in the UK, Oxford (2008) quotes an academic from one of the country's top research-intensive institutions, Nottingham University, as stating that their vice-chancellor wants to ensure that the proportion of academics on teaching-only contracts should be no more than 7.5 per cent, with the reason for doing so being to ensure that the university remains research-driven.

Even non-research-intensive universities have been fighting to improve their research credentials. For instance, the Australian universities created out of the then existing Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) and Institutes of Technology between 1986 and 1994 "have spent the last 20 years transforming their academic staff profiles from 'teaching-only' to 'teaching and research'" (Probert 2013:7). Similarly, within the UK, Sikes (2006) discusses the institutional pressures now being placed on individual academics at a post-1992 institution to engage in research, even though they had been originally recruited with the expectation to focus primarily on teaching.

It is interesting that, despite the increased pressures associated with this requirement, the general opinion amongst the affected staff investigated by Sikes was that it was appropriate for the institution to demand that staff engage in both research and teaching. They felt that it was the right thing to do as "research was integral to and essential for quality higher education" and remaining a teaching-only institution was seen "as turning the clock back to pre-1992" (Sikes 2006:565). In fact, this chimes in with fears across the higher education sector that the advent of teaching-only

22

academics may actually impact the very nature of higher education. For instance, Malcolm Keight, the then head of higher education at the University and College Union in 2008, views the prospect of increased numbers of teaching-only academics with alarm, suggesting that this "would bring into question the nature of higher education" (Oxford 2008), and that higher education would be unsustainable "without the essential link between teaching and research" (Oxford 2008). This is consistent with the assertions made by the academics' own union, the AUT:

> The fact that one in five UK academics is now employed on a teaching-only contract is a matter of concern to the Association of University Teachers because of the likelihood that this will undermine the link between research and teaching in UK higher education (AUT 2005:2).

Similarly, for the case of Australia, Probert reports that "there is a strong rhetorical resistance to the concept of 'teaching-only' roles, with an explicit insistence on the scholarly nature of university teaching and the importance of research" (Probert 2013:2). With respect to Ontario, Canada, Vajoczki et al. (2011) note that the introduction of the teaching-only academic category may lead to a two-tier academic system, with teaching-only academics being less valued than research-and-teaching staff. They also report a prevailing perception amongst academics that the introduction of teaching-only academics is "a 'dangerous precedent' that 'devalues the traditional professorial role'" (Vajoczki et al. 2011:6).

1.6   Academic identity

A key part of this study has been to investigate the changing dynamics of the relationship between teaching-only academics and the research-intensive university. It is through understanding these dynamics that a coherent picture of the emerging teaching-only academic profession can be understood. This will be investigated through the context of academic identity. The concept of identity may be viewed as a self-definition that is performed through social acts such as narrative (Mishler 1999).

Clandinin (2006a:9) defines teacher identity as

> a unique embodiment of each teacher's stories to live by, stories shaped by knowledge composed on landscapes past and present in which a teacher lives and works.

In this study I assume a constructivist approach to identity, namely that identity is not static, but is formed and constantly adapted

> through experiences of, and identification with, certain events, rituals, social institutions and symbols of culture(s) in which an individual was raised and lives (Lillie 1998).

In short, identity is not a given or static; it is an evolving construction within each of us.

There has been some recent work carried out to explore the lived experiences of academics undertaken through studies of academic identity. This includes Archer (2008), Clegg (2008), Fitzmaurice (2011) and Skelton (2012a). A consistent theme in all these studies is that the concept of identity is neither static nor singular. Rather, identity is a fluid, constantly shifting and multiply-composed concept (Clandinin 2006a). In this study I attempted to understand how teaching-only academics make sense of their academic identities and how they reconstruct these identities on a day by day basis and how they negotiate between various identities so as to adapt and position themselves within a research-intensive environment that, by all accounts, is hostile to the teaching-only identity.

1.6.1 Academic identity and differential status within institutions

A review by Young (2006) of the literature on the differential status of teaching and research in the UK revealed that the general perception amongst academics is that one is more likely to be promoted on the basis of research excellence. Young observed that this remains the case even in most of the institutions that have put in place promotion criteria for teaching-only academics.

Similarly, a study by Skelton (2011; 2012a; 2012b) on the impact of quality assurance and enhancement initiatives on teacher identities in a UK research-led institution suggested that in research-led cultures, teaching had a low status. In fact, so low was the perceived esteem of a teaching identity that none of the study participants, despite their acknowledged desire to excel in teaching, wanted to be associated with it. As one of Skelton's study participants who was under pressure to move down a teaching-focussed route put it (Skelton 2012b:35):

> … but that was a terrible moment when she said we want you to be deputy head of learning and teaching, that was the nearest I've ever

come to saying 'no'. It's not that I don't want to do it – it's just the wrong identity … I don't want to be a low-status person in a research department.

In the same study (Skelton 2012b:31), another participant observed that academic staff on teaching-only contracts were 'very much second class citizens in a research culture' engaged to do 'service teaching'. She used the metaphor of women before emancipation to describe the experiences of teaching-only academics in the institution:

> … they were extremely useful and very valued, but had no status …
> They did a good little job, got a pat on the head … 'well done, keep
> doing it … couldn't live without you, but you don't deserve the vote' …
> I feel that's the way we're treated.

In addition to this, another participant from the same study (Skelton 2012a:806) also made the observation that:

> Teaching is still seen as inferior ... people get promoted if they get
> research articles and grants but if you bring in lots of students and set
> up great courses you don't get anything.

On the basis of these studies, therefore, it can be surmised that research remains, at least for the present, more highly esteemed than teaching within universities, and one consequence of this is the low status ascribed to teaching and those employed within higher education for the sole or primary purpose of undertaking teaching.

1.6.2 Formation of academic identity within institutions

Archer (2008) investigated the nature and formation of contemporary academic identities by exploring the perceptions of early career academics. A key finding was that the field of higher education, like any other professional field, is in a state of perpetual change and this places significant challenges on people working within the field, especially those entering the academic profession for the first time. In particular, young academics are prone to suffer from insecurities arising out of the requirement to meet institutional targets, both in their research and teaching.

Fitzmaurice (2011) has also recently explored how early career academics adapt to the academic environment and construct their own professional identities. This study revealed that the formation of an academic identity is influenced by both the institution and the discipline within which the academic is working. Peer pressure from fellow early career academics in similar positions in other institutions and countries also played an important part in motivating this group to partake in research. As one of the participants said:

> It is a kind of self-competition that I want to keep myself on par with my international colleagues in other European countries, USA and my friends who are in a similar position, that at the end of the year it is a matter of competition to see how many journals are coming out and conferences are coming out and all these things (Fitzmaurice 2011:617-618).

It can therefore be surmised that participating in research activities was an important part of their identity as academics within their own subject disciplines.

Fitzmaurice (2011) observed that all of the early career academics wanted to teach, research and publish, and all these three activities were central to their identity as academics. This was in spite of the heavy teaching load they carried which severely limited the time to engage in research, in some instances to the point of effectively precluding research from their day-to-day professional activities.

Clegg (2008) carried out an investigation of the lived experience of practising academics as part of a study on academic identities. The study revealed that academic identities are in a state of constant flux, being actively shaped and re-shaped in response to the changes taking place in higher education and its external environment. However, the study also noted that academics do not formulate their identities as a passive response to the performative pressures placed on them by higher education institutions. Rather, academics exhibit notions of human agency in the formulation of identities, with the result that the emerging identities are as much a result of institutional influences as they are a result of personal agency.

1.6.3 Using academic identity to explore the teaching-only academic role

The development of academic identity, as described by Clegg (2008) and Fitzmaurice (2011), suggests that it is an ongoing sociocultural process in which both personal agency and social structure play an important part. This view is consistent with the definition for teacher identity proposed by Olsen following a study of the growth and development of beginning teachers (Olsen 2015:139):

> I view identity as a label, really, for the collection of influences and effects from immediate contexts, prior constructs of self, social positioning, and meaning systems (each itself a fluid influence and all together an ever-changing construct) that become intertwined inside the flow of activity as a teacher simultaneously reacts to and negotiates given contexts and human relationships at given moments.

Increasingly, therefore, a number of researchers have adopted a sociocultural lens in exploring identity, amongst them Olsen (2015), Sfard and Prusak (2005) and Lasky (2005). In this study, I investigated teaching-only academics and their role within a research-intensive university, and for this I opted for a socio-cultural approach inspired by Bourdieu. A socio-cultural approach would help me to explore the structural factors impinging on the teaching-only academics and their careers. This also includes shedding light on their lived experiences, as well as the resultant agential actions that individuals in such academic roles take. Specifically, I sought to gain an understanding of the teaching-only academic role by exploring how teaching-only academics make sense of their academic identities and how they reconstruct these identities and adapt themselves to teaching in a research-intensive environment.

Most academic roles are situated within academic disciplines. Consequently, the institutional influence on academic identity is likely to be influenced by the culture, values and norms within individual academic disciplines. For most disciplines, however, research has pre-eminence over teaching, and according to Henkel (2005), research is an important component of academic identity, and the RAE/REF by UK research funding bodies has reinforced this. A key aspect of my investigation, therefore, was to explore the links between research and academic identity for teaching-only academics. I did this through an analysis of teaching-only academics' web page profiles at a selected research-intensive university in the UK. I also

investigated this through the life-history interviews that I carried out as part of this study.

According to Bourdieu (1985), the social world can be viewed as a multidimensional space constructed on the basis of the principles of differentiation in accordance with the properties that actively confer power and strength to the individuals occupying the space. Since the properties making up a social space are active properties, the space can also be viewed as a field of forces comprising "a set of objective power relations which impose themselves on all who enter the field and which are irreducible to the intentions of the individual agents or even to the direct interactions among the agents" (Bourdieu 1985:148). Consequently, according to Bourdieu, to understand the interactions between people, or to explain an event or social phenomenon, it is necessary to examine the social space in which interactions, transactions and events occur.

With reference to the university, Bourdieu views it as a field of struggle and conflict within which individuals with different dispositions and capital are in a perpetual competition for power and influence, and which, in turn, is shaped and influenced by the power relations between the competing individuals (Bourdieu and Collier 1988:128)

> The structure of the university field is only, at any moment in time, the
> state of the power relations between the agents or, more precisely,
> between the powers they wield in their own right and above all through
> the institutions to which they belong; positions held in this structure are
> what motivate strategies aiming to transform it, or to preserve it by
> modifying or maintaining the relative forces of the different powers, that
> is, in other words, the systems of equivalence established between the
> different kinds of capital.

The agents within a research-intensive university include research-and-teaching academics, research staff, professional services staff as well as heads of departments, faculty deans, the vice chancellor and all the other staff who make up the university management. In this thesis, a social lens informed by Bourdieu's ideas will bring into focus the nature and extent of the power wielded by the various employee categories,

as well as the strategies each of these categories deploys to maintain or to advance their individual positions within the university social space.

Specifically, Bourdieu's theoretical framework will bring to the fore the skills and attributes that enable teaching-only academics to gain a foothold within the university system, as well as the strategies that they deploy to take advantage of the internal and external pressures on the university to better their position. Examples of internal forces include the demands by university students for improved teaching quality, as informed through feedback mechanisms such as the National Student Survey (Ipsos Mori and Office for Students), for instance. On the other hand, external forces include business expectations of graduate attributes, professional education regulatory bodies as well as government policies and demands relating to education quality such as the Teaching Excellence Framework (BIS 2016).

1.7   Research design

Given that the teaching-only academic role is relatively recent, research focussing on the role is still emerging. Hence, my first step in this study was to establish what is currently known about the teaching-only academic role. To this end I carried out a systematic literature review with the objective of identifying and collating the available evidence pertaining to the emergence, current circumstances and status of teaching-only academics in the UK. Given the paucity of studies in this area, I also took into account relevant literature from Canada and Australia.

 My research question for the systematic literature review was:

1. What is currently known about teaching-only academics in the UK, Canada and Australia?

To gain an indepth understanding of the teaching-only academic role in a research-intensive environment, I augmented the systematic literature review with a case study that focussed on a selected research-intensive university in the UK. My decision to undertake a case study was inspired by the suggestion by Flyvbjerg (2006) that the case study approach makes it possible for a   researcher to gain insights into the deeper causes behind a given problem and its consequences in a particular situation.

 I chose the following research questions to guide the case study:

1. What are the career trajectories of individuals who become teaching-only academics in the engineering faculty of a selected research-intensive institution?

2. What factors contribute to or hinder the development of the teaching-only academic role in the engineering faculty of a selected research-intensive institution?

3. How do teaching-only academics at a selected research-intensive institution conceive, evolve and project their professional identities?

1.8   Organisation of this thesis

This thesis is made up of eight chapters. In Chapter One, which is this introductory chapter, I give an overview of the teaching-only academic phenomenon, placing it within the current context of higher education, after which I develop and pose the research questions that underpin the study. This is followed by Chapter Two, in which I describe the systematic literature review that I undertook to identify and establish current knowledge on the teaching-only academic role in the UK, Australia and Canada.

In Chapter Three, I discuss and justify my choice of the Bourdieu's social theory as my theoretical framework for this study. This is followed by Chapter Four, in which I describe and justify my decision to use a case study approach to study the teaching-only academic phenomenon at a selected research-intensive university. I also describe in detail the methods that I used for data collection and analysis, as well as the ethical issues underpinning the study.

In Chapter Five I look at how teaching-only academics at the case institution use institutional academic web pages to manage and project their professional identities.

In Chapter Six I categorise the life-histories of the seven senior teaching-only academics who participated in this research into five distinct profiles, and I present these profiles with a view to illustrating how the lives of individual teaching-only academics intersect with the historical and social contexts of their lives to mould their career trajectories. These seven participants were all employed as principal teaching fellows, which was the institution's highest possible teaching-only academic grade at the time of the study.

In Chapter Seven I use the life histories of the seven research participants to chart the evolution of the teaching-only academic role at the institution from its inception in 2006 to date, and to draw out the multiple academic identities associated with the role. Finally, in Chapter Eight I sum up the study's research findings, discuss the study's implications, and provide recommendations for further study.

Chapter 2: Systematic literature review of the teaching-only academic role

To date, the research on teaching-only academics in the UK, and elsewhere, is still limited. This is due mainly to the role's relative recency. Apart from leaving a gap in the wider research on higher education, this limited research on teaching-only academics hinders the development of appropriate academic staffing policies as well as policies for improving learning and teaching. In this chapter I report on the systematic literature review that I undertook to address this shortcoming by identifying and collating the available evidence pertaining to the emergence, current circumstances and status of teaching-only academics in the UK. Given the paucity of studies in this area, I also took into account relevant literature from Canada and Australia, two countries that share the same language as the UK, and in which substantial work on the same topic has also been carried out.

2.1 Methodology of the literature review

A systematic literature review is a methodological process for "identifying, evaluating and interpreting all available research relevant to a particular research question, or topic area, or phenomenon of interest" (Kitchenham and Charters 2007:vi). The main rationale behind the use of a systematic review is to ensure that it is accountable, replicable and updateable, and this is made possible through using explicit and transparent methods in conducting the literature review (Oakley 2002). Systematic literature reviews are widely used as an aid to evidence-based decision making. For example, systematic reviews are now widely used in health services research to evaluate the effectiveness of healthcare interventions (Petticrew 2001). The success of systematic literature reviews in evidence-based medical interventions has led to calls for their adoption in the educational research process (Oakley 2002).

The key features of systematic reviews are an explicit research question, transparent and exhaustive search methods to identify published and unpublished studies, clear criteria for assessing the quality of studies, clear criteria for including or excluding studies from the review and a clear statement of the findings of the review (Evans and Benefield 2001; Kitchenham and Charters 2007). In contrast, traditional literature reviews tend to lack transparency with regard to key review criteria such as search strategies and inclusion and exclusion criteria. This, according to Oakley (2002:280),

reduces traditional literature reviews to no more than " discursive rampages through selected bits of literature the researcher happens to know about or can easily reach on his or her bookshelves at the time". Nevertheless, Hammersley (2002) questions the distinction between traditional literature reviews and systematic reviews. He suggests that "if by 'systematic' we mean no more than 'properly carried out, taking account of all the relevant evidence, and making reliable judgements about its validity and implications'", then producing a systematic review is simply to do a literature review well (Hammersley 2002:1). It is this working definition of conducting a systematic literature review that I have adopted in my study.

For this systematic literature review, I followed the nine-phase process suggested by Gough (2007), and summarised by Bearman et al. (2012:627):

(1) Establishing the review question;

(2) Defining inclusion and exclusion criteria;

(3) Articulating the search strategy, including information sources;

(4) Screening the articles based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria;

(5) Reporting the search results;

(6) Extracting relevant data from included studies;

(7) Evaluating the quality and rigour of the included studies;

(8) Synthesising the evidence from the review;

(9) Communicating the review findings and synthesis.

2.1.1 Review question

An appropriate high-level review question that will help to shed light on teaching-only academics within the UK, as well as within Canada and Australia is: What is currently known about teaching-only academics in the UK, Canada and Australia? I divided this review question into these sub-questions:

(1) What are the routes into the teaching-only academic role?

(2) Who enters into a teaching-only academic role?

(3) What is the impact of institutional and external factors on the teaching-only academic role?

(4) What is the nature of the teaching-only academic role?

(5) What can be done to support the teaching-only academic role?

2.1.2 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

To be included in the systematic literature review, an article had to focus primarily on teaching-only academics within the UK, Australia or Canada. Alternately, an article could also be included if it focussed on general academic issues like the academic professions and academic careers.

2.1.3 Search strategy

Prior to carrying out this systematic literature review I had completed a small-scale study of teaching-only academics at a research-intensive university in the UK (Nyamapfene 2014), and I therefore used the knowledge I had gained from this work as a starting point. I searched the following online databases: Australian Education Index, British Education Index and Education Research Complete. Searches were initially conducted, without any date limit, in September 2014, and then repeated in April 2015. I did not set a date limit as I also intended to discover the earliest occurrence of terminology relating to teaching-only academics. The following keywords and search phrases were used:

- "teaching fellow"
- "teaching-only"
- "teaching-focused" OR "teaching-focussed"
- "academic profession"
- "academic profession" AND "transition"
- "academic career"
- "teaching identity"

I also used Google Scholar and Google to search the 'grey' literature for newspaper, institutional and government reports. This included publications from the HEA, the AUT, HESA, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), the Royal Academy of Engineering and the LH Martin Institute.

2.1.4 Screening of articles

Following Thomas and Harden (2008) I did not prioritise the research design of the studies but placed greater emphasis on their relevance. I categorised references as "relevant" or "not relevant" according to the eligibility criteria outlined above. I followed a two-stage process to determine the relevance of an article. First, I considered the

titles of all the references in the search results, and placed those articles with titles that I deemed to be relevant to the study onto a "selected reference list". After this, I assessed the abstract of each reference in the "selected reference list", and removed all those references whose abstracts I deemed to be irrelevant to the study.

I used the EndNote X7 reference manager to store all the references deemed to be relevant following the title and abstract screening process, with the results of each search being stored separately. On completion of the searches, I merged all the references into a unique database, and automatically identified and removed all duplicates.

I downloaded the full text of all the references included after the title and abstract screening and incorporated them as pdf files into the bibliographic database. I then skimmed through all the articles to remove any article that I deemed to be irrelevant, in accordance with the inclusion/exclusion criteria above.

2.1.5 Data extraction

Following Valderas et al. (2012) I designed a data extraction form which captured the following information from each of the remaining reference texts:

- Reference citation
- Reference title
- Area of study
- Research question and/or objectives and aims
- Theoretical framework
- Study data characteristics
- Research methods
- Research findings

The information from the data extraction forms was then consolidated onto an EXCEL spreadsheet.

To ensure that the coverage of the systematic review was sufficiently comprehensive, I complemented the search, screening and data extraction procedure with a review of all backward and forward citations of all the selected publications (i.e., references which are cited by and that cite the "relevant articles" identified during the search process). All these new references were stored in a second bibliographic database,

and were also screened for relevance in accordance with the screening and data extraction procedure outlined above.

2.2   Results

Before starting the database search, I was already aware of 25 articles to include. Of these, 17 were peer reviewed journal and conference articles, and 8 were grey literature publications.

Table 2.1 details the number of references obtained during the search phase. The references have been categorised by database. The items listed in the "Relevant Items" column are the items that remained after screening the titles and abstracts of returned items. The "Time Period" column records the earliest and latest publication dates of items in which the keyword search phrase is found. Several articles appeared in more than one of the three databases. The article numbers in the "Items Returned" and the "Relevant Items" include duplicated items. Duplications were removed at the database integration stage prior to full text screening.

Table 2.1: Results of the search phase and the title and abstract screening phase

Keyword	Database	Time period	Items returned	Relevant items
"teaching-only"	Australian Education Index	1988 – 2013	18	8
	British Education Index	2003 -2005	2	0
	Education Research Complete	1884-2014	91	29
"teaching fellow"	Australian Education Index	1981 – 2013	156	2
	British Education Index	2009	1	0
	Education Research Complete	1921-2014	257	2
"academic identity"	Australian Education Index	1998 – 2013	43	16
	British Education Index	1996 – 2013	30	30
	Education Research Complete	1996-2014	182	47
"academic profession" AND "transition"	Australian Education Index	1993 – 2011	8	5
	British Education Index	2003	2	0
	Education Research Complete	1966-2014	14	5
"teaching-focused"	Australian Education Index	1997 – 2013	19	3
	British Education Index	2003	3	1
	Education Research Complete	1915-2013	33	8
"academic profession"	Australian Education Index	1980-2014	64	10
	British Education Index	1977 - 2013	34	16
	Education Research Complete	1919-2014	316	56
"academic career"	Australian Education Index	2000-2015	57	8
	British Education Index	1999-2015	182	9
	Education Research Complete	1908 - 2014	720	28

Figure 2.1 details the number of references at each stage in the review. Details of the sources of the articles and the reasons for exclusion have been given.

```
┌─────────────────────────────┐        ┌─────────────────────────────┐
│ Reports identified through  │        │ Reports identified prior to │
│ database searching (n=2232) │        │ database search (n=25)      │
└─────────────────────────────┘        └─────────────────────────────┘
               │                                       │
               ▼                                       ▼
          ┌──────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
          │ Reports after the abstract and title screening    │
          │ stage (n=234)                                     │
          └──────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
                               │
                               ▼
          ┌──────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
          │ Reports after duplications removed (n=204)        │
          └──────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
                    │
                    │          ┌────────────────────────────────────────────┐
                    │          │ Articles with indirect relevance to         │
                    │          │ teaching-only academics retained (n=95)     │
                    │          │                                             │
                    │          │ Articles excluded after full text           │
                    ├─────────▶│ screening (n=39)                            │
                    │          │   • Focus unrelated to teaching-only        │
                    │          │     academic staff issues (n=19)            │
                    │          │   • Country of interest outside region of   │
                    │          │     focus (n=7)                             │
                    │          │   • Focusses only on institutional and/or   │
                    │          │     disciplinary issues ( n=13)             │
                    │          └────────────────────────────────────────────┘
                    ▼
          ┌──────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
          │ Articles included in synthesis stage (n=69)       │
          └──────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Figure 2.1: Flowchart showing articles retrieved and included or excluded in the review

2.2.1 What are the routes into the teaching-only academic role?

The systematic literature review identified six routes into the teaching-only academic role. These are:

(1) Transfer of academic staff on research-and-teaching contracts to fixed term or permanent teaching-only academic contracts (Association of University Teachers 2005; Chalmers 2010; Gull 2010; Macfarlane 2011; Oancea et al. 2010; Paye 2011; Probert 2013; Rix et al. 2007);

(2) Transfer of professional services staff with teaching and/or teaching support responsibilities to fixed term or permanent teaching-only academic contracts (Macfarlane 2011);

(3) Direct appointment of recent PhD graduates, PhD students nearing completion, and postdoctoral staff to fixed term or permanent teaching-only academic contracts (Bauder 2006; Hubbard et al. 2015; Nyamapfene 2014; Peters and Turner 2014; Rix et al. 2007; White 1996);

(4) Direct appointment of late career changers to fixed term or permanent teaching-only academic contracts (Hubbard et al. 2015; Kumar et al. 2011; Norton et al. 2013; Nyamapfene 2014);

(5) Direct appointment of current or recently graduated PhD students to part-time or short-term teaching-only academic contracts (Bauder 2006; Bexley et al. 2013; Hubbard et al. 2015; Shelton et al. 2001; White 1996).

(6) Direct appointments of practising or retired professionals to part-time or short-term teaching-only academic contracts (Bexley et al. 2013; Shelton et al. 2001).

Up to the mid-1990s, the majority of those appointed to teaching-only contract were mainly recent PhD graduates or PhD students nearing completion who wanted to gain some teaching experience prior to applying for full-time positions as research-and-teaching academics (White 1996). Other routes only became increasingly dominant from the mid-1990s onwards (Association of University Teachers 2005; Shelton et al. 2001; Willmott 1995).

2.2.2 Who enters into a teaching-only academic role?

Individuals tend to get into the teaching-only academic route involuntarily (Barrett et al. 2011; Bexley et al. 2013; Chalmers 2010; Gull 2010; Macfarlane 2011; Nyamapfene 2014; O'Brien and Hapgood 2012; Oancea et al. 2010; Paye 2011; Probert 2013; Thornton 2013; Willmott 1995). For instance, academics on research-and-teaching roles normally get transferred to the teaching-only role when their research is deemed to be unsatisfactory.   Similarly, recently graduated PhDs mainly get into the role with the intention to use it as a stepping stone to a research-and-teaching role, whilst late career changers typically use it as a temporary job whilst searching for other jobs in the academic world or elsewhere.

Women typically end up as teaching-only academics mainly because of the gender-biased structure of higher education which mitigates against the success of women in the research-and-teaching role (Barrett et al. 2011; O'Brien and Hapgood 2012; Thornton 2013).   According to Thornton (2013), whilst research has become increasingly privileged in the contemporary academy, teaching, in comparison, has become "the preserve of the less-than-ideal academic" who is more likely to be casualised, and more likely to be female.

However, a small but significant number of voices are more upbeat (Hubbard et al. 2015; Skelton 2012b; Vajoczki et al. 2011). This includes Skelton (2012b), who suggests that academics who identify themselves strongly with being a 'teacher' find the role attractive, and voluntarily sign up for it. Hubbard et al. (2015) also report that all the teaching-only academics in their study had entered into their roles voluntarily as they were more motivated by teaching rather than by research. In addition, of the 134 teaching-stream academics surveyed in five higher education institutions in Ontario, Canada by Vajoczki et al. (2011), the majority expressed satisfaction with their roles, with just over half (53 per cent) of the respondents reporting that they had initially aspired to be in a teaching-only academic role, and 87 per cent reporting being satisfied or being very satisfied in their teaching-only academic roles. This is in contrast to only 10 per cent reporting being dissatisfied or being very dissatisfied with their current position. When asked if they would transfer to a research-and-teaching role if given the opportunity, 75 per cent reported that they would not transfer. Therefore, on the basis of these positive voices, though few in number, it is plausible

that a growing number of people now aspire to, and now find fulfilment in, the full-time teaching-only academic role.

2.2.3 Impact of institutional and other external factors on the teaching-only academic role

The teaching–only academic role is primarily an institutional response to recent and current changes within higher education such as:

- The move from an elite to a mass system of higher education (Bryson 2004; Cummings et al. 2014; Probert 2013; Vajoczki et al. 2011; Willmott 1995);

- With respect to the UK, the doubling of the number of UK universities following the abolition of the binary divide between universities and polytechnics/HE colleges in 1992 (Bryson 2004);

- With respect to the UK, the abolition of academic tenure in 1988 (Bryson 2004);

- Reduction in public funding of university education, leading to an increased emphasis on financial stringency within institutions (Bryson 2004; Coates et al. 2008; Cummings et al. 2014; Probert 2013; Vajoczki et al. 2011; Willmott 1995);

- A growing focus on standards and accountability with institutions now required to demonstrate "value for money" via teaching quality assessment and research assessment exercises (Bryson 2004; Willmott 1995);

- The introduction of fees and maintenance loans in place of grants (Bryson 2004; Vajoczki et al. 2011; Willmott 1995);

- A change in emphasis from teacher-centred learning to student-centred learning, accompanied by standardisation moves such as semesterisation, modularity and innovations in information technology (Bryson 2004; Cummings et al. 2014; Probert 2013; Vajoczki et al. 2011; Willmott 1995);

- Increased marketisation of the higher education landscape (Bryson 2004; Vajoczki et al. 2011; Willmott 1995);

- The pressure to provide lifelong learning (Probert 2013);

- Increased competition from private providers (Probert 2013).

2.2.4 Impact of prioritising research over teaching

A strong research profile helps institutions to leverage income and other resources as well as to maintain success in national and international student and labour markets. The prioritisation of research over teaching has led to a two-tiered academic workforce made up of a valued class of research-and-teaching academics who focus primarily on research and another class of less valued academics whose primary role is to bear the burden of teaching, particularly at undergraduate level (Bauder 2006; Bexley et al. 2013; Chalmers 2010; Graham 2015; Gull 2010; Menon 2003; Probert 2013; Thornton 2013; Willmott 1995).

To maintain their research status, Canadian institutions have maintained a strong tenure-stream professoriate (Jones 2013). This protection of all-round faculty has been achieved by introducing new job categories of academic workers with different levels of remuneration and benefit arrangements. For example, increases in student recruitment have been matched by increased recruitment of non-tenure stream university teachers whilst maintaining a core of tenured full-time academic staff (Jones 2013). The same approach of maintaining a tenured core with secure conditions of employment has been adopted by Australia, where increased student numbers have been matched by increased numbers of casual staff (Kimber 2003).

Bexley et al. (2011) suggest that the present norm in Australia is that research-and-teaching academics are often on tenure, or, if not, they are tenurable; teaching-only academics are sessional; and research-only academics are on fixed term. In addition, the research-and-teaching academic role is associated with status, career progression and security (Bexley et al. 2011). In contrast, staff in non-tenured academic positions are often excluded from opportunities to attain tenure and status, and from conducting discipline-based research, and from participating fully as members of disciplinary communities (Chalmers 2010).

2.2.5 Impact of national research assessment exercises

The introduction of the RAE/REF in the UK for the purposes of selectively allocating public funding for research has widened the separation between research and teaching at all levels of university (Brennan et al. 2007; Chalmers 2010; Gull 2010; Jenkins 1995; Locke 2012; Oancea et al. 2010). At the individual level, this has led to increased segmentation of academic roles as characterised by the emergence of

teaching-only and research-only positions and other categories of academic workers (Chalmers 2010). It has also led to increased use of temporary staff in teaching as institutions seek to safeguard research time for full-time academic staff (Elton 2008), and forced the transfer of academic staff deemed to be research-inactive to teaching-only roles (Fazackerley 2004; Henkel 2007).

2.3   What is the nature of the teaching-only academic role?

2.3.1 Casualisation within the teaching-only academic role

Currently the majority of teaching-only appointments in the UK are typically short-term appointments designed to cover short-term teaching requirements within a department (Peters and Turner 2014). This has led to a high degree of casualisation within the teaching-only academic staff category, with 77% of all teaching-only academic staff in the academic year 2012-13 being classified as part-time (HESA 2014). This is in contrast to only 18% of research-and-teaching academics being employed on part-time basis in the same academic year.

With respect to Canada, 19% of all Canadian university professors and college-level vocational instructors in the academic year 2014-2015, were employed to teach on a part-time basis (CAUT, 2015). However, these academics are not covered by the definition for teaching-only academics as specified by Vajoczki et al. (2011).

In Australia most of those engaged solely to teach are employed on a casual basis, with over half of all the teaching of undergraduates in Australian universities being done by casual teaching staff (Coates et al. 2009; Kimber 2003; Probert 2013). As of 2013, 82% of all teaching-only academics in Australia were on casual appointments, and this figure constitutes 23% of the Australian academic workforce (Norton et al. 2013).

2.3.2 Gender imbalance within the teaching-only academic role

The university is seen as a gendered space which privileges men over women (Clegg 2008; Marchant and Wallace 2013; Thornton 2013). Academic labour tends to be stratified along gender lines to the extent that women are predominantly employed in teaching roles, as opposed to the preferred traditional research-and-teaching role (Thornton 2013). For example, in the academic year 2003-2004, only one third of research-and-teaching academics in the UK were women. This is in contrast to the

teaching-only role where 49% of all teaching-only academics in the same academic year were women (AUT 2005). By the year 2012-2013, women constituted only 39.79% of research-and-teaching academics in the UK. In comparison, women made up 51.71% of teaching-only academics in the UK (HESA 2014). Similarly, in Australia, where 40 to 50% of all undergraduate teaching is carried out by academics on casual contracts (Coates et al. 2009; Kimber 2003; Probert 2013), women make up 64% of all academics on casual contracts (Bexley et al. 2013; Chalmers 2010).

2.3.3 Marginalisation of the teaching-only academic role

Teaching-only academics are skilled labour with qualifications that are equivalent to those of staff in in the research-and-teaching academic category, but despite this they are at the bottom of the academic staff hierarchy partly because of the desire by institutions to make savings by using them to buy out more expensive research-and-teaching staff (Peters and Turner 2014). In addition, the job role has a heavy teaching workload that offers little or no time to engage in research activities which are key to prestige and financial reward within the higher education sector (Nyamapfene 2014; Peters and Turner 2014; Vajoczki et al. 2011). Consistent with the findings by Shelton et al. (2001) pertaining to contract academic staff, teaching-only academics are prone to being relegated to marginalised, precarious junior roles. Consequently, their contributions to the employing departments and institutions are largely unacknowledged (Thornton 2013). For the most part, they are also excluded from key decision-making processes that impact on their roles (Peters and Turner 2014). In addition, the marginal roles to which they are assigned offer little or no prospects for career progression   (Graham 2015; Nyamapfene 2014; Skelton 2012b; Vajoczki et al. 2011) .

Marginalisation of teaching-only academics also persists at the disciplinary level, with teaching-only academics feeling isolated from their own disciplines (Hubbard et al. 2015; Skelton 2012b).This is primarily because most learned societies, which are responsible for promoting and championing discipline-based activities, relegate issues pertaining to teaching and education to peripheral special interest groups, rather than incorporating them into mainstream activities that are accessible to all members (Gull 2010; Hubbard et al. 2015).

2.4　What can be done to support the teaching-only academic role?

For the purposes of this review, I have used the term "support structure" to refer to all those measures and policies aimed at creating a sustainable and stable teaching-only academic role. These measures and policies may be put in place at national, disciplinary, institutional and departmental level.

2.4.1　Support structures at the national level

Support structures at the national level may include the policies and measures put in place by governments and other national bodies to support the stability and sustainability of the teaching-only academic role. Given the dominance of research over teaching, this also includes national efforts to improve the esteem of teaching. It also includes the promulgation of labour laws to guarantee that employment conditions for teaching-only academics are fair and non-exploitative.

For instance, in 2003 the UK government published a white paper aimed at improving investment in higher education (DfES 2003). This white paper acknowledged the lack of parity between teaching and research, and proposed to remedy this by increasing funding for teaching, including funding for national teaching fellowships, and for the establishment of centres for teaching excellence. A body to oversee this, and to promote teaching quality and standards was subsequently established. This body is known as the Higher Education Academy (HEA).

In Australia, Probert (2013) observes that the establishment of clear policies and funding signals at national level can have a significant impact on teaching at the institutional level. For example, in 2006 the Australian government introduced the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund (LTPF) aimed at improving the quality of university teaching. This funding was competitively allocated based on the results of the Graduate Destination Survey and Course Experience Questionnaire, as well as attrition and progression data for students. In order to participate, institutions had to show evidence of "probation and promotion practices which include effectiveness as a teacher" (Probert 2013). Because the funding was quite significant, this helped to empower teaching-focussed academics within the universities, and increased the likelihood for academic staff to progress on the basis of teaching excellence. With regard to the UK, Jenkins (1995) also observed that the implementation of assessment

audits for teaching quality had the effect of encouraging individual departments to focus on teaching related issues.

Australia and the UK have collaboratively developed frameworks for teaching criteria and standards (Cummings et al. 2014; Higher Education Academy 2013). The objectives of these frameworks are to assist institutions to develop their own individual teaching-based promotion criteria for their academic staff. The frameworks identify criteria for quality teaching, and for each of these criteria, they suggest levels of competence that should be demonstrated across all academic promotional levels.

The HEA has also developed a UK Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning (UKPSF) that it uses to provide a professional recognition scheme for teaching and learning support within the higher education and further education sector (Turner et al. 2013). In a survey to assess the impact of the UKPSF, 84% of the surveyed institutions claimed that the UKPSF had led to changes to academic development, learning, teaching and the student experience within their institution (Turner et al. 2013). This underscores the importance of nationally driven schemes to improve learning and teaching within the higher education sector.

2.4.2 Support structures at the disciplinary level

The discipline remains an important part in academic life. It determines academic identity (Henkel 2005), and shapes academic beliefs and perceptions (Henkel 1997), and this holds true across all academic roles (Brennan et al. 2007). To ensure that teaching-only academics are not isolated from their own disciplines, Hubbard et al. (2015) suggest that teaching and education should be embedded within the mainstream activities of learned societies. In addition, given the funding cuts that have been sustained by the HEA, they recommend that learned societies should take more responsibility for championing teaching and education within their own disciplines. They also urge learned societies from different disciplines to collaborate together on themes relating to education and outreach.

2.4.3 Support structures at the institutional and departmental levels

Research remains highly privileged over teaching, and this has proved to be a significant barrier to the recognition and reward of teaching (Cashmore et al. 2013; Kumar et al. 2011; Probert 2013; Thornton 2013). However, most institutions now

recognise the need to change their culture to make it compatible with a teaching ethos, and many have developed policies for promoting and rewarding teaching and education (Cashmore et al. 2013; Rix et al. 2007; Strike 2010).

Other institutions have sought to raise the profile of teaching by demanding the same stringent criteria for teaching from both the academics being transferred from research-and-teaching roles and the individuals who are seeking direct appointments to these roles (Rix et al. 2007). This will help to prevent teaching from being perceived as an activity reserved only for those who have failed in research (Chalmers 2010; Gull 2010).

Some institutions are also raising the profile of their teaching by only appointing to teaching-only academic roles those individuals who have demonstrated passion and excellence in teaching. This also includes the appointment of experienced professionals who can help university teaching to bridge the gap between theory and practice (Norton et al. 2013).

2.5 Discussion

This study strongly suggests that the teaching-only role is a by-product of recent and ongoing changes in higher education. However, whilst there is still ambivalence as to the status of the role, it is apparent that the role is likely to be a permanent feature of higher education. This is indicated by the establishment of formal career pathways for the role in most institutions (Cashmore et al. 2013; Rix et al. 2007; Strike 2010). Whilst some institutions are opting to go back to a unitary academic career pathway, this appears to be happening on a new understanding that individuals can pursue different pathways within the same academic career framework. For instance, the University of Bradford has recently reverted to a unitary academic career pathway because they want to offer individuals flexibility in determining, in consultation with their heads of departments, their own optimal balance of teaching and research (Newman 2007).

It is now possible for teaching-only academics to progress to full professorships in some institutions (Cashmore et al. 2013; Kumar et al. 2011; Probert 2013; Thornton 2013). This suggests that although research remains the main determinant for academic progression, the value systems within higher education are gradually

changing. This change now makes it feasible for individuals to pursue academic careers that are not premised on excellence in research.

The results from this study also suggest that the teaching-only academic role is a non-homogeneous, multi-stranded evolving role. With the exception of only one strand, all the other strands are the products of the multi-faceted changes that have been affecting the higher education environment over the past 30 years. These changes include the introduction of selective research funding, massification of higher education, and the re-purposing of teaching in higher education into a human resources development tool to support national economies (Bryson 2004; Cummings et al. 2014; Probert 2013; Vajoczki et al. 2011; Willmott 1995).

What it means to be a teaching-only academic is directly dependent on the particular strand to which an individual belongs. This includes such aspects as status within the academic community, academic professional identity, the nature of the tasks undertaken within the role, and also the demography of the people making up the role. Table 2.2 shows the various teaching-only academic strands emerging from the literature.

The first strand is what I have termed the academic apprenticeship strand. The objective of this strand is to prepare and mentor PhD graduates and PhD students for the traditional research-and-teaching academic career. An example of this type of teaching-only academic role is discussed in White (1996). Appointment contracts for this role are necessarily short term, and the key concern for departments running such roles is to ensure that role-holders get sufficient exposure to teaching practice whilst ensuring sufficient time for role holders to finalise their dissertations, or to develop an individual publication record. The academic apprenticeship strand is concerned more with the developmental needs of the role holder, rather than meeting departmental teaching requirements. Role holders are primarily drawn from the department's current and recently graduated PhD students, although external candidates can be hired. The academic apprenticeship strand can therefore be seen as providing a transition between PhD studies and the academic career.

Another strand is the one arising out of institutional and departmental responses to national selectivity in institutional research funding. For this reason, I have termed this strand the selective research funding strand. Role holders of this strand comprise

academics who have been transferred from their previous roles as full-time research-and-teaching academics because of failure to meet the performance criteria needed to participate in prevailing national research assessment exercises (Association of University Teachers 2005; Fazackerley 2004; Harley 2002; Henkel 2007; Willmott 1995). In the current research culture of higher education, being judged to be failing in research is tantamount to having failed as an academic. Hence, this strand is effectively a stigmatised role for failed academics.

Table 2.2: Emerging teaching-only academic strands

Teaching-only academic strand	Description of the strand	Literature sources in which strand is identified
Academic apprenticeship strand	to prepare and mentor PhD graduates and PhD students for the traditional research-and-teaching academic career	White (1996)
selective research funding strand	For academics who do not meet the performance criteria needed to participate in prevailing national research assessment exercises	AUT (2005); Fazackerley 2004; Harley 2002; Henkel (2007); Willmott (1995)
the higher education massification strand	Temporary teaching-only staff hired specifically to increase departmental teaching capacity	Kimber (2003); Probert (2013); Shelton et al. (2001)
the teacher-administrator strand	individuals hired to teach, coordinate and manage learning and teaching activities	Cashmore et al. (2013)
the practitioner academic strand	practising or retired professionals hired by university departments to fill in the professional skills gap in departments	Graham (2015); Gull (2010); Kumar et al. (2011)

A third strand, which I have termed the higher education massification strand, is the one arising out of institutional and departmental responses to increased student numbers in a period of declining public funding. Universities have responded to increased student numbers by increasing academic staff numbers. However, to keep academic labour costs under control, these staff increases have been met by hiring temporary staff to undertake most of the teaching under the direct management of full-

time academic staff (Kimber 2003; Probert 2013; Shelton et al. 2001). Individuals engaged in this strand are in effect engaged in a secondary academic labour market characterised by multiple, non-guaranteed, short term contracts across different institutions, minimal engagement with the department or institution employing them except that which is necessary for them to do the job they are hired for, and, ultimately, little or no scope for career progression.

Another two strands have arisen out of the need for universities to produce graduates who have the skills needed to support and grow the national economy. This requirement has led to increased external scrutiny of university teaching (HESA 2011b). An example of this is the TEF that has been recently introduced by the UK government with the objective of linking funding to higher education with teaching quality (BIS 2016). Coupled with the introduction of student fees, these measures have led to increased management and control of the teaching function by university administrations.

The first of these two strands, which I have termed the teacher-administrator strand, comprises experienced teachers who have been hired specifically to improve the quality of teaching. In addition to teaching, these academics also coordinate and manage departmental learning and teaching. Individuals on this strand have relatively secure jobs, with the majority of them being on fixed term and full-time contracts.

The other strand, which I have termed the practitioner academic strand, comprises practising or retired professionals hired by university departments to impart industry-specific skills to students. Full-time academics are often ill-equipped to do these tasks owing to the fact that they typically progress from PhD and postdoctoral studies into full-time academic roles without having practised in industry. Hence, this strand helps to fill a gap in the skillset of university departments. Such appointments are common in education, medical, engineering and architectural departments (Graham 2015; Gull 2010; Kumar et al. 2011). Role holders in this particular strand are motivated mainly by the need to give something back to society through sharing their knowledge with students, and by the need to establish and maintain economically valuable contacts with the university department in question.

2.6 Concluding remarks and further areas for research

In this systematic review I have identified five teaching-only academic strands based on the nature of the entry route that individuals took to get into the role as well as their intended institutional objectives. Individuals employed in different strands of the role are likely to come from different backgrounds, and to have different professional and personal experiences of the teaching-only academic role. For instance, individuals who were transferred from the research-and-teaching academic role to the teaching-only role on the basis that their research outputs were perceived to be inadequate for them to be entered for RAE/REF are likely to perceive the teaching-only academic role differently from practitioner academics who were hired specifically for their practitioner experience and expertise.

In order to gain an indepth understanding of the interplay between social background and career trajectory into and out of the teaching-only academic role, I undertook a case study on teaching-only academics from the engineering faculty of a selected research-intensive institution in the UK. My choice of department and institution were entirely opportunistic, being based solely on ease of access. The research question that I used to guide this research is:

RQ 1. What is the nature of individuals who progress into teaching-only academic roles within the engineering faculty of a selected research-intensive institution, and what is the nature of their career trajectories?

I sub-divided this research question into three specific sub-questions, with one focussing on social background, one on career trajectory into the role, and the third one on career progression within and beyond the role:

RQ1.1 What are the backgrounds of the people currently in teaching-only academic role in the engineering faculty of the research-intensive institution?

RQ1.2 Which career trajectories did current teaching-only academics in the engineering faculty of the institution follow?

RQ1.3 What are the perceptions of the teaching-only academics on their career progression, both within and beyond the teaching-only academic role?

As this systematic literature review illustrates, several factors have had, and continue to have, an impact on the establishment, growth and nature of the teaching-only role. This includes the introduction of research assessment exercises (Brennan et al. 2007; Chalmers 2010; Gull 2010; Jenkins 1995; Locke 2012; Oancea et al. 2010), national and institutional policies (Cashmore et al. 2013; Probert 2013; Rix et al. 2007; Strike 2010), and departmental and institutional culture and values, in particular those relating to research and teaching (Fitzmaurice 2011; Henkel 1997; Skelton 2012a; Young 2006). Again, there is a need to explore the interplay of these factors, and any other emerging factors, on the development of the teaching-only academic role in a specific academic department in the case study institution. The research question that I will use to explore this is:

RQ 2. What factors contribute to or hinder the development of the teaching-only academic role in the engineering faculty of a selected research-intensive institution?

To explore both institutional and environmental factors as well as the impact of personal agency, I sub-divided the research question into the following sub-questions:

RQ2.1   What are the institutional and environmental factors that sustain, drive and shape the teaching-only academic role in the engineering faculty of a selected research-intensive institution?

RQ2.2   What is the role of personal agency in shaping, driving and sustaining the teaching-only academic role in the engineering faculty of a selected research-intensive institution?

Given the importance of the discipline in shaping academic identity (Henkel 2005), including academic beliefs and perceptions (Henkel 1997), it is necessary to explore how individual disciplines influence the perceptions of teaching-only academics within each of the individual strands. This would help to shed light on the perceptions of individual teaching-only academics, including their beliefs regarding the relationship between research and teaching. Given that teaching-only academics increasingly undertake the bulk of undergraduate teaching, such an understanding would help to improve learning and teaching within higher education.

Again, given that the majority of teaching-only academics experience some measure of isolation and marginalisation (Hubbard et al. 2015; Skelton 2012b), it is also necessary to explore how individual teaching-only academics identify with the role, their particular strand, their discipline, the academic profession in general, and with the institution employing them. For instance, is it possible for a teaching-only academic to think only of oneself as a sessional teacher, teaching specialist, or as a manager of a learning and teaching function and not as an academic? Or alternately, do teaching-only academics view themselves as academics who happen to be employed in particular teaching-only academic strands? This may help to shed light on the extent of assimilation or dissociation of individual teaching-only academics from their disciplines, their institutions, and from the academic profession as a whole. I formulated the following research question to explore these issues related to identity:

RQ 3.   How do teaching-only academics at a selected research-intensive institution conceive, evolve and project their professional identities?

I sub-divided this research question into one focussing on the lived experience of the teaching-only academics, another focussing on their self-perceptions, and another focussing on their self-identity.

RQ 3.1   What is the lived experience and perceptions of being a teaching-only academic in the engineering faculty of a selected research-intensive institution?

RQ 3.2   How do teaching-only academics at a research-intensive higher education institution in the UK project themselves and their role within the institution and to the world at large?

RQ 3.3   How do the teaching-only academics in the engineering faculty of a selected research-intensive institution self-identify themselves and their role?

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

In this chapter I discuss Bourdieu's theoretical framework, which is the theoretical framework underpinning this study. I start with a brief explanation of the key concepts underpinning Bourdieu's theoretical framework, and provide some justification for why I think this theoretical framework is appropriate to this study of teaching-only academics within research-intensive institutions. As part of this justification, I also highlight some studies in both higher education and the broader field of education that have also used Bourdieu's theoretical framework. I then highlight the relevance of theoretical frameworks in qualitative studies such as this one, after which I go into an extended discussion of the key concepts that constitute Bourdieu's theoretical framework. I then conclude the chapter with a brief description of how I have used the theoretical framework to guide this study.

3.1   Justification for Bourdieu's theoretical framework for this study

Bourdieu's theoretical framework uses the concepts of field, capital and habitus as a means of understanding the way in which "social structures interweave with human activity" (Reay 1998:59). Specifically, when these three concepts are used in conjunction, they help to shed light on the social setting (field), the various dispositions possessed by individuals in the social setting (habitus), as well as the different resources that the individuals can potentially deploy in order to succeed in the social setting in question (capital). In this way, the framework helps to bring out a "real account of individuals in their existential reality" (Grenfell and James 1998:180), including the contextual constraints and social possibilities open to them.

Bourdieu's theoretical framework enables me to explore the drivers and constraints that direct people into following career trajectories leading into the teaching-only academic role. It also enables investigations of how institutional, cultural and environmental factors interact with the personal agency of incumbent teaching-only academics in developing and evolving the teaching-only academic role. Through habitus, which depends, in part, on the historical experiences of an individual, Bourdieu's theoretical framework also facilitates investigation of how the different backgrounds of incumbent teaching-only academics impact individual departments, institutions, and the higher education sector as a whole. Bourdieu's theoretical framework also facilitates exploration of how social space interacts with habitus, and

in so doing it offers opportunities to explore the development and evolution of professional identity amongst teaching-only academics.

Bourdieu's theoretical framework has been applied to a number of studies within higher education and the broader field of education. Examples within education include studies on initial teacher education (Grenfell 1996; Nolan 2013) and on teachers' construction of their professional identities (Coldron and Smith 1999; Zevenbergen 2006). Within the UK, Bourdieu's theoretical framework has been applied to studies of policy formulation in England's higher education system (Maton 2005), social and educational differentiation of medical schools (Brosnan 2010), and gendered and classed differentiation in academic labour (Reay 2004). Elsewhere, the same framework has also been applied to investigating segmentation of academic labour in geography departments within Canadian universities (Bauder 2006), studying academic staff agency within a United States striving university seeking to transform itself into a national research institution (Gonzales 2014), analysis of higher education institutional change in South Africa (Kloot 2009), and investigating the development of academic practice at a South African institution (Jawitz 2009).

3.2   Overview of theoretical frameworks

It is now generally accepted that qualitative research is not value-free, but, instead, researchers bring into their research their values, biases and pre-conceptions. As Harris (2006:141) puts it, "qualitative enquiry is a value-bound enterprise whereby all data collection and analysis are filtered through the researcher's worldview, values, perspectives and theoretical frames." Denzin and Lincoln (2003) are also of the same opinion, suggesting that a researcher approaches a research study equipped with a set of ideas and a theoretical framework that specifies both the research questions and the methodology and data analysis techniques utilised in that study.

Whilst there are several explanations of the concept of theory in the literature on qualitative research, these explanations generally agree that a theory helps to explain and clarify some aspect of how the world works. For instance, Strauss (1995, quoted in Anfara Jr and Mertz, 2006) likens theory to a model or map of why the world is the way it is, whilst Anfara Jr and Mertz (2006) view theory as an enlightening story that sheds new insights and broadens understanding of the phenomenon under study. Another way of explaining the role of theory in qualitative research is to conceptualise

it as a lens to view and describe the phenomenon from a particular perspective (Anfara Jr and Mertz 2006). More formally, Silver (1983, quoted in Anfara Jr and Mertz, 2006:xiv) defines theory as "a unique way of perceiving reality, an expression of someone's profound insight into some aspect of nature, and a fresh and different perception of an aspect of the world". Theories are not exclusive, in the sense that several competing theories can be used either singly or in conjunction to describe a phenomenon. In this case, each theory sheds light on a particular aspect of the subject of the research study.

I now turn to an explanation of the term "theoretical framework" as applied to qualitative research. Anfara Jr and Mertz (2006:xxvii) define a theoretical framework as "any empirical or quasi-empirical theory of social and/or psychological processes, at a variety of levels (e.g., grand, mid-range, and explanatory), that can be applied to the understanding of phenomena". A theoretical framework achieves this "understanding of phenomena" by bringing a clear focus to the research study, and by specifying the nature of research questions to be pursued in the study, which, in turn, point to the research methodology and data analysis structure (Fowler 2006). Simply put, a theoretical framework "fundamentally shapes the sorts of things that the research focuses on and therefore also fundamentally shapes the method and techniques required for the research" (Liamputtong and Ezzy 2005:14). Not only that, a theoretical framework provides a coherent explanation for "why people are doing or saying what they are doing or saying" (Bettis and Mills 2006:68). In this way, the theoretical framework helps to "move the research project beyond the realm of the descriptive into the realm of the explanatory" by enabling generalisations to be inferred from the research study in question (Bettis and Mills 2006).

3.3   Bourdieu's theoretical framework: Agents and social space

Bourdieu suggests that agents within a social space are defined by their relative positions in the social space based on the nature and values of the properties that they possess that are active in that social space (Bourdieu 1990a). This distribution is such that agents, groups or institutions have more properties in common to each other the closer they are, and fewer properties in common the further apart they are (Bourdieu 1990a). Social space is therefore a relational structure that establishes objective relations between the positions that agents occupy in the social space and the distribution of resources that can be used effectively in competition for the

appropriation of the rare goods which constitute the locus of the social space (Bourdieu 1990a).

Bourdieu believes that, in the main, agents behave pre-reflexively, like "fish in water", to the extent that "agents to some extent fall into the practice that is theirs rather than freely choosing it or being impelled into it by mechanical constraints" (Bourdieu 1990a:90). Archer believes that Bourdieu's view essentially reduces human beings to "passive beings to whom things happen", and she disagrees with it, suggesting instead that far from being passive, agents actively and reflexively engage with their social environment (Archer 2000:2-3).

Elder-Vass (2010:113) argues that there is some merit to both Bourdieu's and Archer's approach, and that the two can be merged by accepting "the role of acquired dispositions in the causation of our behaviour and the effect of social context on those dispositions" and by acknowledging that "we, as reflexive beings, are sometimes able to evaluate critically and thus modify our dispositions in the light of our experience, our reasoning capacities and our value commitments". In this thesis I adopt Elder-Vass' synthesis of Archer and Bourdieu's positions, namely that the higher education social environment determines the locus of opportunities and possibilities for individuals working within it, and that individuals respond differently to social environment dynamics based partly on their personal dispositions, abilities and capacity to act.

3.4   Bourdieu's theoretical framework: Fields

A field may be regarded as a structured social space, akin to a field of forces, comprising agents who dominate and agents who are dominated (Bourdieu 1998). Agents are distributed within the field in accordance with the overall volume of capital that they possess as well as in accordance with the relative composition of the different kinds of capital active in that social space (Bourdieu 1990a). Agents within a field vie to establish a monopoly over the nature and composition of capital effective in the field as well as over the hierarchy between all forms of authority in the field (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Changing the form and composition of capital effective within a field leads to changes in the relative effectiveness of capital possessed by agents in different positions of the field, and hence to changes in the structure of the field.

Social fields do not exist in isolation, but are co-dependent on each other, and some fields are subsets, or specialisations of bigger fields. For instance, an academic

disciplinary department within a university is a subset of the university field. As an illustration, within the faculty of engineering of a university academics are positioned in various locations within the faculty social space based on values such as research grants secured, number of publications, citations, and teaching competence as evaluated through student reviews and performance. The university field impacts on the relative values of attributes that constitute the symbolic capital in the faculty of engineering. For instance, a university seeking to get a high rating in the research evaluation framework may prioritise the number of publications in reputable journals and number of citations over and above attributes relating to teaching. In such instances, engineering academics with substantial numbers of publications in reputable journals and a high number of citations are in a more competitive position compared to someone with a capital set biased towards teaching at the expense of research. Alternately, in a university striving to go up the undergraduate teaching student survey tables, a high preponderance of teaching quality capital would position an individual in a stronger position.

Moreover, a particular university is also a subset of the higher education field within a country, and the higher education field is subject to influences from the political and economic fields. Governments, responding to the economic field, determine the goals to be achieved by the higher education system. Ultimately, different autonomous fields impact on each other such that the distribution of positions within an individual field is aligned to positional distributions in other fields as well.

3.5 Bourdieu's theoretical framework: Capital

The active properties involved in the construction of a social space constitute the different kinds of power or capital active in that social space. In other words, capital refers to what is at stake in social spaces (Bexley et al. 2011). The amount and composition of capital possessed by an individual determines an individual's position in a field, and whether the individual is in a dominant position or a dominated position.

There are three fundamental forms of capital, namely economic, social and cultural (Bourdieu 1986). Economic capital relates to monetary resources.

Social capital relates to resources based on group membership, relationships, and networks of influence and support. Bourdieu (1986:51) defines it as "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network

of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition". Social capital is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalised in titles of nobility. The acquisition of social capital is not instantaneous, but requires investment in time and effort, consciously or unconsciously, to establish networks of relationships that are directly usable in the short or long term.

Cultural capital relates to forms of knowledge, skills, education or any advantages that enable an individual to gain a higher status in society. The acquisition of cultural capital requires investment, both in terms of time and economic resources. Cultural capital can exist in three forms: in an embodied state, objectified state and institutionalised state. In embodied form, cultural capital takes the form of long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body. The acquisition of embodied cultural capital is identical to the formation of habitus, an integration of mind and body harmoniously adapted to specialised habitats (fields) (Moore 2008). In the objectified state cultural capital takes the form of cultural goods such as pictures, books, dictionaries, instruments, and machines. In the institutionalised form, cultural capital takes the form of legally guaranteed qualifications that are formally independent of the person who bears them, and that gives the bearer an advantage over other members of society who do not possess them.

Bourdieu defines another form of capital, which he terms symbolic capital, and which he considers as a crucial source of power within a social space (Bourdieu 1989). According to Bourdieu(1989:20), symbolic capital comprises those properties which when perceived by "agents endowed with the pertinent categories of perception … function as distinctive signs and as signs of distinction, positive or negative". Symbolic capital includes job titles, titles of nobility, educational qualifications, and lifestyle. For instance, according to Bourdieu, even the very act of playing golf may constitute symbolic capital in some circles where it signifies membership of the old bourgeoisie class. More succinctly, symbolic capital may be defined as "any species of capital that confers to its holder prestige, honour, or the right to be listened to" (Dogaru 2008:15).

For Bourdieu, symbolic capital is important because it confers to its holders symbolic power, namely the authority to define the legitimate principles of division of the field

(Bourdieu 1985). Bourdieu also views symbolic power as the power to make or change the world, since it grants to its holders "the power to impose upon other minds a vision, old or new, of social divisions" within a social space (Bourdieu 1989:23). Simply put, symbolic power is the recognised authority to define the world-view in a specific social space, including defining what is and what is not important in that social space, as well as what is and what is not acceptable. This includes recognition and acceptance of the imposed world-view by even those categories of society who are likely to be most disadvantaged by its imposition.

3.6   Bourdieu's theoretical framework: Habitus

Habitus refers to the dispositions or mental structures through which agents in a field apprehend the world (Bourdieu 1990a). It is essentially a product of an internalisation of the structures of the social world. Habitus is structured by the agent's position in social space, and in turn it shapes the possible activities that an agent can embark on in a given social space (Bourdieu 1979). Habitus can be viewed as the 'the feel for the game' that agents acquire through experience in the social space within which they are located (Bourdieu 1990a:9). Consequently, as a result of habitus, an agent is capable of generating "all the lines of conduct consistent with the rules" that can be objectively determined for conduct in the given situation (Bourdieu 1979:116).

Nevertheless, "although there is no choice that cannot be accounted for, at least retrospectively, this is not to say that every act is perfectly predictable" (Bourdieu 1979:116). Rather, in opposition to structuralism, agents in a social space still retain the ability to act subjectively, and should not be viewed as "automata regulated like clocks, in accordance with laws which they do not understand."

Within the academic field, habitus may lead to academics from different backgrounds to have different values and priorities. For instance, an academic who attained a PhD in a research-intensive university where research is highly prized may be inclined to prioritise research capital over teaching capital. On the other hand, an academic moving from engineering practice may prioritise engineering education over and above academic research. However, habitus does not work alone, but interacts with the agent's position within the field, as well as the field's valued capital to dispose an agent to take a specified action. For instance, in an academic department where research is

prioritised over teaching, academics disposed towards research are better positioned to advance and accrue more academic capital.

However, habitus is not static, but has the ability to evolve and change. As Bourdieu puts it:

> [Habitus, as] the product of social conditionings, and thus of a history (unlike character) is endlessly transferred, either in a direction that reinforces it, when embodied structures of expectation encounter structures of objective chances in harmony with these expectations, or in a direction that transforms it and, for instance, raises or lowers the levels of expectation and aspirations" (Bourdieu 1990a:116).

Crucially, for my study of teaching-only academics, habitus also undergoes transformation if social conditions are undergoing change themselves (Bourdieu 1990a). Hence, the concept of habitus offers the possibility of tracking how changes at the departmental, institutional and/or higher education sector level can impact the individual dispositions, perceptions and professional identities of teaching-only academics.

3.7 Applying Bourdieu to this study

Bourdieu's theoretical framework can provide insights into the nature and composition of the capital currently effective within higher education. Some of this capital may, or may not, be within reach of teaching-only academics, as this is dependent on their individual positioning within their departments, universities, disciplines and the higher education sector vis a vis other academics, departmental and institutional management, as well as professional services staff.

Bourdieu identified two forms of capital at work in universities, namely "scientific" or "intellectual" capital and "academic" capital (Bourdieu and Collier 1988). Scientific or intellectual capital emphasises research, with research funding, research projects and publications being the main forms of capital (Clarke et al. 2015), and is associated with scientific authority or intellectual renown (Bourdieu and Collier 1988). Academic capital, on the other hand, focusses on teaching, academic networking, leadership and protection of disciplinary boundaries (Clarke et al. 2015), and it is associated with control of the instruments of reproduction of the professorial [academic] body. This

includes obtaining and maintaining positions that enable domination of other positions and their holders, as well as gaining control over access to academic positions (Bourdieu and Collier 1988:84).

The nature and composition of capital that an individual teaching-only academic can access and accumulate within their departments, universities, disciplines and the higher education sector, together with their relative positioning within these fields vis a vis other academic and university employees also serves as an indicator of the durability of the teaching-only academic role as a career. In addition, an analysis based on the concepts of field and capital, when taken together with the changes taking place within higher education, can provide a more nuanced understanding of the teaching-only academic role that goes beyond the current narratives of spoilt identity and marginalisation (Nyamapfene 2014; Peters and Turner 2014; Vajoczki et al. 2011).

In the systematic literature in Chapter 2, I identified five strands of the teaching-only academic role based primarily on their career and academic background prior to entry into the teaching-only academic role. These different backgrounds shape the individual habitus and dispositions that individuals bring into the role (Wacquant 2016). Additionally, the habitus of an individual entering into the teaching-only academic role is not necessarily aligned with the collective habitus informing the shared repertoire of practices and ways of doing things in the destination department and institution (Jawitz 2009). Such a misalignment can trigger the transformation of an individual's habitus upon entry into the teaching-only academic role (Bourdieu 1990a). This can help to reveal how individuals potentially reshape their professional identities and their conceptions of the teaching-only academic role on entry.

An individual's habitus also has the potential to reshape departmental, institutional and even higher education values and practices (Jawitz 2009). Since a considerable number of teaching-only academics are being recruited from professional practice outside higher education, attention to habitus can also shed light on the nature and extent to which these recruitment practices are impacting academic values and practices at the departmental, institutional, discipline and higher education sector level.

Chapter 4: Method

In this chapter I provide a description and justification for using a case study approach in this thesis. The case study consisted of two parts. In the first part, I documented and analysed how teaching-only academics at the case institution self-represent themselves on the institution's academic web pages. In the second part of the case study I carried out a life-history study of seven of the senior teaching-only academics in the case institution's faculty of engineering.

4.1   Justification of the case study approach

According to Swanborn (2010), a case study focusses only on a handful of instances. This has given rise to criticisms that the case study approach does not enable researchers to generalise their research results beyond the case study. However, a case study enables a phenomenon to be studied to significant depth within its own natural context. As Bassey (1999:47) notes:

> An essential feature of case study is that sufficient data are collected
> for researchers to be able to explore significant features of the case
> and to put forward interpretations for what is observed. Another feature
> is that the study is conducted mainly in its natural context.

Because of this closeness to real-life situations, and the wealth of detail that it generates, a case study makes it possible for a researcher to gain insights into the deeper causes behind a given problem and its consequences in a particular situation (Flyvbjerg 2006). From a Bourdieusian perspective, therefore, a case study enables one to closely investigate the role played by agency and structure in a particular context. By making appropriate adjustments, it is possible for the outcomes of a case study to be used to provide insights into how the same phenomenon may play out in other contexts as well. Hence, I felt that the case study was the most appropriate method for gaining insights into the academic lives, perspectives and identities of teaching-only academics.

4.2   The case institution and academic department

In my case study I looked at teaching-only academics employed within a research-intensive institution in the south of England. I chose this institution partly because I was an employee of the institution at the time of the study, and it was convenient for

me to carry out the study within the institution. My research can therefore be characterised as insider research since I was employed as a teaching-only academic within the case institution, and the target of my research were fellow teaching-only academics employed by the institution. Secondly, the institution is a member of the Russel Group of universities. This is a grouping of universities that aspire towards research excellence. The institution is therefore representative of the elite research-intensive universities in the UK.

I adopted two complementary interpretive research methods in my study. I started out my study by exploring the lived identity of teaching-only academics within the institution. I did this by investigating how they projected themselves to other colleagues and to the wider world through their personal web pages. I then used the insights from this study to gain an understanding of how teaching-only academics in this institution construct their own academic identities in relation to the institution and to their counterparts in the research-and-teaching academic category.

Following the study on academic identities, I carried out a life-history study of teaching-only academics within the engineering faculty who were at the principal teaching fellow grade. At the time of the study, the grade of principal teaching fellow was the highest that teaching-only academics could attain at the institution. I specifically targeted this grade for my research because, compared to the more junior grades of the teaching-only academic role, individuals at the grade of principal teaching fellow were more established in their academic roles, and because of their seniority, they had more personal experiences of what it takes to progress in a teaching-only academic role at the institution. In addition, because of the seniority of their role, they had supervisory responsibilities over the more junior teaching-only academics. In this way, I figured that in addition to their own personal experiences, they also had indepth understanding of the experiences of the more junior teaching-only academics.

At the time of the study, the engineering faculty employed almost one third of all the teaching-only academics in the institution, making it the highest employer of teaching-only academics within the institution. This dominance in employment was even more marked at the higher grades of the teaching-only academic role, with more than half of all the senior and principal teaching fellows in the institution being employed in the engineering faculty. In terms of teaching-only academic employment, therefore, the

engineering faculty can be regarded as an extreme case within the institution. Flyvbjerg (2006) advises that when the research objective is to achieve the greatest possible amount of information on a given problem or phenomenon, it is more appropriate to select an extreme case as opposed to a more representative, average case. This is because extreme cases have more actors, and consequently, more opportunities to reveal insights into the situation being studied.

4.3   On being an insider researcher

Insider research may be defined as research that "is conducted within a social group, organization or culture of which the researcher is also a member" (Greene 2014:1). This definition applies to me since in this research, I am a teaching-only academic carrying out a case study research on teaching-only academics within the institution that I work for. Hence as a teaching-only academic, I share a common identity and experiential base with my research participants (Asselin 2003), and they naturally regarded me as one of them.

One advantage for being an insider was that I was familiar with the work environment of my research participants, and I had ready access to them (Brannick and Coghlan 2007; Dwyer and Buckle 2009; Greene 2014; Mercer 2007). This was very helpful for me at the interview stage as I was able to approach and speak to potential participants before sending out any formal invitations.

Even during the interviews, my insider status was helpful as research participants were able to talk freely to me. The research participants accepted me as one of their own, and, as best illustrated by Dwyer and Buckle (2009), their response to me was as if they felt that "You are one of us and it is us versus them (those on the outside who don't understand)." This, of course, naturally raises the likelihood of informant bias, whereby participants tailor what they say based on what they assume the interviewer wants to hear from them. However, Mercer (2007) presents examples of past research showing that informant bias can affect both insider and outsider research. She also reports that in her own research, she carried out interviews at two sites. At the first site, the participants were very familiar with her, and even knew her personal views on the research topic. At the other site, participants were less familiar with her, and were unaware of her own position regarding the research topic. When she

analysed the interview transcripts from both sites, she noted that the participants' level of familiarity with her had not affected their interview responses.

As an insider, the researcher "plays two roles simultaneously: that of researcher and researched" (Greene 2014:2). Whilst this helps to facilitate access to potential research participants, and enable rapport between the researcher and participants during the interviews, it also has the potential to negatively affect the research process as it progresses (Dwyer and Buckle 2009). For instance, as a result of familiarity with the research participants and the research topic, the insider is "more likely to take things for granted, develop myopia, and assume their own perspective is far more widespread than it actually is" (Mercer 2007:6). This might also affect the analysis process, with the possibility that the researcher's personal experiences may lead to an emphasis on factors consistent with their experiences or vice versa (Dwyer and Buckle 2009).

Walsham cautions that it is important for the qualitative researcher to be aware of their own role in the constructions and views generated by the research participants (Walsham 1995; Walsham 2006). According to Walsham (1995), qualitative researchers access other people's interpretations, filter these interpretations through their own conceptual apparatus, and communicate a version of the events to others, including in some cases both their interviewees and other audiences. Hence, regardless of whether the researcher is an insider or outsider, he or she is in some way a participant in the constructions and views generated by the research participants. Because of this, Greene (2014) suggests that researchers, in particular the insiders, should adopt reflexivity as a way of assessing their role and impact on the research process.

Pierre Bourdieu also explored the application of reflexivity in research to some considerable detail. He believed that just like any other agents located in a field, when researchers carry out their work, they are also subject to influence from the doxa at play within their own academic field. Consequently, if researchers do not approach their work in a critical and reflexive manner, the results of their research may be impacted by the social positions of the researchers within their own field of research. In other words, as researchers "we bring our own prejudices (our personal history, or habitus), and our own background (including our class, race and gender) to the social

research process, to our selection of tools of social research, and hence to the 'spectacles' through which we look at the social problem we intend to investigate" (Webb et al. 2002:67). To counteract this tendency, therefore, Bourdieu advocated a reflexive, self-critical approach to social studies research which he terms "participant objectivation" (Bourdieu 2003).

Participant objectivation goes beyond typical reflexive analysis by also applying the same tools and techniques used to analyse the objects of the research to the researcher as well. According to Bourdieu (2003), "it applies to the knowing subject the most brutally objectivist tools that anthropology and sociology provide." Participant objectivation enables the researcher to be cognisant of the pre-reflexive values and biases that the researcher tends to project unconsciously onto the objects of the research. In Bourdieu's words (2003), the aims of participant objectivation are to enable the researcher to:

> … grasp everything that the thinking of the anthropologist (or sociologist) may owe to the fact that she (or he) is inserted in a national scientific field, with its traditions, habits of thought, problematics, shared commonplaces, and so on, and to the fact that she occupies in it a particular position (newcomer who has to prove herself versus consecrated master, etc.), with 'interests' of a particular kind which unconsciously orientate her scientific choices (of discipline, method, object, etc.).

In line with Greene (2014), and in the spirit of Bourdieu's participant objectivation (Bourdieu 2003), I therefore adopted a reflexive approach as a means of countering any researcher bias on my part. As part of this approach, I adopted a strategy whereby I continually interrogated and scrutinised the whole research process, including my data analysis.

4.4   Data management

I closely followed the guidelines from the UK Data Archive to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of participant data. All personal information belonging to participants was stored in a separate location to the interview data. I stored all the personal information on password-protected files on Dropbox, and all the interview data on password-protected files on the University of Exeter U-drive.

To keep track of the participants, I used a simple alphanumeric identity code to number the participants as well as to encode their academic career grades. I did this by encoding all teaching fellows as TF1, TF2, …, TFk, all senior teaching fellows as STF1, STF2, …, STF*m,* and all principal teaching fellows as PTF1, PTF2, …, PTF*n* respectively.

Furthermore, to make it more difficult for participants to be identified by departmental affiliation, I aggregated departments into faculty groupings as follows:

- Academic services – taking into account all professional services departments where teaching-only academics are employed

- Engineering– taking into account all engineering and built environment departments

- Physical sciences – taking into account all the mathematics, statistics and physical science departments

- Social and historical sciences – taking into account all social science and history-related departments

- Humanities – taking into account all the arts and humanities departments

- Life sciences – taking into account all the biological, pharmaceutical and medical departments.

I also ensured that any recorded participant information would not be so specific that it would be used to identify an individual. For example, to record participants' responsibilities, I used generic titles like "module coordinator", "programmer lead", "tutor" instead of the precise titles associated with their specific administrative responsibilities. With regard to academic publications, I used numerical ranges such as 0 -5; 6-10; 11-15; etc. instead of stating the individual's exact number of publications. I also used the same approach to anonymise any research grants awarded to participants.

In addition, with respect to participants' research activities, instead of identifying the sponsor of any grant received by a participant, I simply recorded each grant as externally sponsored if it came from an organisation or individual outside the case university. If the grant had been awarded from within the university, I simply recorded

it as internally sponsored, without identifying the specific university unit that made the award. However, to enable comparisons to be made between research and teaching-related activities, I categorised and recorded awarded grants either as discipline-based research grants or as learning and teaching grants. Also, instead of specifying the exact dates the grants were awarded, I simply stated whether or not the grant had been received within the past five years. I settled on five years because at this particular institution, individuals are regarded as research active if they have received at least one grant within the past five years with a value equal to, or exceeding, a specified monetary value as determined for their department by the institution. Individuals failing to meet this requirement would automatically be recorded by the institution as research inactive. Range values were also used to capture the monetary value of each grant. Typical range values included £0 - £500; £ 500 -£1000, £1000 - £5000, £5000 - £10000 etc.

To further guarantee participant anonymity, I also made anonymous any other institutions that participants had been, or were currently associated with at the time of the interviews. For higher education institutions, I identified them either as research-intensive or as teaching-focussed. I based this by referring to their position on their relative positions on institutional league tables, and on how the institution described themselves on their websites. I also included a geographic location descriptor in the identifier for the institution. For instance, for a research-intensive institution based in South East England I would identify it as South East Research-intensive, and a teaching-focussed institution in London would go by the identifier Great City Teaching Intensive. For any other organisations I simply identified them by the nature of their business, and by their geographic location. For instance, for a further education institution based in Manchester I would identify it as North West Further Education College, and a national retail organisation would go by the name National Retail Chain 1, and so on.

To guarantee the security of interview data and participant information, I decided that no data would be stored on physical devices such as laptops, memory sticks or memory cards. I also ensured that any hard copy transcripts and signed consent forms were stored in a locked filing cabinet. In addition, I also decided that all voice, video or personal identifiable data would not be published or shared outside the research team in any way. For example, no personal identifiable data would be published in journals,

conferences, or as part of training materials. I also decided that all the project material would be retained for five years from the end of the project, after which it would be destroyed in accordance with guidance from the UK Data Archive.

To guarantee my commitment to the privacy of any interview data and participant information, I used the standard University of Exeter Graduate School of Education consent form with the following privacy notice:

> Data Protection Act: The University of Exeter is a data collector and is registered with the Office of the Data Protection Commissioner as required to do under the Data Protection Act 1998. The information you provide will be used for research purposes and will be processed in accordance with the University's registration and current data protection legislation. Data will be confidential to the researcher(s) and will not be disclosed to any unauthorised third parties without further agreement by the participant. Reports based on the data will be in anonymised form.

4.5   Teaching-only academics' self-representation on institutional Web spaces

As part of my study of teaching-only academics employed by the case institution, I investigated the academic identity and online self-projection of teaching-only academics working in the institution. The underlying goal for the study was to explore the extent to which the teaching-only role is taking root and establishing itself within higher education.

A person's career has both a personal and institutional dimension associated with it. For instance, Goffman (1963:127) suggests that a career can be regarded as a two-sided concept:

> One side is linked to internal matters held dearly and closely, such as image of self and felt identity; the other side concerns official positions, jural relations, and style of life and is part of a publicly acceptable institutional complex.

Consequently, a profession such as an academic career gives an individual a sense of who they are and a self-concept of their value as individuals. At the same time, an institution defines the value and status of that profession with regard to other job roles within the institution. This juxtaposition of the personal and the institutional within a job role suggests that within the social context of the institution, an individual can exhibit human agency in coping and managing their own professional identity. Hence, investigating the relationship between teaching-only academics and the research-intensive university will help to provide insights into the teaching-only academic profession.

Flowerdew and Wang (2015) take the view that identities are "social positions that individuals assume as they interact with others within communities by following certain rules and conventions, while at the same time exercising their agency through their individual linguistic choices." Taken in this regard, therefore, "an individual's identity is determined by a particular configuration of social context, and the appropriate identity in a given context will rise to the top of a hierarchy of possible identities" (Omoniyi 2011). Consequently, I adopted academic identity as a tool to investigate the teaching-only academic role within research-intensive institutions.

4.5.1 Linking the lived academic identity to virtual academic identity

Individuals tend to manage the impression they make on others by adopting appropriate self-presentational behaviours (Goffman 1959). Hyland (2011) has identified a link between text, both online and off-line, and its author's identity, thereby associating self-presentation, or self-definition, with identity. Mishler (1999) goes a step further, by proposing a definition of identity as a self-definition that is performed through social acts such as narrative. With regard to online texts, Döring (2002) has suggested that personal home pages give their authors the opportunity to systematically answer the identity-critical "Who am I" question (Döring 2002). They do this by flagging topics, stances and people regarded by the author as significant, thereby helping to project the author's virtual identity (Chandler 1998). Put another way, for personal homepage authors, the careful selection of what to include and what not to include in their home pages is an important way of projecting what they consider to be the desirable and intangible aspects of their identity (Schau and Gilly 2003). As

Erickson (1996) puts it, "a personal page is a carefully constructed portrayal of a person".

Academic personal homepages have become a ubiquitous feature of scholarly life. This ubiquity is underlined by the study of social networking practices of over half a million academics by Tang et al. (2007) which found that 71% of the academic researchers had at least one homepage. The information on an academic' personal homepage typically comprises biographical information, a curriculum vitae (CV), research interests and activities, a list of publications, talks, as well as teaching related material (Hyland 2011; Más-Bleda and Aguillo 2013; Thoms and Thelwall 2005). All of this information is specifically selected to assert the academic's professional credibility as well as the status of the employing institution (Hyland 2011). An academic personal homepage serves simultaneously to advertise the individual academic as well as the employing department and university (Hess 2002).

The information presented on academic personal homepages is basically the same, regardless of whether or not the homepage is created and hosted on the employing institution's web domain (Thoms and Thelwall 2005). This suggests that even when freed from institutional constraints, academics tend to stick to information related to an academic persona (Hyland 2011). This therefore confirms the view by Flowerdew and Wang (2015) that academic identities "are often constructed according to the conventions of specific communities of disciplinary practices", thereby suggesting that virtual identity may be consistent with an individual's lived academic identity. Consequently, a study of the online self-projection of teaching-only academics at the institution in question can help to shed light on their academic identity, which in turn helps to give us an understanding of their lived experiences within the institution.

4.5.2 Ethical considerations in researching academic personal homepages

The British Psychological Society Code of Human Research Ethics suggests that observational research on individuals without their informed consent may be acceptable in "public situations where those observed would expect to be observed by strangers" (The British Psychological Society 2010). This may apply to academic personal Web pages since they are set up for the purpose of sharing information with other people and may therefore be treated as public virtual spaces. As Schau and Gilly (2003) point out, "Personal Web sites are personal in that they present the self, but

they are public in that they are posted in a broadly accessible domain." In addition, academic web pages may also be viewed as web text (Bukvova 2011; Chandler 1998; Erickson 1996; Más-Bleda and Aguillo 2013; Thoms and Thelwall 2005). In this regard they can be treated as documentary research sources or cultural artefacts from which it is possible to extract information without informed consent (Wilkinson and Thelwall 2011). On the basis of these two reinforcing viewpoints, I have taken the position that web pages are public virtual spaces that can be analysed without seeking consent from their owners.

However, unlike off-line texts, web pages often contain personal information. Wilkinson and Thelwall (2011) suggest that web page data can be ethically researched as long as safeguards are taken to ensure that the web page authors are anonymous. The British Psychological Society Code of Human Research Ethics suggests that as researchers we have a responsibility to safeguard the privacy of research participants. This includes respecting confidentiality, and ensuring that individuals' personal data are appropriately anonymised and cannot be traced back to them by other parties.

For personal data to be anonymous, it has to exclude both direct and indirect identifiers (UK Data Archive n.d.). Direct identifiers include attributes such as names, addresses, postcode information, telephone numbers or pictures. On the other hand, indirect identifiers are attributes, which, when linked with other publicly available information sources, could identify someone. This includes information on workplace, occupation or exceptional values of characteristics like salary or age. Hence, for personal data to be anonymous, it has to be rendered into "a form that does not identify individuals and where identification through its combination with other data is not likely to take place" (UK Information Commissioner's Office 2012).

4.5.3 Method and Data

I studied the institutional personal homepages of teaching-only academics across all the major disciplines taught by the research-intensive university. Teaching-only academics at this research-intensive institution fall into three career grades. The first one is the teaching fellow grade, which is an entry level academic grade. This is followed by the senior teaching fellow grade, which is equivalent to the lecturer grade in the research-and-teaching academic job category. The third and most senior

teaching-only academic grade is the principal teaching fellow grade. This is equivalent to the senior lecturer grade in the research-and-teaching academic job category.

The first step that I carried out was to identify and collect data from institutional personal homepages owned by teaching-only academics across the university on a department by department basis. I carried out this task in the month of February 2015.

As of the end of February 2015, there were 151 personal homepages belonging to teaching-only academics. Fifteen of these belonged to principal teaching fellows, 42 to senior teaching fellows, and 94 to teaching fellows. Rather than categorising the teaching-only academics by department, I aggregated the individual disciplines roughly along faculty lines. This was partly to enhance the anonymity of the data as advocated by the UK Data Archive, and partly to make the data more manageable. Table 4.1 illustrates the distribution of teaching-only academic personal homepages by faculty grouping.

Table 4.1: Teaching-only academic homepages by faculty grouping and by career grade

Teaching-only Academic Grade	Faculty Grouping						Grade Total
	Academic Services	Arts and Humanities	Social and Historical Sciences	Engineering	Physical Sciences	Life Sciences	
Principal Teaching Fellow	2	0	0	7	2	4	15
Senior Teaching Fellow	4	3	10	20	0	5	42
Teaching Fellow	0	0	44	30	12	8	94
Faculty Grouping Total	6	3	54	57	14	17	151

4.5.4 Sampling of Personal Homepages

I adopted a stratified sampling approach whereby I sampled each of the three grades of teaching-only academics separately. I did this because I wanted to investigate similarities and differences within homepages in each grade, and to provide me with information to carry out comparisons across the three grades.

Since there were only 15 principal teaching fellow homepages, I analysed all of them. The senior teaching fellow academic homepages were considerably more than those of the principal teaching fellows. As a result, I randomly sampled and analysed 70% of them. However, owing to the high degree of similarity in the senior teaching fellow profiles of the Academic Services grouping, I randomly chose only one of the available four homepages. The teaching fellow grade had the highest number of available homepages, so from each academic department, I randomly sampled and analysed at least 50% of the available homepages. This was with the exception of the Social and Historical Sciences faculty grouping where I reduced the sampling ratio to 30% as a result of the high similarity exhibited by the homepage profiles. This similarity is largely down to the nature of the senior teaching fellow role, where they are generally expected to teach and to lead on course modules, as well as to engage in student-facing activities such as pastoral support.

Table 4.2: Sampled teaching-only academic homepages by faculty grouping and by career grade

Teaching-only Academic Grade	Faculty Grouping						Grade Total
	Academic Services	Arts and Humanities	Social and Historical Sciences	Engineering	Physical Sciences	Life Sciences	
Principal Teaching Fellow	2	0	0	7	2	4	15
Senior Teaching Fellow	1	2	7	14	0	3	27
Teaching Fellow	0	0	14	13	6	5	38
Faculty Grouping Total	3	2	21	34	8	12	80

4.6   Life-history research

In this study I have adopted the life-history approach to gain insights into the career histories of the participants. The life-history approach seeks to find answers to some or all of the following questions (Goodson and Sikes 2001:1):

> Who are you? What are you? Why do you think, believe, do, make sense of the world and the things that happen to you, as you do? Why have these particular things happened to you? Why has your life taken the course that it has taken? Where is it likely to go? What is your total experience like in relation to the experiences of other people? What are the differences and similarities? How does your life articulate with those of others within the various social worlds you inhabit? What are the influences on your life and what influence and impact do you have? What is the meaning of life? How do you story your life? Why do you story it in this way? What resources do you employ in assembling your life?

Chase (2007) defines life-history as "an extensive autobiographical narrative, in either oral or written form, that covers all or most of a life." Hence, life-history study can be viewed as a form of narrative research.

 Trahar (2009) suggests that narrative research, or narrative enquiry, is based on "the premise that as human beings we come to understand and give meaning to our lives through story." According to Clandinin (2006b) human beings "both live and tell stories about their living." It is through living, telling and talking about these stories that "we create meaning in our lives as well as ways we enlist each other's help in building our lives and communities" (Clandinin 2006b). In narrative analysis, the focus is not on the factual accuracy of the story, but on the meaning it has for the story-teller (Dhunpath 2000). Hence, through narrative, we can discern how people live and act in a given setting, and the particular nature of the happenings that they experience can help to shed light on their beliefs, desires, theories and values (Bruner 1991).

Narrative enquiry has been used previously by other researchers to explore identity. For instance, Mishler (1999) has applied narrative enquiry to the investigation of identity formation in the lives and work experiences of craft artists. Mishler views narratives as social acts that enable us to perform our identity through speaking.

According to Mishler, personal agency is revealed by the way a person selects and organises language resources to tell a story in a particular way that fits the occasion, the person's intentions, the intended audience as well as the social context. Consequently it becomes possible to learn about identities from the shape and contents of narratives (Mishler 1999).

Clandinin (2006a) and her research team have also used narrative enquiry to make sense of the lives of the children, administrators, teachers and families at a North American school. With respect to teachers, they discovered that the stories they narrated about their professional knowledge and work environment were intimately woven into their stories of "who they were and who they were becoming" (Clandinin 2006a:8). They suggested that these stories could be viewed as the stories teachers lived and told. Consequently, they defined these teacher narratives as "stories to live by."

4.6.1 Why I Adopted the Life-history Approach in this Study

There are three reasons which convinced me to adopt the life-history approach in my study. The first reason is that the approach has been found to be ideal for shedding light on the "interactive relationship between individuals' lives, their perceptions and experiences, and historical and social contexts and events" (Goodson and Sikes 2001:2). By studying an individual's life alongside the historical and social contexts intersecting with that individual's life, it is possible to gain an understanding of the choices, contingencies and options that were available to that individual, both in the past, and in the present (Goodson 2008).

The life-history approach also helps to bring to light the key events in an individual's life which leads the individual to take major decisions and actions that shape the individual's life going forward. These events are referred to as critical incidents, and they are a "useful area to study, because they reveal, like a flashbulb, the major choice and change times in people's lives" (Measor 1985). In the life-history study of teaching-only academics, critical incidents may include the events surrounding the individual's decision to embark on an academic career, and the specific events relating to the individual's entry into a teaching-only academic role. Such events may be personal, as in the case where a married participant gets a divorce and is forced to leave full-time employment and to take a part-time academic role so as to have sufficient time

to look after the family as a single parent. Critical events may also be professional, as in the case when an academic chooses to go onto the teaching-only academic route following a discussion with the head of department regarding missed research targets.

The second reason is that the life-history approach gives the researcher an opportunity to explore participants' identify formation within their careers. As Goodson and Sikes (2001:2) suggest, the life-history approach can "show how individuals negotiate their identities and, consequently, experience, create and make sense of the rules and roles of the social worlds in which they live." Mishler (1999) suggests that identity is best viewed as a collective term referring to the dynamic organisation of relatively distinct and autonomous axes of self-definition (or sub-identities) that may or may not be in conflict with each other. Mishler also suggests that identity formation should be viewed as a continuous process and emphasises the importance of disjunctions and discontinuities in lifetime work trajectories to identity formation. As part of this study I will seek to identify the continuities and discontinuities in the lifetime work trajectories of the study participants and relate them to the individual, institutional and external environmental factors at play within research-intensive institutions.

The third reason why I adopted the life-history approach is that it gives one the opportunity to explore the role and extent of agency and structure in the development of the teaching-only academic role. Put another way, the life-history approach gives us a perception of how the intersection of institutional and individual experiences in a person's life are reflected in the person's current motives and practices (Dhunpath 2000). The life-history approach therefore ties in with the Bourdieusian analytical framework that I have adopted in this study. From a structural viewpoint, Bogdan (1974:4) suggests that life-history enables us "to see an individual in relation to the history of his time, and how he is influenced by the various religious, social, psychological and economic currents present in his world."

Moreover, by studying a person's life over an extended period, one also gains insights into the process by which teaching-only academics come to term with their roles in the academic world. This includes coming to terms with the "the constraints and conditions in which they work, and how these relate to the wider social structure" (Goodson 2008:34-35). Faraday and Plummer (1979:773-795) underscore the close match between the life-history approach and the Bourdisean analytical framework when they

suggest that the life-history approach is ideal for "… generating concepts, hunches and ideas, both at the local and situational level and on a historical structural level and within the same field and in relationship to other fields."

Personal dispositions, or habitus, acquired over the life course have the potential to influence career decisions and trajectories. For instance, studies of early-career teachers by Achinstein et al. (2004) suggests that teachers' personal backgrounds shape their worldviews, and have an influence on their choices of where and how to pursue pre-professional preparation, as well as where to work. A possible explanation for this is that an individual's habitus is not a static structure, but a "multilayered and dynamic set of schemata that records, stores, and prolongs the influence of the diverse environments successively traversed during one's existence" (Wacquant 2016:68).

Life history can therefore serve as a tool for revealing the development of personal dispositions over an individual's career trajectory. Steensen (2009) concurs with this assertion by suggesting that sociocultural/economic background and life history contribute in creating a specific identity and disposition towards the teaching profession. Her conclusion follows an analysis of the life histories of selected student teachers in conjunction with the empirically observable utterances, feelings and actions that they made with regard to their future teaching career.

The teaching-only academics in my study come from various academic and career backgrounds, with some coming into the role following PhD studies, some moving into the role as late-career changers from roles in industry, and with some opting to teach on a part-time basis whilst maintaining their professional roles in industry. As part of this study I used life-history research to explore how their socio-cultural backgrounds and career trajectories shaped the dispositions they brought into the teaching-only academic role, and how this, in turn, shaped their perceptions of the role, as well as their own professional identity.

4.6.2 Research participants for the life-history study

My intention in this case study was to focus on teaching-only academics who have successfully moved up the teaching-only academic hierarchy to reach the principal teaching fellow grade, which, at the time of the interviews, was the highest grade that teaching-only academics could attain in this university. Such individuals are likely to have been involved in higher education for a considerable period, hence they would

be able to shed light on the development of the teaching-only academic role over time. A number of them may have been with the institution for a considerable period of time, beginning as junior academics and rising to the principal teaching role over time. They would therefore have more indepth first-hand experience of what it means to be a teaching-only academic in the university across a wider range of academic levels. In addition, most of the principal teaching fellows have considerable managerial responsibility for teaching within their departments. Being in such a position would enable them to gain insights into the relationship between teaching and research, and into the departmental and institutional beliefs on the role of teaching in research-intensive universities.

At the time of the research, there were twelve principal teaching fellows in the engineering faculty. In terms of gender, this population was more or less evenly balanced, with seven of them being female and five being male. The gender balance of this group is consistent with the gender proportion of teaching-only academics in the UK, and in contrast to the gender proportion amongst research-and-teaching academics in the UK which is biased towards men (HESA 2016). This gender composition is also in line with published research which suggests that UK higher education tends to consign women to teaching-only academic roles as opposed to the more highly regarded research-and-teaching role (Barrett et al. 2011; O'Brien and Hapgood 2012; Thornton 2013).

Nine of them were programme directors on one or more undergraduate courses, with primary responsibility for the content and structure of their degree programmes, and for all the teaching on the programme. Two had overall responsibility for all the undergraduate teaching within their departments, and one had responsibility for an entire suite of master level degree programmes. Invitation letters to participate in the research were sent out to all the twelve principal teaching fellows. Since there were only twelve principal teaching fellows, I felt that this number was small enough to conduct a detailed narrative enquiry on each of them, whilst enabling me to assess any variation and to make comparisons across all their experiences.

Of the twelve principal teaching fellows, seven agreed to participate in the research. This number, in my opinion, was large enough to capture a substantial range of experiences across the principal teaching fellow role within the department. Of the

seven participants, three were male and four were female. At the time of the interviews, the youngest participant was 33 years old, and the oldest participant was 68 years old. Three were aged under 40 years, and the other four were all above 55.

4.6.3 Interview method used in the research

Mishler (1991) suggests that "an interview is a joint production of what interviewees and interviewers talk about together and how they talk to each other." This implies that an interviewee's responses may be affected by the interviewer's style of questioning, and how the interviewer responds to the interviewee's answers. The responses of interviewees may also be affected by power differentials between the interviewer and interviewee, and their assumptions of what the interviewer may be looking for in the interview. Mishler therefore suggests that the structure and context of the interview may hinder or facilitate an interviewee's efforts to construct meaning from their experiences.

Interviews therefore need to be structured and conducted in such a way that they enable interviewees to "perceive, organize, give meaning to, and express their understandings of themselves, their experiences and their worlds" (Mishler 1991: preface pp. ix). One approach, which I adopted as my interview style in this study, is the conversational interview style in which the interviewees are free to use narrative in their responses (Goodson and Sikes 2001). This approach is ideal because, as human beings, we naturally "… tell stories about our life and our 'self', or rather our 'selves', as a sort of reflective interpretative device, with a view to understanding who and what we are and the things that happen to us" (Goodson and Sikes 2001:41). My study methodology can therefore be described as consisting primarily of narrative enquiry carried out within a life-history context.

For the one-to-one interview-conversation method to be effective, the researcher has to allow the participant to narrate their stories as freely as possible, with as few interjections as possible.   To this end, Goodson and Sikes (2001:28) suggest that these interviews should be "relatively unstructured, informal, conversation-type encounters." As a general guideline, in this study I have followed Goodson's rule for life-history interviews (Goodson 2008):

> The **more** we prescribe our questions, the **more** we structure our
> enquiries, the **less** we learn (*emphasis in the original text*).

4.6.4 Ethical considerations for the life-history study

According to Gilbert (2008), ethics is a "matter of principled sensitivity to the rights of others" in which researchers have to take account of the effects of their actions upon the participants in their research and act in such a way as to preserve their rights and integrity as human beings. At a minimum, therefore, I ensured that my study should comply with the ethical guidelines for educational research issued by the British Educational Research Association (2011). I did this firstly by safeguarding the rights of my fellow study participants through seeking their informed consent to carry out this study. I also safeguarded their personal privacy and the confidentiality of their personal data by using pseudonyms instead of their actual names. In addition, I also adopted an appropriate pseudonym for the case university.

However, the use of pseudonyms is unlikely to be foolproof given the fact that the life-history approach involves the creation of rich detailed descriptions of participants, their history, and their social activities. Consequently, once the research is published into the public domain, it is quite possible for participants, and others outside the pool of participants, to identify themselves and each other by means of these detailed descriptions. For instance when Stein published her ethnographic study of a small town divided by a local ballot initiative against gay/lesbian civil rights (Stein 2001), the research participants easily identified each other and reacted negatively to the information Stein had collected and written about them (Stein 2010). Similarly, Carolyn Ellis (2007) reports that when she published her ethnography on two isolated fishing communities living in Fishneck, Virginia (Ellis 1986), she received hostile reactions from the study participants.

To further protect the confidentiality of my research participants I followed Muchmore (2002) who, in deciding what sort of personal information to include or exclude for each participant, was guided by the Kantian tenet that "we should treat people as ends in themselves, never as merely the means to an end" (Kant 1785/1959). To this end, and in line with Muchmore (2002), I made a decision to leave out any potentially embarrassing personal information. In addition, I also excluded any personal information that a participant did not wish to be published.

To guard against an inadvertent backlash from my study participants, I showed drafts of the study report to each of the participants to ensure that any reference to each of

the participants is correctly ascribed. I also provided my research participants with a copy of the British Educational Research Association ethical guidelines to enable them to see for themselves the extent to which the study complied with the guideline. In addition, I also ensured that all the participants in this project had read and signed the University of Exeter Graduate School of Education consent form, a copy of which I have included in the appendices to this dissertation.

Given my insider status, there was a possibility that some potential participants would be reluctant to participate in the project because of confidentiality concerns. To allay these fears, I also applied for ethical approval from the host institution. However, this was not deemed necessary by the host institution as they felt that the ethical and confidentiality guidelines and procedures of the University of Exeter adequately addressed their concerns. Notwithstanding this, I emphasised to each participant their right to withdraw from the project at any time, and guaranteed non-use of their data should this occur.

4.6.5 Coding and analysis of interview data

In this study I was interested in tracing out each participant's career trajectory, including all its relevant nuances and possible critical points. To capture this information, I created biographical profiles for all the seven interview participants. This was informed by the suggestion by Seidman (2006) that a biographical profile "… allows us to present the participant in context, to clarify his or her intentions, and to convey a sense of process and time, all central components of qualitative analysis."

I used Seidman's (2006) sequential method to come up with the biographical profiles. For each participant, this basically meant identifying and selecting all the passages from the interview transcript that I felt were important in telling the participant's story. I then used these to create a narrative using, as far as possible, the participant's own words and I wrote this narrative in the first person. I also numbered each line of text in each biographical profile to enable me to reference any line of text. To protect the identity of each participant, I used pseudonyms and changed the names of all the organisations, places and individuals that each participant had been involved with during their career.

I was also interested in carrying out horizontal comparisons across the career trajectories of all the participants. To do so, I carried out thematic analysis of all the

seven biographical profiles. Thematic analysis is well suited to identifying, analysing and reporting patterns, or themes, within data (Braun and Clarke 2006). According to Braun and Clarke (2006), "a theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set."

Braun and Clarke suggest that thematic analysis may be data-driven, whereby themes are deduced from the data without necessarily fitting them into a pre-existing coding frame or the researcher's analytic preconception. Alternately, thematic analysis can be theoretically focussed, whereby the themes that are coded are only those ones that fit in with the study's research question. For this research, I chose the latter approach by using as a guiding framework, the research questions that I developed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation.

For each research question, I read all the seven biographical profiles, identifying potential themes that were compatible with the research question. For each thematic code I also included the specific segments from each biographical profile that corresponded to the code. I tagged each segment with its line numbers from the biographical profile in question. This enabled me to link each thematic code to specific sections of the biographical profiles. Following an iterative process, I re-read each biographical profile, merging and renaming some of the codes as I went along. Simultaneously, I also began to identify and document all the themes emerging from the research. Hence, iteratively, I discovered and compiled the emerging thematic connections within each biographical profile and across all the profiles.

4.7   Reflection on life-history interviews, coding and analysis

As I have pointed out earlier in this methods chapter, my claim to being an insider researcher rests on the fact that I belong to the same faculty, namely the faculty of engineering, and to the same academic job family, namely the teaching-only role, as all the seven research participants whom I interviewed in this study. Prior to the interviews, I had met with five of them in the periodic education-related meetings that we routinely attend as part and parcel of our role in the faculty. However, apart from these professional meetings and the occasional email exchanges, I had no personal relationship with any of them. Nevertheless, as teaching-only academics within the same faculty we all felt that we were members of the same community (Asselin 2003;

Mercer 2007), and this made it easier for them to freely share their experiences with me, something that might not have been possible had I been a complete stranger to them (Dwyer and Buckle 2009; Müller and Kenney 2014). This therefore helped to facilitate a relatively unstructured, conversational interview approach (Goodson and Sikes 2001) which helped me to create a detailed dataset. Like Loveday (2017), to maintain the natural flow of the conversations, I also took part by sharing my own position and experiences when asked, as this excerpt shows:

[Me]: That's an important question, you enjoy teaching but …

 PTF4: … I know how you go from the academic route to the
teaching route, how do you go the other way?

[Me]: You are ordered. That's another question, is it possible to go
back, is it possible to go back?

PTF4: But is your interest in teaching, or you are there because
that's what was available?

[Me]: For me I see myself as a teacher, because when I finished
my PhD I was 39 I thought research was past me, anyway I
had never researched in my life apart from the PhD. I enjoy
what I am doing, and my kind of research is more to talk to
guys like you, more to focus on practice, more to improve the
link between practice and undergraduate education, perhaps
if you have a dedicated master's programme.

However, from my experience on the taught part of the Ed.D programme, and from the literature, I was aware that as an insider my own personal experiences could lead to bias and myopia on my part as an interviewer (Dwyer and Buckle 2009; Mercer 2007). As a means of countering this, I adopted a reflexive approach on my role throughout the whole research process, including during the interviews (Bourdieu 2003; Greene 2014). For instance, during the interview process I consistently made use of follow-up questions, even for those aspects that we felt were familiar to both of us, as I illustrate in this interview excerpt:

[Me]: So if you compare before and after like when you were
switched were there any differences?

PTF1: One - S28 you know the protection the lecturers have?

[Me]: I have heard of that.

PTF1: I think it is S8 or whatever it is called section 8. I lost that. They won't give that to teaching fellows. … so academics don't get fired, teaching fellows do.

[Me]: So for teaching fellows it's just your 3 months you are gone?

PTF1: If you are a lecturer they can't do it, not once you have passed probation and all that. It's a way of giving you tenure without giving you tenure and academics have still got it.

[Me]: Even incoming academics?

PTF1: I believe so. They haven't changed it, I don't think, and they tried to, but I don't think it went through, I don't know …

I was also aware that as an insider, my own personal viewpoints have an effect on the constructions, interpretations and viewpoints arising out of this research (Walsham 2006; Webb et al. 2002). To ensure that the voices of the research participants were not drowned out by my own voice as a researcher, I gave the research participants an opportunity to review their interview transcripts as well as their life-history profiles that I developed from the transcripts. In addition to clarifying areas of the interview recordings that were difficult to decipher, this approach also ensured that the resulting interview transcripts and profiles broadly captured the views intended by each of the research participants.

As suggested by Roberts et al. (2006:42), each qualitative researcher should address the question: 'How can I assure the user of my work that it is trustworthy?' This is particularly important for insider research like my own study where the researcher is closely linked to, or is an integral part of, the community being researched. Trustworthiness can be improved by ensuring that the research design and conduct, including inference processes used to arrive at findings are all transparently presented (Lewis and Ritchie 2003). To ensure transparency in my research design and methods, I have prepared detailed documentation that captures all stages of my research process, including documentation of all the decisions that I have made at

various stages of the research process. This includes my ethics application to the University of Exeter, which appears in the appendices, communications with research participants, and records of meetings with my research supervisors. In addition, my supervisors also served as an independent panel of researchers who kept track and scrutinised my research conduct, including interrogating and evaluating my interpretation of the research data.

Chapter 5: Teaching-only academic self-representation on institutional web spaces

In this section I report on my analysis of the institutional personal homepages of teaching-only academics at the case institution. I grouped the teaching-only academics in accordance with the three career grades then available for the role at the institution, namely the teaching fellow grade, which is an entry level grade, followed by the senior teaching fellow grade, which is equivalent to the lecturer grade in the research-and-teaching academic job category, and lastly the principal teaching fellow grade, which is equivalent to the senior lecturer grade in the research-and-teaching academic job category. I used the following topics to categorise the web-page data:

- Roles prior to current job
- Academic and teaching related qualifications
- Current responsibilities
- Research and scholarly engagement.

5.1   Analysis of principal teaching fellow homepages

All the fifteen principal teaching fellows are from engineering and the built environment, physical sciences and life sciences, with none from the humanities and social sciences. Four of the principal teaching fellows are female, implying that females make up 26.7% of the principal teaching fellows in the university with academic homepages.

5.1.1 Roles prior to principal teaching fellow job

Twelve of the fifteen principal teaching fellows indicate their previous roles on their personal websites. Two got into the principal teaching fellow grade through promotion from the senior teaching fellow grade. Another four got into the grade from senior research-and-teaching academic roles within the university, including one who holds a professorial title despite the principal teaching fellow grade being in a non-professorial grade. One person got appointed to the grade from a research-only role. The remaining five principal teaching fellows have a practitioner background. Of these five, three now hold full-time positions within the institution, whilst two are still active in industry and commerce, and are engaged by the institution on a part-time basis.

Table 5.1: Categorisation of principal teaching fellows by their previous roles

Previous Role	Practitioner	Teaching-only role		Lectureships in other institutions			Research-only role within institution
		The institution	Other higher education institutions	UK research-intensive	UK teaching intensive	Non UK institution	
Number	5	2	0	4	0	0	1

5.1.2 Academic and teaching related qualifications

Regarding academic qualifications, twelve are educated to PhD level, with the remaining three holding master level qualifications. In contrast, only seven hold additional teaching-related qualifications such as teaching fellowships from the Higher Education Academy or postgraduate diplomas in learning and teaching. This would seem to underscore the subordination of teaching credentials to research, even within the teaching-only academic role.

5.1.3 Current responsibilities

Nine of the fifteen principal teaching fellows have programme-level responsibilities for teaching. This is consistent with the fact that at the time of the study, the principal teaching fellow grade is the highest level that can be attained by a teaching-only academic in this institution.

Turning to the six principal teaching fellows who have no programme-level responsibilities, two are employed on a part-time basis and hold director-level positions within their own organisations. Given that the principal teaching fellow level is the highest possible teaching-only academic grade within the institution, the offer of teaching-only part-time roles at this level to these professionals would indicate tacit recognition of their seniority by the institution.

Three of the four principal teaching fellows without any programme-level responsibilities moved into the grade from other academic roles within the institution. One was previously a professor who used to lead a research group, another was a senior lecturer, whilst the third was a senior researcher. This therefore suggests a direct transfer of senior academics from research-only and research-and-teaching roles to the most senior level in the teaching-only academic role.

Table 5.2: Categorisation of principal teaching fellows by assigned responsibility

Responsibilities	Programme-level teaching administration	Part-time university teaching role plus senior management role in Industry	Non-specified
Number	9	2	4

5.1.4 Research and scholarly engagement

The level of scholarly engagement of this cohort of teaching-only academics is relatively small. Three principal teaching fellows, i.e. 20% of the cohort, report being involved in discipline-specific research, and two, i.e. 13% of the cohort, report being involved in scholarly, or learning and teaching, research.

Of the fifteen academics, only one reports securing external funding for either teaching scholarship or discipline-based research activities. Similarly, only five report achieving five or more refereed publications within the past five years. The cohort's self-reported involvement in discipline activities is also limited. For instance, only two principal teaching fellows report being external examiners at other institutions. Similarly, only two individuals report significant involvement with their learned societies. This is in contrast to the research-and-teaching academic role where external engagement is generally expected of senior academics.

5.2 Analysis of senior teaching fellow homepages

I analysed the institutional personal homepages of twenty-seven senior teaching fellows. Of these, twenty senior teaching fellows reported the dates they entered into the teaching-only role. Eight joined the university between 1990 and 1999, four between 2000 and 2009, and eight between 2010 and 2015.

Of the twenty-seven senior teaching fellows, eight are female, implying that females make up 29.6% of the senior teaching fellows in this study. Twenty senior teaching fellows are from engineering and the built environment, physical sciences and life sciences, with the remaining seven coming from the humanities and social and historical sciences.

5.2.1 Roles prior to senior teaching fellow job

Of the twenty-seven senior teaching fellows, nineteen indicated their previous roles, and these are outlined in Table 5.3. As indicated in the table, practitioners in industry

and commerce and lecturers from other higher education institutions comprised the highest category of entrants into the senior teaching fellow job, with 6 individuals each. Of the six former lecturers, one is from a UK-based research-intensive institution, two are from non-UK institutions and three are from UK teaching intensive institutions. Of those who were previously teaching fellows, three came from other UK research-intensive institutions, and two had progressed from the teaching fellow job within the institution. Two individuals had progressed from research-only roles within the institution, and none had transferred from lectureships within the institution.

Table 5.3: Categorisation of senior teaching fellow interviewees by their previous roles

Previous Role	Practitioner	Teaching-only role		Lectureships in other institutions			Research-only role within institution
		The institution	Other higher education institutions	UK research-intensive	UK teaching intensive	Non UK institution	
Number	6	2	3	1	3	2	2

5.2.2 Academic and teaching related qualifications

Of the 26 senior teaching fellows reporting their academic qualifications, sixteen are educated to PhD level, eight to master level, and two to bachelor level. Only four of the senior teaching fellows report that they have teaching-related qualifications such as teaching fellow recognition from the Higher Education Academy or postgraduate diplomas in learning and teaching. Again, this would seem to underscore the subordination of teaching credentials to research, even within the teaching-only academic role.

5.2.3 Current responsibilities

As shown in Table 5.4, eighteen of the 27 senior teaching fellows held teaching administrative responsibilities which included programme management, coordination of multiple modules, or coordination of faculty-wide modules. Of the remaining nine, six were primarily involved in discipline-specific research, whilst three did not indicate any assigned responsibilities.

Table 5.4: Categorisation of senior teaching fellow interviewees by assigned responsibility

Responsibilities	Teaching administration	Research role	Non-specified
Number	18	6	3

5.2.4 Research and scholarly engagement

The level of scholarly engagement of this cohort of teaching-only academics is relatively small. Fourteen senior teaching fellows, i.e. 52% of the cohort, report being involved in discipline-specific research. This contrasts to seven, i.e. 26% of the cohort, reporting being involved in learning and teaching research. With regard to securing research funding, only one senior teaching fellow reports having secured a research grant in the past five years, and only two report having secured funding for teaching-related activities. Eight of the senior teaching fellows report having five or more refereed conference papers in discipline-based research, and only three have five or more refereed learning and teaching scholarly publications.

The cohort's self-reported involvement in discipline activities other than research is also limited. Of the twenty-seven senior teaching fellows, ten report having national recognition as leaders or experts in their research disciplines. This includes three who are recognised by the national media as subject experts, three who are on the editorial boards of journals, two who are noted leaders in their discipline learned societies and two who have been invited to be keynote speakers at one or more conferences.

With regard to learning and teaching external engagements, five are visiting professors at other higher education institutions, five have been keynote speakers at learning and teaching conferences, and two are currently serving as external examiners at other institutions. Again, given the seniority of the senior teaching fellow level, this level of external engagement would appear to be limited when compared to that of research-and-teaching academics at the equivalent grade to the senior teaching fellow grade.

5.3 Analysis of teaching fellow homepages

I analysed the institutional personal websites of thirty-eight teaching fellows. Twenty-four of them stated on their homepages that they had entered into the teaching fellow grade within the past five years, whilst two reported entering into the grade between 2004 and 2009. Another two specified their status as temporary or visiting and did not specify their engagement dates.

Of the thirty-eight teaching fellows, nineteen, i.e. 50% of the cohort, are female. Twenty-five teaching fellows, i.e. 66% of the cohort, are from engineering and the built environment, physical sciences and life sciences. The remaining thirteen are from the humanities and social and historical sciences.

5.3.1 Roles prior to the teaching fellow job

Of the thirty-eight teaching fellows, thirty-four indicated their previous roles, and these are outlined in Table 5.5. Direct entries from PhD studies constitute the highest number of people entering into the teaching fellow grade. This is followed by early career research-and-teaching academics from lectureships from other institutions as well as those in research-only positions from within the university and from other institutions. Three current PhD students are also engaged as teaching fellows. Only two teaching fellows are from a practitioner background, and only one was previously employed in a teaching-only academic role at another institution.

Table 5.5: Categorisation of teaching fellow interviewees by previous role

Previous Role	Direct from PhD Studies	Currently on PhD studies	Research-only positions	Practitioners	Lecturer at the institution	Lecturers at other higher education institutions	Teaching-only roles at other higher education institutions
Number	16	3	5	2	1	6	1

5.3.2 Academic and teaching related qualifications

Of the 35 teaching fellows reporting their academic qualifications, 30 are educated to PhD level, three are working towards their PhDs, and two are educated to master level.

Only three of the thirty-eight teaching fellows report that they have teaching-related qualifications such as teaching fellow recognition from the Higher Education Academy or postgraduate diplomas in learning and teaching. Again, this is consistent with the dearth of teaching credentials at both the senior and principal teaching fellow levels. Given that this is primarily a teaching role, this would seem to confirm the low status accorded to teaching, even within the teaching-only academic role.

5.3.3 Current responsibilities

Only eight teaching fellows, i.e. 21% of the cohort, hold teaching administrative responsibilities such as programme management, coordination of modules, and departmental tutor roles. Such a low percentage of teaching fellows with administrative responsibilities is consistent with the fact that this is an entry level position. Two other teaching fellows have research leadership roles, with one being responsible for a cross-institutional research project and another sitting on the editorial board of a learned journal published by their department. This would suggest that some individuals within the role still engage with research activities within their disciplines, despite being on the teaching-only track.

5.3.4 Research and scholarly engagement

Twenty-three teaching fellows, i.e. 61% of the cohort, report being involved in discipline-specific research, and only two, i.e. 5% of the cohort, report being involved in learning and teaching scholarship. With regard to securing research funding, only two report to having secured funding, and this is with regard to teaching-related activities. Twelve of the teaching fellows report having five or more refereed conference papers in discipline-based research, and only one has a refereed learning and teaching scholarly publication.

The teaching fellow level's involvement in discipline activities is also limited. Five teaching fellows report having national recognition as leaders or experts in their research disciplines. This includes two who are recognised by the national media as subject experts, one on a journal's editorial board, one who has been a co-chair at a conference, and another one who has been a keynote speaker at a conference. With regard to learning and teaching external engagements, only one is an external examiner, whilst another has contributed to lecture material for his discipline's learned

society. Although this low level of external engagement is consistent with the entry level nature of the position, it is also consistent with the general low level of external engagement at senior and principal teaching fellow level.

5.4   Discussion

A striking feature emerging from this study is that across all three levels, the teaching-only academic role is biased more towards engineering and the built environment, physical sciences and life sciences than it is towards the humanities and social and historical sciences. This bias is more pronounced at the principal teaching level and less so at the teaching fellow level. Such a bias may suggest that the teaching-only academic category is more firmly established in the more vocationally and lab-oriented disciplines than in the humanities and social sciences. However, it may also indicate that within the arts and humanities there is little or no scope for the teaching-only academic role beyond the entry teaching fellow level.

There also appears to be significant differences in the career trajectories of teaching-only academics in the three teaching-only academic levels. At the principal teaching fellow level, post holders are drawn almost exclusively from within the institution and from outside academia, with no one having been recruited from other higher education institutions. The first aspect may be due to the fact that in 2006, when Elite Southern University introduced the teaching-only academic route, all non-research active academics at the senior lecturer grade or above were transferred to the principal teaching fellow grade. Secondly, this may also indicate that given the relatively low salaries in higher education, the institution may be using the principal teaching fellow grade to attract appropriately experienced professionals into university teaching.

None of the senior teaching fellows, and only one of the teaching fellows, had progressed into the role from research-and-teaching academic positions within the institution. This is due to the fact that after 2006, the institution has transferred research-inactive academics from the research-and-teaching academic role to the teaching-only role at a much lower rate. In addition, there are significant numbers of senior teaching fellows and teaching fellows who have been hired from other universities. These two aspects suggest that Elite Southern University may now be recruiting individuals into the teaching-only academic role based on the strength of

their teaching expertise as opposed to using the role simply as a destination for underperforming academic researchers.

Again, the data emerging from this study of these personal homepages suggests that a significant number of teaching-only academics recruited from other higher education institutions were already in teaching-only or teaching-focussed roles prior to coming to Elite Southern University. This suggests the emergency of increased cross-institutional mobility for the teaching-only academic role, which, in turn, suggest that the role is increasingly gaining acceptance as a distinct academic career route across the entire higher education sector.

At both the principal and senior teaching fellow grades there are significant numbers of entrants from industry and commerce. This suggests that Elite Southern University also hires individuals with professional experience to undertake teaching. Such hiring decisions are increasingly common across the higher education sector as institutions seek to stem the decline in the number of research-and-teaching academics with the necessary professional experience needed to effectively deliver undergraduate programmes caused by the increased prioritisation of research skills that meet RAE/REF requirements (Graham 2015; Tennant et al. 2015).

As expected, the core activity for the majority of teaching fellows across all the three levels is teaching and its administration. However, there is a small but significant minority of teaching fellows whose stated primary role is research. For instance, in the study sample, six senior teaching fellows and two teaching fellows list research as their primary role, whilst at principal teaching fellow level, two of the four people with no teaching administration responsibilities are from research-focussed roles within the institution. Given that research-only academics tend to be hired on a project by project basis, this may indicate that some managers may be using the role to retain active researchers who may not be having a currently active project.

With regard to gender bias, at the teaching fellow level, there is gender parity, with women constituting 50% of the study cohort. However, the proportion of women drops to 29.6% at senior teaching fellow level and to 26.7% at principal teaching fellow level. This decline in gender parity at the higher career levels of the role seems to be consistent with the findings from the literature that the university is a gendered space

which privileges men over women (Clegg 2008; Marchant and Wallace 2013; Thornton 2013). These figures are also consistent with the 2012-2013 UK national higher education statistics on gender whereby women constitute 52% of all teaching-only academics, as opposed to 40% for the teaching and research academic role (HESA 2014).

Across all the three levels, reported involvement in discipline-specific research is higher than that reported for the scholarship of teaching. A study of homepages belonging to academic psychologists' by Dumont and Frindte (2005) also found that the information on academics' homepages is "heavily weighted towards result-oriented research activities and publications", with only a limited amount of teaching-related information. Again, with respect to reported external engagements, at all levels, teaching-only academics are more likely to report on engagements that focus on discipline research than reporting on teaching-focussed external engagements. This bias towards research-focussed engagements is highest at the entry teaching fellow level. This data therefore suggests that teaching-only academics are more likely to emphasise research outputs and activities in their homepages.

The increased emphasis on research outputs and activities at the entry level grade may suggest that an increasing number of individuals are progressing into the role from postgraduate studies or postdoctoral contracts. Such an emphasis would also seem to confirm that academics tend to give greater publicity to those activities and outputs that are rewarded by the academic system (Dumont and Frindte 2005), which, in this case, is research. Alternately, since disciplines tend to prioritise research over teaching, this may suggest the enduring role of the disciplines in shaping the identity, academic beliefs and perceptions of individual academics, regardless of the role that they are engaged in (Brennan et al. 2007; Henkel 1997; Henkel 2005).

The tendency to prioritise research over teaching by early-stage teaching-only academics coming into the role via the doctoral route is consistent with the findings from a study of PhD students in Canada which suggests that during the course of their training, PhD students develop research-oriented, academic habituses which predispose them towards academic careers, and this predisposition increases as the students advance in their doctoral studies (Gemme and Gingras 2012) .This is also consistent with research findings which suggest that in the UK, 63% of research

students intending to go into an academic career are primarily motivated by research, and only 30% per cent express a strong interest in teaching (Metcalf et al. 2005).

Compared to research, achievements in teaching, in the form of national and institutional awards and recognition, are reported to a significantly lower extent. This is despite the fact that this is a teaching-focussed role. Non reportage of such teaching achievements may be due to the fact that none of the teaching-only academics has achieved them yet, which would be highly unlikely, or that the teaching-only academics do not see them as worthy of reporting. Assuming that the second alternative is the more likely, this would seem to reinforce the low status ascribed to teaching, even by teaching-only and teaching-focussed academics for whom teaching is the primary activity (Nyamapfene 2014; Skelton 2012b). Given that research has pre-eminence in research-intensive institutions, this may also imply that teaching-only academics, as Goffman(1959:23) observed of other professionals, tend to "incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society", regardless of their other roles and duties.

5.5 Concluding remarks

An attempt has been made to shed light on the perceptions that teaching-only academics at a research-intensive higher education institution in the UK have on their role, as well as how they project themselves to the outside world. This has been done by analysing the contents of their institutional personal homepages. Identity theories pertaining to academic discourse, as well as theories on self-presentation, have been used to guide the analysis.

A key finding from this research is that the role is largely non-homogeneous, comprising as it does individuals from different backgrounds with different perceptions of the role. The study also highlights the clear determination by the majority of the individuals to buttress their research credentials, and a clear determination to downplay their involvement with teaching related pursuits. This suggests that whilst the teaching-only role is now a visible feature of the higher education landscape, the role is still struggling to appropriate for itself a robust identity within a higher education system where the predominant institutional culture is biased towards research.

A shortcoming of this study is that it relies solely on self-reported information available from personal homepages, and the level and type of information that academics put

on homepages may differ from discipline to discipline, as suggested by Fry and Talja (2007). Consequently, personal homepages may not record all their owners' activities or achievements. In addition, some homepages may not be up-to-date. Moreover, at Elite Southern University, having a homepage is not compulsory, which gives the possibility that some teaching-only academics may choose not to have one. However, the findings serve as important preliminary insights into the teaching-only academic role. In the next study I use the life histories of senior teaching-only academics in the institution to explore these preliminary findings in more depth.

Chapter 6: Selected principal teaching fellow life-histories

As I stated in Chapter 4, for the life-history interview stage I interviewed seven senior teaching-only academics who were at the principal teaching fellow career grade. At the time of the interviews this was the highest possible grade that teaching-only academics could attain in the case institution. All of the seven research participants were from the engineering faculty. As I stated in Chapter 4, at the time of the interviews the teaching-only academic role at the case institution consisted of three career grades, namely teaching fellow, senior teaching fellow and principal teaching fellow. The principal teaching fellow role is equivalent to the senior lecturer grade on the research and academic career pathway, whilst the teaching fellow and senior teaching fellow are equivalent to the lower half and upper half of the lecturer grade respectively.

6.1   How I developed the life-history profiles

First, I placed the life-histories of the seven principal teaching fellows into five categories. I arrived at these five categories by grouping life histories with similar career trajectories together. These five categories are as follows – one based on the life histories of PTF1 and PTF5, one based on the life histories of PTF6 and PTF7, and three other categories, one each for the life histories of PTF2, PTF3 and PTF4. Then from each of the five categories I selected a representative life-history which I then developed into a biographical profile. Each profile sheds light on past and present choices, contingencies and options available to that individual at key stages of their life-history, and how these interworked, and continue to interwork, to shape the individual's career trajectory. These profiles also demonstrate how an individual's prior background and personal experiences interact with the individual's current institutional and personal experiences in helping to shape the individual's identity as a teaching-only academic.

As per my discussion of coding and analysis methods in Chapter 4, I used Seidman's (2006) sequential method to come up with the five biographical profiles. For each participant, this basically meant identifying and selecting all the passages from the interview transcript that I felt were important in telling the participant's story. I then used these to create a narrative using, as far as possible, the participant's own words and I wrote this narrative in the first person. This approach, according to Seidman (2006:pp 119), "… allows us to present the participant in context, to clarify his or her

intentions, and to convey a sense of process and time, all central components of qualitative analysis." In so doing it helps to address one of the three research questions, namely:

> What are the career trajectories of individuals who become teaching-only academics in the engineering faculty of a selected research-intensive institution (Seidman 2006 :pp 119)?

As demonstrated by these five profiles, individuals come from different backgrounds, and follow different pathways into the teaching-only academic role. For instance, as is the case with PTF2, some individuals embark on a PhD on completion of their undergraduate studies, and then subsequently end up in teaching-only academic roles after moving through one or more research or professional service roles. Others progress into industry with pre-university qualifications, and over time they gain university qualifications and expertise in fields that are in high demand in universities. Some, like PTF1 and PTF5, continue working in industry until they reach retirement, and then take up new careers as teaching-only or teaching-focussed academics. Others, like PTF4, stay on in industry and alongside this they take up part-time teaching positions within universities. Yet others, like PTF7 and PTF6, attain undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications, embark on careers in industry, and early on in their careers, they move into full-time teaching-only academic roles. With the exception of PTF3, all the biographies start from early childhood. PTF3's profile focusses entirely on his 26-year-old academic career at Elite Southern University. This is in contrast to all the other profiles that make some reference to early childhood experiences.

6.2 PTF1's Story: Embarking on a second career in university following retirement

I left school at 14. Working class girls did in those days. I went to be a telephonist in what was then the post office. The thinking in those days was if you got a good post office training, then you would go on to get a job almost anywhere until you get married and have children.

I got promoted very quickly. By the time I was 17 I was a training instructor for telephonists. I did it for about 7 years and then I went into administration and then I

started studying again. They were very encouraging and they invested in me, and so I started studying part-time and then eventually took some sabbatical to do full-time study. After this, I moved into marketing, before leaving for 3 years to do my MBA.

After the MBA I stayed on for another two years. At this point I could no longer see anything I fancied doing, and they were offering very attractive redundancy packages, so I took one. At the time, I thought, "If I wanna have a change in job, now is the time. I have been working here for 25 years and now is the time when they are offering quite a lot of money to go, and this will give me a financial cushion to do something else." So I decided to go.

I used the redundancy money to buy my house outright, so I didn't have to worry about a mortgage. My child was still young, and as a single parent, I decided to look for a child friendly job that just paid me enough to live on. I enrolled for a PGCE and got a part-time job here. I wanted to teach because I had enjoyed my time as a trainer.

I also took other part-time jobs elsewhere. So for a few years I had a little portfolio of part-time teaching and consulting jobs. Over time, I let go of these other part-time jobs bit by bit until I became full-time here. This was not planned in any way. To be honest I just wanted little part-time jobs till I retire and get my pension. I didn't know I would end up where I am now - 20 years into a second career as a lecturer.

The teaching fellow job category didn't exist then. We were all lecturers even though we were not research-active. I stayed on the lecturer grade until about 2006, when they brought in the teaching fellow grades. They made us switch across to the teaching fellow grades. It was to keep us out of the REF basically.

I stayed on the same grade and same pay for over 20 years as I was at the top of grade 8, and there was no promotion beyond the senior teaching fellow grade. This was because you still needed to have a research track record to be considered for promotion to principal teaching fellow. Two years ago they changed that, and I applied for principal fellowship and got it.

I don't know for certain what helped me to secure the promotion. This is because promotions are done behind closed doors, and you don't get any feedback. They just said you got it. Moreover, there are no teaching fellows on the promotion panel. It is made up of professors who don't know you, and heads of departments from all over

the university. All of them are academics from the lecturer grade.

We, teaching fellows, do most of the undergraduate teaching in the department. The business model in my department is to free up the lecturers, which is a misnomer, because the lecturers hardly do any teaching. They don't touch undergraduate teaching. If it is postgraduate teaching, that's the sort of teaching the lecturers will be given because it would be small classes and there won't be too much of it. However, if it is a big elective course, then teaching fellows have to do it. That's what we are paid for.

In addition to teaching, I also do a lot of work with the association for project management and with the association for learning technology. I also work with the academic development unit, I also chair the irregularities panel, the plagiarism panel in my department, and I am a member of the teaching committee. There are all sorts of opportunities to explore and develop as a professional but these are within the gift of the senior management team in the department. I don't think it is to do with lecturers or teaching fellows. I think there are some people who get a lot of opportunities and some who don't seem to get any, and I don't know why.

I also do some scholarship of teaching, but only in a small way, and not in a REF way. I only publish internally, and not in journals. This is because I haven't got the time in my loading to do it. We don't get any relief to do research. We are not expected to do it. Research is only expected from lecturers and not teaching fellows, and I do not aspire to a lectureship. Even if I wanted to, which I don't, my research would not be enough for me to transfer to the lecturer stream because my boss can't publish it. He is only interested in the top management journals that he has identified so if you can't publish in those he is not interested.

And I don't feel envious of the researcher guys. No, I wouldn't like their lives, no thanks. I don't want to do research, not in the slightest. I know some people think that being a teaching fellow means you are a failed researcher. I don't view myself as a failed researcher. I view myself as having never researched. I view myself as a professional teacher. That's what I am.

Now that I am a principal teaching fellow I am keeping a close eye on what happens with professorship to see what the requirements are for that and whether there is any opportunity. I am not going to get my hopes up for anything because I don't know what

may be possible. I am not interested in going to other universities. I am happy here at Elite Southern University, and I don't really want to change. No I like what I do. I have no reason to move. No whatsoever. Not in terms of money, but the money here is probably more than in other places anyway. I am happy here doing what I like doing. Besides, I am at the end of my career not the beginning, so it's different. So I have fewer options.

6.3 PTF2's Story: From PhD, to professional services, to the teaching-only academic role

I have done a physics degree. My dad is an engineer, and he always encouraged me. The fact that I was a girl he never saw that. For university I went to Oxford, and that was basically teachers telling me that I could do it.

My learning experience at Oxford was tough. It was really, really tough. I had a tutor who was very supportive all the way, though. I must have been the world's worst student for him because I handed in pretty much every piece of work late, but he understood and gave me some leeway.

Having an Oxford degree has helped me. I have got a bad Oxford degree and if I had gotten a bad degree from anywhere else I would not be in this position. I got a third, and I was desperately upset for about 2 or 3 weeks, since it meant that I could not proceed to postgraduate studies. I had applied for a masters at Elite Southern University and also a PhD at Oxford. I contacted my tutor at Oxford, and he intervened on my behalf and I got accepted after passing an entrance exam. I started the MSc a year after I had graduated, which allowed me to work for a year.

As I was finishing the MSc, my project supervisor offered me a PhD studentship. I was in two minds. I already had a job with the NHS, but after seeking advice, I decided to do the PhD. This took just over three years, and as I was writing up my dissertation my PhD supervisor offered me a job as a research project manager.

I had started teaching during my PhD studies. It started off when I stood in for someone else, and over time I took on more teaching, and ended up doing what you would classify as too much teaching if you want to get a lectureship in a research-intensive university. It was all masters level teaching, and I was doing a lot.

Then the department introduced a distance learning MSc, and they needed a teaching fellow to run it. At that time, I was going to get married, and we were talking about having children. I saw this as an opportunity of taking on a job where if I needed to go part-time in the future I could, and being distance learning, I could possibly work from home. It was a conscious decision to go into that.

As it turned out my life didn't go that way. I actually ended up getting divorced and didn't have children. I did that teaching fellow post for two years, and also kept up with my research. I also took on supervision of a couple of PhD students although this was not technically on paper. Even now, although I supervise PhD students I am not necessarily on paper.

Two years ago I took up a position at the Engineering Research Centre. I was about to get divorced, and my ex-husband and I worked in the same department. So that was a good opportunity for me to have a slightly fresh start as well. This was a grade 8 professional services contract, although the work was primarily teaching fellow work, with some administrative work.

However, a year ago, the Engineering Research Centre went into a period of uncertainty, and I started looking for another job. I avoided teaching fellowships since they only went as far as principal teaching fellowship. However, after I had just missed out on a lectureship, I sat down and actually thought about it, particularly the pressure being placed on academics for REF. I looked at my own research track record and realised that my research career had gone down significantly, and I thought if I were to become a lecturer then I would be eligible for REF, and I would not be able to do very well as it stands. I also realised that they are looking at bringing in a professorial level for teaching fellows, and I thought, "Actually, why don't I just do that?"

I also spoke with friends at other, if you like, less research-intensive universities and I realised that I could still pursue my career at other universities should I leave Elite Southern University, so by being a teaching fellow here I am not necessarily cutting myself out of jobs elsewhere.

So I applied for the teaching fellow post here which was advertised at senior/principal teaching fellow level, and I basically went, "I want principal fellow." I felt quite frankly that it was the easier option. I think I met most of the promotion criteria for principal

fellow. However, I have not come across enough people who have gone through the promotion process to know exactly what's required.

With regard to my future plans, 5-10 years from now I want to be vice dean for education, if not here, then somewhere else. Because I am in kind of leadership role in my new job, it's kind of a logical step to stay in teaching leadership and I enjoy that. I would probably not be at Elite Southern University. I don't think we have reached the point where someone will let teaching fellows be vice dean education yet. Faculty tutor yes, vice dean education, that's probably seen as more of an academic role. But I think if I got that role in this current setup I could execute the job. I have not been doing a lot of active research in recent years. I think it is important to keep in the loop with the research and find out what is going on. I do run the risk on the engineering side of falling out of touch a little bit, which I haven't done yet but I am aware that this is a problem. Keeping yourself in touch with what is going on is difficult. And I think it makes you a better teacher if you know what is happening. You do need to know your discipline and some combination of research and teaching or keeping in touch with the research is important.

6.4 PTF3's Story: Striving for parity of esteem between research and teaching

There are institutional blockages at this place that preclude anybody who is active from teaching fellow routes applying for professor. I applied for grade 10 last year knowing that I wouldn't get it, knowing that it was not supported, just to make the point, you know, and I am going to apply next year as well because this university has said we value teaching excellence. This university has said we want to build teaching to the same level as research. Everything that they say is right, but everything they do, is at odds with what they say.

Why did I go down the teaching-only route? It was a complete fluke. I have been here for 26 years and I worked with another colleague. He preferred research and went down the research route. I preferred teaching and went down the teaching route. It was as fluky as that. We taught purely on an elective basis before we ever had our own undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, and I developed the courses and put them together into an undergraduate programme.

Then the university decided to separate out teaching from research. All the research active staff were put into the Research Excellence Framework, and we were transferred to this teaching fellow - senior teaching fellow- principal teaching fellow route.

I was made senior teaching fellow, probably on grounds of my longevity of service.7-8 years ago they introduced promotion to principal teaching fellow for us teaching fellows, and I applied and got promoted. Since then I have done everything that a principal teaching fellow should do. I have been a keynote speaker at international conferences, and I have travelled all over the world. I have produced over 50 books, I have produced loads of conference papers, and loads of teaching initiatives as well.

I also put together a new undergraduate degree. It's a good little programme from our point of view. It delivers three deliverables actually. First, of all the 11 intakes that we have had, we have only had 30 students dropping out. Now the medical school loses more than that in Freshers' Week each year. Without exception everybody who has graduated from the programme has got their chosen next destination, either the graduate employment scheme of their choice or the postgraduate course of their choice. And third, it has grown and grown. It is the largest course of its type. I secured an external grant of 2.9M to get the programme running.

My work is international. First of all, you have to have an international presence, secondly you have to have a national presence, thirdly you have got to have a sectoral presence, and all of those things have come about as a result of the efforts I have made. Is that the job of a principal teaching fellow? I don't quite know. Is that the job of a principal fellow de facto? Absolutely yes it is, yeah.

Am I operating at principal teaching fellow or professorial level? I leave that to others to judge. The reason I give an answer like that is that I have seen professors of this and that around the place, thousands, dozens of professors. Do I do what they do on the research front? Absolutely not. Do I do what they do on the impact front or the sort of pushing back boundaries? Absolutely yes. So in between the two there is a path to be charted. Certainly if text books were weighed the same as research papers there is no doubt. I know readers, associate professors who have not published 50 papers, let alone 50 books. If there is any sort of parallel between books and papers I would be a professor.

If I was 20 years younger I would be on the research path, if I was 20 years older the teaching would have been valued. There is a large rump of people in my position aged anything from about 50 to about 70. Anyone younger than 50, they would go through the research route and if they then choose the teaching fellow route it would be on the basis that they also publish in journals. And anyone older than that is now pretty much out of the system. They were excellent teachers, and they produced a lot of great curricula for their students.

Ultimately my progress is in other people's hands. All that I can do is to keep knocking at the door. Eventually you hope that it will be a bit like Shawshank Redemption, you sort of scrap at the wall for long enough and eventually you go through it. We don't want to denigrate the research at this place, which is phenomenal. What we want is for phenomenal teaching to be recognised as such. In the end there will be a TEF in the same way as there is a REF. It would be great to be part of that if I am still here, it would be great to know that people are going to get the same opportunities for teaching as they get for research because at the moment the two are not on par.

I have participated in learning and teaching forums. I have been all over the world. In the last year or two I have been teaching in Romania, Holland, Singapore, Hong Kong, presenting what we do, presenting at learning and teaching conferences. I am an external examiner, programme validator, and I am invited to do these things on the basis that I am a principal teaching fellow, associate professor or reader, or whatever you want to call it.

There is currently no institutional will to have progression from grade 9 to10 for teaching fellows. At the moment it's just words. One reason is that there are very very powerful research interests in this place, very very powerful schools, medical school, law school, this faculty to an extent, you know, that say you cannot give teaching the same recognition as research.

Big corporates are looking for well-educated graduates with a high level of practical awareness. Our teaching has to deliver. This actually means teaching is highly valued in our department, and even research-active people have to be good at teaching as well since students are paying a lot of money.

I could have moved to the newer universities at a higher level. What made me stay in a research-intensive given all the challenges? First of all, you get institutionalised,

secondly, I personally like it here, third there is the football analogy: Do you play for Arsenal or some small team? If you have been at a high value place, you will move on when you have to but you will play at that level for as long as you possibly can.

There is not the slightest doubt that the institution brands you. If I am asked, "Who do you work for?" "I work for Elite Southern University." You know there is a prestige thing around this, the institution brands you. Whatever you do, principal teaching fellow, footballer, actor, engineer or anything else, part of your brand are the people you work for as well as your own intrinsic contribution.

6.5 PTF4's Story: Juxtaposing a professional career with an academic career

I didn't do a first degree. I did an HND, and then did a professional qualification with the CIOB, the chartered body for construction management. I worked in construction, and later moved into a corporate planning and business development role with another company who agreed to sponsor me to do a masters in construction management and economics part-time over two years at Elite Southern University.

I was also very involved in accrediting university degree programmes for the CIOB. This led me to meet somebody who ended up coming to Elite Southern University to head up the department. I said to him half joking, but I had an interest in doing it, "If you want anybody to do any management teaching give me a ring," and he said, "I will, you will hear from me." Later, this individual invited me to come and do some teaching on a part-time basis, saying, "You are in project management, we would like you to do that as an academic subject."

In the first year it was one unit, starting at 4 0'clock in the evening to 6 o'clock. And having done that he said, "For the second year we want you to continue with the unit in more detail, but in the third year." So I am saying, "Hang on. Now I am doing two units, I am still doing a full-time job, so it will all be a bit difficult." But I accepted, anyway.

When he left Elite Southern University, the new head of department said to me, "I need somebody to help run the undergrad programme. You have been here for a couple of years. Would you be interested in doing it?" I agreed, but I would now spend two days at Elite Southern University and three days in industry. That was 20 years ago, and

that's what I have been doing. For the past 15 years I ran the undergraduate programme in project management for construction for three days a week, and the rest of the week I was working in industry. Now, for our degree, which is a vocational degree, that arrangement was perfect - that somebody who executed it in real life could then come and teach here. So if you would like, I have not had an academic career. I have always been somebody from industry that has taught.

Seven or eight years ago, when I was 62/63, another new head of department who was much more focussed on research, which had not been a strength prior to that, said to me and three other part- time lecturers, "You don't do research. We need to make you teaching fellows to exclude you from the RAE (now the REF)." So I went from a senior lecturer to a principal teaching fellow. I have no particular view about the rights or wrongs of that. It wasn't something that bothered me because I was still doing the same job, but the three of us did feel slightly that "OK, just because we do not do research, and teaching is very important, why does that mean we have to be called something different? Why can't we still be lecturers and senior lecturers?" But the idea was to take us out of the RAE. We are out of the equation because we are not full-time academics who have to do research. We are there to do purely teaching and that's what we have done.

A few years ago I got to retirement age, but they asked me to stay on, so I continue to do a unit. In the last three years I have also ran the undergraduate final year dissertations, and industrial placements. And this year because a member of staff left suddenly to go to another job, I have taken over another third year unit. So as a teaching fellow, I do quite a lot, bearing in mind I am paid for one day per week.

I haven't had a history of doing research. I enjoy the interactions with students. I feel very strongly with a vocational degree we are preparing them for careers. So I feel that part of my job is to prepare them for that, and to give them an academic slant on subjects, as well as a practical slant on what the subjects are all about so that when they hit industry they are used to the terminology and to the techniques. So that's what I enjoy, and that's what I would rather do.

When I first got involved in the degree, it could not justify full-time staff, so everyone on it was part-time. 15 or so years ago, a new head of department with a view to strengthen the school decided that he would try and limit part-time teaching and he

would try and grow the full-time staff. This was because there were very few people doing research, and so we were very vulnerable. I say we were vulnerable because Elite Southern University is very focussed on research and we are a school that does little research. When it comes to the RAE we have got very little to hand in. As a school that has very little research, it would not take very much for somebody to say, "If you are not research active you don't match Elite Southern University's profile, so we'll close you down". And so the head of department's brief was to increase the research profile of the school. And now at the last REF, our school was profiled very highly as well. So we have gone very quickly from the position of little or no research to a position of great research strength, so that strategy did work.

However, because of the breadth of the construction programme (we have 24 different modules), it is not possible to have full-time members of staff in the school who have specialism in all that. So we always rely on part-time people to come in and do specialist things like the building services, or law.

I think as the school has become much more active in research a lot of the activities, a lot of the discussions now exclude teaching fellows. We do feel on the edge of the school, if you like. I wouldn't feel we are undervalued, in a sense because everybody appreciates the volume of teaching that teaching fellows do, and how this takes the load off academics to allow them to focus on research. But I feel that in the school there are full-time members, and also on the fringes there are teaching fellows as well. "Second class citizens" may be putting it too strong, but there is a definite feeling of not being in the mainstream.

In my case, over the past 15-20 years I feel I have moved from being at the centre to the fringe. I have gone from running the undergraduate programme to being gradually moved away and sitting on the outside of it. It's not something I deeply resent because I am past retirement age. I shouldn't be here at all. I am only here because they haven't got anybody else to do the teaching at the moment. If I felt very strongly about it, presumably an option would have been for me to become a full-time academic. That's something I didn't ever want, probably for financial reasons as much as anything else.

6.6 PTF7's Story: Early career transition from professional practice to academic practice

I am a practising structural engineer, and I am a chartered engineer. I did an HND in Ireland, and the reason for that was I didn't have enough A level points. After the HND I moved into an elite research-intensive university, and I was disappointed with the teaching when I arrived on the course. I felt that it was less practical, and less useful, and some of the lecturers were more focused on their research, and it was a bit old fashioned. The other place was younger, and it had more enthusiastic people who had real experience who were teaching. This added onto the things that I wished to do at some stage during my life.

When I finished I worked as a structural engineer for a few years. Then when the crash happened in Ireland in 2008-2009, I moved to London to work as a structural engineer. I was then head-hunted to do management consulting in the Middle East and South Africa.

However, I decided to move back to London to look for work as a structural engineer, but then this job came up. I had always kept an eye on jobs.ac.uk, and I had gone for one or two unsuccessful interviews with other jobs. The job was to replace a senior lecturer who was retiring. There were two things I was hired to do. One was to revamp the final year integrated design project, and the second one was to involve industry a lot more in teaching.

I was brought in as part of the team. The plan was to bring in part-time practitioners for one day a week. So the idea was that these two would work one day a week, and I would be their full-time support person, so together we would be a team basically. So, initially, it may have been perceived that I would be their assistant. I would be doing a lot of work for them, but I think they got more than they were expecting. I was able to do more than they imagined or expected. We relaunched the project in a new format with a lot of industrial participants after one year. I spent the first year observing, and then the following year we were ready to go, and it was done really quickly, and that surprised people that the change happened so fast.

So at that point I was promoted from teaching fellow to senior teaching fellow. The director of studies at the time supported my promotion, and the head of department

promoted me internally from teaching fellow to senior teaching fellow. I had imagined I would get a pay rise, but I was put at the bottom of the senior teaching fellow route which I wasn't very happy with. As a result, we then entered into the senior promotions process for principal teaching fellow, and it was only then that I started to realise that, actually, I did meet a lot of the criteria. I had already met a lot, not all, but a lot. We went for it. We weren't sure if it would happen or not, but it did.

When I started there were two or three teaching fellows in this department and they were very similar to me. They were people from industry without PhDs who would teach in a particular area, and then we developed them to take on more responsibilities in what we were doing. Then more teaching fellows were hired, because, I would like to say, we were good. So now there are 10. They said, "These people are effective, let's hire teaching fellows as opposed to a lecturer because we want this person to do more teaching." So there is more of us now.

When the director of studies role came up, PTF6 and I put ourselves forward. I think the response was they were looking for somebody with a little bit of experience. They gave it to somebody else. I reckon a teaching fellow will get the role someday, if this has not already happened in some other department. The question is: the criteria for the job, is it enough to become a professor later, having done the director of studies as well, and having written some books, and done other bits and really good teaching. Is that enough to become a professor? Probably it should be.

There are lots of opportunities that I would need to be able to take, but for me to be able to take those opportunities they would need to put other staff into taking on some of my work, and that's where the issue is at the moment. It's this balancing of workload as you move on. I would probably keep doing as I am doing, which is taking advantage of stuff that comes my way, saying yes to stuff that is useful or stuff which is not useful but is interesting, probably make connections with other universities and look a bit more outside than internally. I am not really thinking about it, to be honest, because I think it will happen naturally. Definitely I am not there yet, no way, but I could be in a few years. I think I will do another stint in industry again. I don't think I will be here forever. I don't see myself here in ten years' time. I would like to spend more time doing what it is that I am already good at, keeping my skills up by keeping practising, and working with industry.

116

I imagine that I will always be back and forth, so I don't see myself staying here and working here for another 40 years - 30 years till I retire. I need to go back and forth, whether that is a couple of days a week here, a couple of days a week there, whatever it is. I will certainly need to move back, because I don't think I will be as good at what I do, which is teach engineering, unless I am practising it. That's important for academics as well. If they are researching in an area, they need to know that industry in order to be effective at their research, or to be researching the right problems. They need to be really close to industry. That's what we have done, which is good.

6.7   Discussion

From the profiles that I have presented in this chapter, it is apparent that the career pathway that an individual takes into the teaching-only academic role depends both on the individual's personal circumstances, their motivations, as well as the opportunities available in the recruiting institution. These profiles also demonstrate that an individual's career trajectory into the teaching-only academic role, together with their personal experiences within the institution, have significant impact on the nature of professional identities that they construct and maintain. In turn, these constructed identities shape the manner in which individuals view and conduct themselves in the discharge of their roles, as well as their perceptions of the opportunities for career progression available to them. In this section, I use life-history techniques such as critical incidents, significant others, and narrative form to explore these issues in more detail.

6.7.1 Teaching-only academic career pathways

The profiles that I have presented in this section illustrate the variety of pathways that individuals take to get into the teaching-only academic role. PTF1, PTF4 and PTF7 have experience in professional practice. PTF1's profile is that of a retired, experienced professional who takes on flexible part-time roles to complement her earnings following retirement. She ended up taking multiple part-time jobs, and as she became more established at Elite Southern University, she let go of the other part-time jobs and became a full-time academic. This was unplanned, and it ended up leading to a full-time second career.

In contrast to PTF1, PTF7 is an early career stage, practising professional who was laid off as a result of the recession in 2008, and ended up securing a teaching-only

academic role at Elite Southern University. Unlike PTF1 who is close to retirement, and identifies herself as a professional teacher, PTF7 identifies himself as a practising professional, and hopes to go back to industry at some point.

Whereas PTF1 and PTF7 are employed exclusively by Elite Southern University, PTF4 splits his work between his professional practice in industry and part-time teaching at the university. PTF4 does not see himself as an academic, rather he views his professional identity as that of a practising professional who also happens to be teaching. Hiring of practising professionals on a part-time basis is not confined to PTF4's department alone. Other departments within the institution have started hiring practising professionals on a part-time basis to assist with undergraduate teaching. For instance, one of PTF7's role is to hire and manage practising civil and structural engineers to assist with undergraduate teaching.

The hiring of individuals with professional experience to undertake teaching is not limited to Elite Southern University alone. The literature also reports that a number of engineering schools are doing this in order to address the shortage of practical engineering skills amongst their teaching staff (Craig et al. 2016; Tennant et al. 2015). According to Harley (2002) the introduction of the RAE in 1986, and its subsequent replacement by the REF in 2014, has led to an increased preference by UK higher education institutions for research-active academics who meet RAE/REF targets. However, these research-active academics lack the professional skills that traditional academics also had, hence the recruitment to teaching roles by engineering schools of individuals with professional experience.

PTF2's profile is that of an individual who goes to university, proceeds on to a PhD, and eventually progresses into the teaching-only academic role via a series of professional services contracts that included teaching duties as well. This is consistent with the observation by Whitchurch (2012) that the distinction between 'academic' and non-academic' roles and activities has become increasingly blurred. PTF2's profile is also consistent with those of PhD students who are offered teaching opportunities on short-term contracts, usually towards the end of their PhD studies, when they are writing up (White 1996).

PTF3's profile is that of an academic who was transferred to the teaching-only role as part of the institution's goal of ensuring that non-research active staff are excluded

from the RAE/REF assessment. Unlike other research participants who make reference to childhood and pre-university background, PTF3's life-history begins from when he was already engaged by the university as an academic, and the main focus of his narrative is to advocate for parity of esteem between teaching and research, in particular the need to establish progression routes for the teaching-only role that are equivalent to the progression route on the research-and-teaching academic role.

6.7.2 The flexible nature of the teaching-only role

As I discussed in the literature review, a significant number of individuals on the teaching-only academic role are on part-time or short-term teaching-only contracts. This includes recently graduated PhD students (Bauder 2006; Bexley et al. 2013; Hubbard et al. 2015; Shelton et al. 2001; White 1996), as well as practising and retired professionals (Bexley et al. 2013; Shelton et al. 2001).   Whilst these part-time academic contracts are often viewed as underpaid, insecure and precarious (Coates et al. 2009; Kimber 2003; Probert 2013; University College Union 2016), this study also reveals that some individuals view part-time teaching contracts as flexible and attractive options for those individuals who cannot afford to take up full-time roles due to constraints in their personal lives such as child-rearing. For instance, one of the main reasons that PTF1 opted for a teaching role in universities was the fact that she was a single parent, and she needed a job that she could fit around her child-keeping role. Similarly, when PTF2 was considering getting married and starting a family, she consciously opted for a teaching-only role as it would enable her to go part-time if she needed to do so.

These profiles also suggest that flexible part-time contracts also make it possible for institutions to access professional expertise for their teaching. For instance, PTF4 suggests that the degree programme that he taught on required at least 24 specialisms which made it prohibitively expensive for the department to meet through full-time academic contracts only. PTF7 also suggests that when he was initially hired, one of his main role was to hire and manage professionals on part-time university teaching contracts. All this suggests that part-time roles are increasingly becoming a cost-beneficial avenue for university departments to access professional expertise that they could not otherwise access through full-time employment contracts. As PTF4's profile indicates, some practising professionals are eager to take part-time university teaching roles alongside their professional roles as a means of giving back to society.

6.7.3 The role of critical incidents in the career trajectories of teaching-only academics

As I pointed out in Chapter 4, one of the main reasons why I opted for the life-history approach in this study was that it helps to bring to light the critical incidents, or key events, in an individual's life which leads the individual to take major decisions and actions that shape the individual's life going forward (Measor 1985). For instance, in her profile PTF1 suggests that she left school at 14 to go into employment because that's what was expected of working class girls. However, when she took up employment she suddenly had access to opportunities for further studies which she took advantage of. Hence, for PTF1 securing employment turned out to be a critical event which enabled her to develop a professional career beyond the expectations of a working class girl.

Another critical incident in PTF1's career trajectory is when, after 25 years in employment, she made the decision to take redundancy, a decision which ultimately led her to a second career as a teaching-only academic. For PTF3, a critical incident can be when he made a conscious decision to deliberately eschew research in preference for teaching, a decision that eventually led to him being transferred to the teaching-only academic route in 2006.

For PTF1, PTF3 and PTF4, the institution's decision to move non-research active academics to the teaching-only academic route can be said to constitute a critical incident. Amongst other things, this move effectively froze the career progression of all three individuals for some considerable period of time. For PTF1 and PTF3, career progression only became possible two years before I conducted interviews with them, in 2014, when the institution changed career progression rules to allow teaching-only academics to be promoted to principal teaching fellow. For PTF4, who was transferred from senior lecturer to principal teaching fellow, this effectively curtailed all expectations for career progression at the institution since he reached retirement age before the institution had set up a career progression route from principal teaching fellow to professor for the teaching-only academic role. Again for PTF1 and PTF3, the introduction of career progression up to principal teaching fellow is effectively a critical incident in their career trajectories as it effectively restored to them opportunities for career progression that had effectively been removed by their transfer from the then unitary research-and-teaching academic role to the teaching-only academic role.

6.7.4 Influence of significant others on career trajectory

These profiles also shed some light on the influence played by significant others in shaping the career trajectories of the teaching-only academics. Looking at PTF2's profile, she suggests that her interest in an engineering career stemmed from her father's encouragement, and she also attributes her application and entry into Oxford to the encouragement she received from her secondary school teachers. In addition, her tutor at Oxford played an important role in facilitating her entry onto the MSc programme at Elite Southern University after she had failed to get the required qualification grades.

6.8   Concluding remarks

In this chapter I have identified and presented five distinct life-history profiles from the interview transcripts of the seven teaching-only academics who participated in this study. These profiles reveal the diversity in entry pathways into the teaching-only academic role. This includes transfer from the research-and-teaching academic role, early career entry into the role from professional practice, late career entry into the role following retirement professional practice, entry into the role from PhD studies, and part-time entry into the role whilst holding a full-time role in professional practice. An individual's progression into the role depends on such factors as the individual's own agency, critical incidents in an individual's personal and professional life, as well as the influence of significant others. In the next chapter I explore the lived experiences of the research participants through the lens of Bourdieu's social theory, agency and academic identity.

Chapter 7: Principal teaching fellows and their academic identity

In this chapter I use the concepts of identity and personal agency as analytical tools to explore the life-histories and lived experiences of the seven principal teaching fellows that I interviewed in this study. In so doing, I hope to shed light on the factors that contribute to, or hinder, the development of the teaching-only academic role in the engineering faculty at Elite Southern University. Whilst the lessons learnt from this study may not be wholly generalisable across all universities, departments and faculties, it is my expectation that, at a minimum, this study will serve to deepen current understanding of the teaching-only academic phenomenon in higher education.

Specifically, in this study I have investigated the conception, evolution and projection of professional identity by the seven senior teaching-only academics, all of whom are based in the engineering faculty at Elite Southern University. In line with Clegg (2008), I have augmented this by investigating how these 7 teaching-only academics have exhibited personal agency in their interactions with the socio-cultural and environmental factors within the engineering faculty as they develop and evolve, collectively and individually, their teaching-only academic roles.

7.1   Teaching-related academic capital and its impact

The work that I report in this chapter differs significantly from previous work on teaching-only academics by other researchers in one important respect: I have focussed exclusively on teaching-only academics who, at the time of the study interviews, were at the highest possible grade for the teaching-only academic role in their institution. Unlike other teaching-only academics who have not yet reached senior academic levels, these senior teaching-only academics who are the focus of my study hold administrative responsibility for education within their departments, and, unlike early career academics, they have built up significant capital in the form of academic and professional reputation, as well as social and professional networks, both within and outside the institution. In this section I discuss how these forms of capital have empowered them to serve as advocates and champions for the teaching-only academic role.

Unlike early career academics, senior teaching-only academics at the level of principal teaching fellow are more likely to have a comparatively small financial dependence on Elite Southern University. This may be because they are employed on a part-time basis within the institution whilst retaining a higher-paying job in industry, as in the case of PTF4, or they are effectively on a second career following retirement from industry, as in the case of PTF1 and PTF5. Because of this reduced financial dependence on the institution, they feel that they are in a better position to raise any issues pertaining to the teaching-only academic role without fear of any repercussions. For instance, PTF5 has a paid-up mortgage, and is receiving a pension from her previous career. Consequently, she feels that she is better placed to speak out compared to other teaching-only academics who are in less fortunate positions than hers:

> I think the majority are not in a position [to speak out]; I suspect the majority are being held because they need the money, they have families, they have mortgages, most of us have to earn a living, we got bills to pay, and we got expenses to pay [PTF5 Transcript, lines 488-490].

Unlike early career academics, senior teaching-only academics who have been in the institution for a long time, namely PTF1, PTF3, PTF4 and PTF5, have managed to establish longstanding working relationships with both research-and-teaching academics and industry professionals. These contacts would have been developed through working together over a considerable period of time, and by the time the individual gets to the position of principal teaching fellow, these contacts will now be in positions of responsibility and authority. These senior teaching-only academics are therefore able to draw on the support of these high-value contacts, for instance, when they are putting together applications for promotion. PTF1 believes that this was a significant factor in enabling her to secure her promotion to principal teaching fellow:

> … my referees are heads of departments, not my own. I mean he [PTF1's head of department] had to write a reference anyway, but my other Elite Southern University referee, and my external referees were chairs. They were from professional bodies; they were very eminent

people. That's the beauty of being around for so long. That's one of the advantages. If somebody comes in who is a bit newer, they haven't got the same contacts. [PTF1 Transcript, lines 686 -691].

Again, unlike early career academics, the senior teaching-only academics are able to draw from their experience in previous roles to achieve their personal and professional objectives. PTF5 attributes her success in securing promotion to principal teaching fellow against the wishes of her head of department to her experience in industry as a marketing executive:

… with [the Dean] and [Vice Dean for Education] supporting me, … I engineered a position where he [the head of department] would have found it difficult, given the support I got, to not write a supporting statement.   … I spent an entire career in marketing and communications without knowing how to do that? [PTF5 Transcript, lines 198 -207]

In addition, the prior experience that some of the principal teaching fellows bring with them from industry serves as useful capital in its own right. For example, PTF7 observes that one of the experienced professionals that his department had hired from industry was so highly regarded in industry that the department decided to hire him on a visiting professor contract even though he had no research background, and even though there was no promotion route to professorship for teaching-only academics. This therefore suggests that in some cases an individual's industry reputation and professional experience may be such that it more than makes up for the individual's lack of research expertise. This, in turn, helps to raise the profile of the teaching-only academic within the department and institution, thereby lending academic credibility to the teaching-only academic role.

Also, by the time most of these principal teaching fellows got into the teaching-only academic role, they would have achieved success in other career roles. Such success imputes to them a can-do attitude that enables them to tackle with confidence some of the issues that they face in the teaching-only academic role. PTF6 exemplifies this as follows:

I suppose I don't tend to kind of, I look at what I have done in all my career, I have never kind of sat still and just been like OK, we just carry

on. I am always trying to do something else, expanding, sort of challenging the stuff, and then or I do stuff, I take on something new that takes me out of my comfort zone, and then within about 4 weeks I am crying at home saying why did I take myself out of my comfort zone. [PTF6 Transcript, lines 683-686]

PTF6 and PTF7 both believe that it was through having such a can-do attitude, and the confidence that it brings, that enabled them to collaboratively secure promotion, first to senior teaching fellow and then to principal teaching fellow within a relatively short period of 18 months. Specifically, PTF7 attributes this success to their willingness and preparedness to fight for this:

… we didn't get where we are by working hard in a corner, and being very quiet about it [PTF7 Transcript, lines 216-217].

Finally, on the basis of their experience and understanding of the academic workplace, senior teaching-only academics are able to mount credible challenges to the prevailing status quo in the institution. For instance, PTF3, who, at the time of the interviews, had been at the university for 26 years, felt confident enough to challenge the institution to introduce promotion to professorship on the basis of education-based criteria:

… Certainly if text books were weighed the same as research papers there is no doubt. I know readers, associate professors who have not published 50 papers, let alone 50 books, and that is a contextual thing. If there is any sort of parallel between books and papers I would be a professor. [PTF3 Transcript, lines 148-151]

From the comments that I have expressed in this section, it is apparent that the seniority of this group of teaching-only academics, and the experience and expertise that they bring to the role, has empowered them to view themselves as advocates and champions for the role, thereby enabling them, collectively and individually, to fight with the institution to ensure that conditions of employment improve, both for themselves and other teaching-only academics. From a Bourdisean perspective, these findings seem to suggest that these teaching-only academics have accumulated valuable teaching-related capital which has strengthened their position within their departments and the institution vis-à-vis the research-and-teaching role.

7.2   Insights into the transferees from the research-and-teaching role

The teaching-only academic role at Elite Southern University started in 2006 when the institution made a decision to put all non-research active academic staff on teaching-only academic contracts so as to exclude them from the RAE/REF assessment. Its introduction at Elite Southern University is consistent with similar decisions across the UK higher education sector during this period (Association of University Teachers 2005; Chalmers 2010; Gull 2010; Macfarlane 2011; Oancea et al. 2010; Paye 2011; Probert 2013; Rix et al. 2007). Of the seven principal teaching fellows who consented to being interviewed, four were unilaterally transferred in the early 2000s from the research-and-teaching academic role to the teaching-only role so that they would not be included on the REF assessment exercise. These are PTF1, PTF3, PTF4, and PTF5.

> … when I came in the teaching fellow grade didn't exist. We were lecturers even though we were not research active … and when they brought in the teaching fellow grades they made us switch across. We were forced to. We had no choice. … that was when they decided to make a distinction between teaching-only staff and research staff. It was to keep us out of the REF basically. [PTF1 Transcript, lines 163-179]

> … I think there were three of us who were part-time teachers - when I was appointed to run the undergraduate programme I was made a senior lecturer, so I had a senior lecturer role for that period, the others had lecturer roles. He said to the three of us, you don't do research, we need to make you teaching fellows to exclude you from the RAE, now the REF. So it was, if you like, something that was imposed. So I went from a senior lecturer to a principal teaching fellow. [PTF4 Transcript, lines 53-58]

All three of them identified strongly with teaching prior to being switched to the teaching-only academic role, and they have all maintained a positive teaching identity after the switch. PTF1 and PTF5 had also invested in the teaching role by securing Postgraduate Certificates in Education (PGCEs) when they retired and went into teaching in higher education:

> So I took the redundancy money … and I had a few months off … and
> then signed up for a PGCE because I knew what I wanted to go back
> into I wanted to teach because I enjoyed my time as a trainer. [PTF1
> Transcript, lines 110-112]

Both PTF1 and PTF5 identify themselves as professional teachers, and reject being labelled as "failed researchers":

> … I know some people think that teaching fellow means you are a
> failed researcher, …, I don't view myself as a failed researcher, I view
> myself as having never researched, I view myself as a professional
> teacher, that's what I am. [PTF1 Transcript, lines 569-579]

Before taking up a part-time teaching role at Elite Southern University, PTF4 served on the degree programme accreditation panel of his professional institution in addition to his day job. He describes himself as follows:

> So if you would like, I have not had an academic career, I have always
> been somebody from industry that has taught. [PTF4 Transcript, lines
> 45-47]

PTF3 opted to focus on teaching well before the introduction of the teaching-only academic route, and in his current role he maintains his positive identity with teaching, going as far as to stating in the interview that the impact he is making as a teaching-only academic exceeds, or is at par with, the impact made by research-and-teaching academic colleagues.

The main finding from this section is that the four individuals who were transferred from the research and academic role to the teaching-only role all positively identified with the newly introduced role. This is at variance with the general reluctance to be associated with a teaching identity expressed by both early career academics, as reported in the studies by Skelton(2011; 2012a; 2012b) and the study by Fitzmaurice (2011), and the general academic community, as reported by Oxford (2008), the Association of University Teachers (2005) and (Probert 2013), amongst others. This difference may be due to the fact that all three of them had an interest in teaching prior to the introduction of the teaching-only academic role. Moreover, all four of them had been engaged by the university to primarily teaching roles, even though they had been hired on traditional research-and-teaching academic contracts. Consequently, it may

be that the transfer to teaching-only contracts served only to confirm to them their status as professional teachers, as in the case of PTF1, PTF3 and PTF5, and as engineering professionals who teach, as in the case of PTF4.

7.3   Insights into the direct entrants to the teaching-only academic role

Three of the principal teaching fellows who participated in this research, namely PTF2, PTF6 and PTF7, were recruited directly into the teaching-only academic role well after its introduction in 2006. All three worked their way up from the teaching fellow grade to the senior teaching fellow grade and then to their current positions as principal teaching fellows. As my analysis of academic web pages in Chapter 5 has revealed, entry into the teaching-only academic role through unilateral transfer from the research-and-teaching academic role had become increasingly rare by the time each of the three entered into the role. PTF2 progressed into the role from PhD studies, whilst both PTF6 and PTF7 were recruited into the role from industry.

In addition to teaching, PTF2 still conducts some research and supervises some PhD students, thereby contributing to the institutional REF outputs, but even then she feels that she loves teaching more, and she feels that this would mitigate against a career as a research-and-teaching academic as it would prevent her from undertaking research to a level that enables her to meet REF requirements:

> … so I am conscious of the fact that if I became a lecturer -- it's not that I don't like doing research, I love doing research, but I just need to look at how I spend my own time and my own life, and actually I clearly love the teaching more. And I have seen it in the past when people have been pushed to do teaching coz they are good at it, and then it's come back and someone goes, "Why haven't you got these 4 papers for REF", and it's "Well you told me to spend most of my time doing teaching", and I could see that I could end up in a lot of trouble when REF comes round. [PTF2 Transcript, lines 502-509]

Both PTF6 and PTF7 are exclusively involved in teaching, and they express no interest in research:

> PTF6 and I don't have a PhD, and we have managed to get through, we have no interest in getting a PhD, it's not to say that we don't want

to do research, or that every role should look like ours, but we just don't find it useful. [PTF7 Transcript, lines 207-209]

Hence, even the more recent principal teaching fellows express a love for teaching, and they have consciously eschewed research for teaching. Again, these findings contradict earlier research on teacher identities in higher education which revealed that the teacher identity within research-intensive institutions is of such a low status that even teaching-only and teaching-focussed academics recoil from being associated with it (Nyamapfene 2014; Skelton 2012b). This may suggest that the attitudes of teaching-focussed academics towards their role is undergoing transformation, or it may simply be that the senior teaching-only academics who are the focus of my study hold views on teaching that are at variance from those of other teaching-only academics, possibly as a result of their seniority.

7.4   The evolving nature of the teaching-only academic role

The literature suggests that the teaching-only academic role is primarily an institutional response to a combination of recent and current changes sweeping through higher education. These changes include a growing focus on standards and accountability, with institutions now required to demonstrate "value for money" through periodic teaching and research assessment exercises (Bryson 2004; Willmott 1995). Within the UK, the outcome of this on the research side was the introduction of the RAE/REF, which led to the introduction of the teaching-only academic role at Elite Southern University and other institutions as well.

Other changes that have also been taking place within the higher education sector relate directly to learning and teaching. This includes the drastic increase in student numbers due to higher education massification (Bryson 2004; Cummings et al. 2014; Probert 2013; Vajoczki et al. 2011; Willmott 1995) and expansion of the higher education sector (Bryson 2004), coupled with a fall in per capita public funding of higher education (Bryson 2004; Coates et al. 2008; Cummings et al. 2014; Probert 2013; Vajoczki et al. 2011; Willmott 1995). At the institutional level, these changes have implications for the management and staffing of the education function.

Taken together, the life histories of the seven principal teaching fellows shed some light on how the teaching-only academic role has evolved at Elite Southern University in the face of these changes.

7.4.1 Teaching and research before the teaching-only academic role

Prior to the introduction of the teaching-only Academic role in 2006, all the academics were on the same traditional academic pathway, regardless of whether they were research-active or not:

> When I came in the teaching fellow grade didn't exist. We were lecturers even though we were not research active … [PTF1 Transcript, lines 163-164].

As PTF3 suggests, prior to the introduction of the teaching-only academic role, academics could opt to specialise in teaching or research whilst retaining the same role and privileges. PTF3's academic department had been specifically set up to provide service teaching to other departments. However, as the department grew and started taking on research-and-teaching roles, he had the option to stay in a teaching-focussed role, or to move onto a research-and-teaching role. This decision was not influenced in any way by career progression or financial considerations:

> I have been here for 26 years and when I started working here I was working with a guy called Jackson who said … "I prefer the research, you obviously prefer the teaching, I am better at the research, you are better at teaching, what about dividing up like that" … and so he went off down the research route, and I went off down the teaching route, and it was as fluky as that. (PTF3 Transcript, Lines 19- 26).

7.4.2 The RAE/REF and the introduction of the teaching-only academic role

The research participants believe that the introduction of the RAE/REF is the primary reason that led to the academic job being split into a separate teaching-only role and a separate research-and-teaching role:

> … then it [the university] came to the view that if they wanted research excellence, they had to separate out the teaching and the research so that only those who were research active and got

published in the right journals and had impact went into the research excellence framework. So alongside that they said, "Right everybody who has got teaching stuff had better be recognised," so they came up with this teaching fellow - senior teaching fellow- principal teaching fellow route … (PTF3 Transcript, Lines 42-47).

In fact, so strong is the perceived link between the RAE/REF and the introduction of the teaching-only academic role that an individual's RAE/REF eligibility is seen in some quarters as a defining criterion for categorising the individual as either a research-and-teaching academic or a teaching-only academic:

… anyone who is not in the REF in our department is a teaching fellow. That's how it works. The only people who have the title lecturer are the people that publish and that my head of department will consider for REF and they got objectives to publish in the top three journals. [PTF1 Transcript, lines 240-243]

The introduction of the teaching-only academic role in 2006 also came along with the perception that working conditions at the institution depend primarily on whether you are on a research-and-teaching contract or a teaching-only contract. For instance, one such perception is that the university provides more secure employment contracts to research-and-teaching academics than they do to teaching-only academics:

They won't give that to teaching fellows. … there is two things it gives you; one is the freedom of speech without prosecution, you know, so you can speak freely and secondly, in order to fire you they have to have an academic board agreement or academic committee meeting. So academics don't get fired, teaching fellows do. …it's a way of giving you tenure without giving you tenure and academics have still got it. [PTF1 Transcript, lines 188-198]

7.4.3 The teaching-only academic role: Perceived aims

Generally, the research participants believe that the main driver for the introduction of the teaching-only academic role was the need to meet the institution's research objectives, and not necessarily to improve the quality of teaching:

> … the business model is built around top class researchers being attracted in who can produce the highest level of research output and publications, and you put the structure of teaching fellows in place to help support that happening, you want the highest, high quality teaching, but essentially you want it to sit in its box and deliver so that research can get on with being research. so it's just viewing the, if you like, the state of teaching fellows as a resource that helps you achieve other objectives, and so it's not in itself an end to itself. There has been little or no attention until relatively recently to the career development of those individuals because if one left you could get another one. [PTF5 Transcript, lines 251-258]

In some departments, undergraduate teaching is now largely undertaken by teaching-only academics, leaving research-and-teaching academics to concentrate on research and postgraduate teaching:

> The business model in my department is to free up the lecturers, which is a misnomer, because they hardly do any lecturing as in teaching. … Correct. So they can focus on research. It's all done by us. That's the business model in my department. … They don't touch it [undergraduate teaching]. It's almost exclusively teaching fellows, exclusively almost, undergraduate teaching for sure, yes. [PTF1 Transcript, lines 493-504]

Nevertheless, even if the teaching-only academic role was introduced specifically for the purposes of enhancing the institution's research, increasingly the role is being accepted in some departments as a vehicle for driving improvements in teaching:

> When I started there were 2 or 3 teaching fellows in this department and they were very similar to me. They were people from industry without PhDs who would teach in a particular area, and then we developed them to take on more responsibilities in what we were doing. Then more teaching fellows were hired, because, I would like to say, we were good. So now there are 10. They said, "These people are effective, let's hire teaching fellows as opposed to a lecturer

because we want this person to do more teaching." So there is more
of us now. There are 10 or 12 of us. [PTF7 Transcript, lines 470-476]

7.4.4 Changing perceptions towards the teaching-only academic role:

Individuals contemplating an academic career increasingly view the teaching-only academic role in a more positive light. For instance, PTF2 had to choose between pursuing a research-and-teaching academic role, or to go on the teaching-only academic route. Given her passion for teaching, she felt that she could potentially miss REF targets if she opted for the research-and-teaching role. This subsequently led her to consider a teaching-only academic career instead.

> About a year ago … I just missed out on a lectureship. I could have
> tried again and again, but I sat down and actually thought about it and,
> not so much at Elite Southern University, the pressure being placed
> on academics for REF … and I thought if I were to become a lecturer
> then I would be eligible for REF and I would not be able to do very well
> as it stands, and in reality, because I love the teaching and people
> know I am good at it, I will put my focus on that and it would come back
> and bite me. [PTF2 Transcript, lines 492-502]

This is coupled with perceptions that changes within the institution and within higher education in general now make the teaching-only academic role a viable career route:

> … the ground rules are changing, what the provost is saying about
> teaching and research equivalence is only mirroring the sort of noises
> that are coming from government in terms of teaching [PTF5
> Transcript, lines 281-283]

> What keeps me going is that I feel I am doing the right things in the
> right way, that I am moving with the tide, and that there are others not
> moving with the tide, and will eventually have to move. [PTF5 Own
> Story, lines 501-503]

Research participants also perceive a change in how the institution values them:

> I feel more valued today than I felt over the past 12 years, I probably
> feel more valued than at any other points in those 12 years. What

keeps me going is that I feel I am doing the right things in the right way, that I am moving with the tide, and that there are others not moving with the tide, and will eventually have to move [PTF5 Transcript, lines 499-503].

7.4.5 Perceptions of change in career progression opportunities

The research participants, in particular the younger principal teaching fellows - PTF2, PTF6 and PTF7 – feel strongly that opportunities for career progression within the teaching-only academic role are improving:

> … I think things are changing. I remember saying to the old dean a year ago and he was saying "Would you like to be a teaching fellow?" And I remember saying to him "I would be a teaching fellow if a teaching fellow could become head of department." I don't think we are at that point but there would be other institutions that could consider that, I think. And so it's like opening my eyes and going, "Actually you are not getting into a career that in ten years' time you have hit the top." And that was kind of my biggest worry … I didn't want to get to the point where I just went for the next two decades doing the same thing. [PTF2 Transcript, lines 540-553]

This includes opportunities for progression to professorship:

> So I sat there and thought about it for a long time and I discovered that they are looking at bringing in professorial level for teaching fellows and I thought actually why don't I just do that, you know I enjoy the teaching, that is clearly what I want to do, if I get an academic post I am probably not going to be as successful as I can be in teaching …
> [PTF2 Transcript, lines 513-517]

Teaching-only academics are also realising the existence of opportunities to progress from the teaching-only role at Elite Southern University to other academic roles at other institutions:

> I have friends at other, if you like, less research-intensive universities. I have a friend who is at Greenwich, … and I got a friend who is quite high up at Westminster … and so what's interesting is that they don't

135

have teaching fellows, they basically just have academics, so anyone who is a teaching fellow at Elite Southern University would be an academic there. And so I kind of started to think that if at some point I decided to leave Elite Southern University by being a teaching fellow here I am not necessarily cutting myself out of jobs elsewhere. Because that was my initial worry as well that if I am a teaching fellow now and at some point I moved to somewhere else in the country will my job be there. You know after talking to them I discovered that actually probably not. [PTF2 Transcript, lines 517-534]

However, the teaching-only academic role comes along with a heavy workload, which, as Bennett et al. (2017) observes, is a significant factor in the lack of career progression for teaching-only academics, a sentiment held by the senior teaching-only academics interviewed in this study:

There is lots of opportunities that I would need to be able to take which would involve, for me to be able to take those opportunities, they would need to put other staff into taking on some of my work, and that's where the issue is at the moment. It's this balancing of workload as you move on, so a lot of people are being promoted but are effectively doing the same job; they are even more stretched. PTF6 is very stretched; PTF6 is just doing more and more and more. So we all work very hard and so that's what we would need to have - to put other people and resources to support your role so that you can start to do the things you need to do to hit that level. [PTF7 Transcript, lines 598-606]

7.4.6 Concluding remarks on the evolution of the teaching-only academic role

The current research on higher education suggests that the emergence of the teaching-only academic role is largely due to increased prioritisation of research over teaching, which has given rise to a two-tiered academic workforce made up of a valued class of academics who focus primarily on research and another class of less valued academics who bear the burden of teaching (Bauder 2006; Bexley et al. 2013; Chalmers 2010; Graham 2015; Gull 2010; Menon 2003; Probert 2013; Thornton 2013; Willmott 1995). In this scenario, the teaching-only academic role is generally perceived as an unwanted identity reserved for those whose research is perceived to

be failing to meet RAE/REF requirements (Skelton 2012a). However, as this analysis of the role's evolution at Elite Southern University suggests, the role has assumed a much more fluid identity, and is increasingly seen in some quarters as a valued career pathway for academics who wish to focus primarily on delivering education. This is despite the perception by the research participant that the heavy teaching workload associated with the role tends to serve as a structural impediment to pursuing opportunities for career progression.

7.5   Perceptions and attitudes relating to career progression

In this section I look at the attitudes and opinions of the principal teaching fellows regarding career progression within the teaching-only academic role. I consider first the four principal teaching fellows - namely PTF1, PTF3, PTF4 and PTF5 - who were all transferred from the research-and-teaching academic role to the teaching-only role in 2006. I then compare their attitudes to those of the other three principal teaching fellows - namely PTF2, PTF6 and PTF7 - who were all directly recruited into the teaching-only academic role at later dates after 2006.

At the point of transfer to the teaching-only academic role, PTF1, PTF3, PTF4 and PTF5 were all moved from the lecturer grade to the equivalent senior teaching fellow grade on the teaching-only academic route. PTF4, who was already a senior lecturer, was transferred to the equivalent principal teaching fellow grade. However, the decision by Elite Southern University to transfer non-research active academics to the teaching-only academic route in 2006 effectively curtailed for 8 years the career progression of affected individuals since at that time there was no direct promotion for teaching-only academics beyond the senior teaching fellow grade. Opportunities for career progression only became possible in 2014 when it became possible for teaching-only academics to progress to the level of principal teaching fellow.

The affected principal teaching fellows responded differently to the effective curtailment of career progression that came about as a result of being transferred to the teaching-only academic role. For instance, PTF1, PTF4 and PTF5 expressed no concern at the lack of career progression in the teaching-only academic role. PTF1 and PTF5 only applied for progression to principal teaching fellowship simply because the opportunity for doing so materialised, and not on the basis that they needed the career progression for financial reasons or otherwise:

Yes, two years ago they changed it [promotion criteria for principal teaching fellowship] and they have a teaching-only route which I applied for and got it. [PTF1 Transcript, lines 222-223]

Meanwhile, PTF4, who still retains his job in industry, was already a principal teaching fellow, and throughout the interview he expressed no concern about the lack of career progression. This apparent lack of concern persisted even when Elite Southern University stated that they were planning to introduce career progression to professorship for teaching-only academics. By then, PTF4 had already reached retirement age, and PTF5 was looking forward to retirement, and expressed no desire to go for promotion:

I've got a big project, I bought a huge piece of land last year, I am building a house, building a garden, the earlier I can retire the faster I can build the house. [PTF5 Transcript, lines 725-726]

Of the three, only PTF1 expresses a desire for promotion to professor, but, as was the case prior to the introduction of promotion to principal teaching fellowship, she is not pushing for the professorship to happen, preferring instead to adopt a wait-and-see attitude:

I am keeping a close eye on what happens with professorship to see what the requirements are for that and whether there is any opportunity. I am not going to get my hopes up for anything because I don't know, I don't know what may be possible. [PTF1 Transcript, lines 423-425]

In contrast to this, PTF3 has been vocal about the lack of career progression on the teaching-only academic role, and has adopted a somewhat more militant approach aimed at pressurising the institution to introduce career progression opportunities for the teaching-only academic route that are at par with those of the research-and-teaching academic route:

…there are institutional blockages at this place that preclude anybody from teaching fellow routes applying for professor. I applied for grade 10 last year knowing that I wouldn't get it, knowing that it was not

supported, just to make the point, you know … [PTF3 Transcript, lines 10-13].

PTF3 intends to continue putting in further applications until he is successful, or until he gets to retirement, because:

> … this university has said we value teaching excellence, this university has said we value teaching pioneering, this university has said we want to build teaching to the same level as research, and everything that they say is right, but everything they do, yeah, there is a concrete wall and that's the position. [PTF3 Transcript, lines 14-17].

PTF3's attitude is closer to that of the younger principal teaching fellows, PTF2, PTF6 and PTF7, who were all recruited directly into the teaching-only academic role. For instance, PTF2 took advantage of a newly created vacancy in another department in her bid to secure progression to principal teaching fellow, whilst PTF6 and PTF7 had to apply pressure on their head of department to facilitate their promotion, first to senior teaching fellow, and then to principal teaching fellow.

A possible reason for these different attitudes towards career progression may be that PTF1, PTF4 and PTF5 are not as financially dependent on Elite Southern University as the other four. I base this assumption on the fact that PTF1 and PTF5 only entered into teaching after retiring from earlier careers, and they both retired with redundancy packages, whilst PTF4 still retains his professional role in industry which, in his own words, pays better than his role at Elite Southern University. To underscore this, at one point in my interview with her, PTF5 expressed her financial independence from the institution as follows:

> I don't need Elite Southern University any more than Elite Southern University needs me; I believe that it suits us both to exist together. I believe that I contribute. I believe that Elite Southern University believes that I contribute, if one was to say that's not the case, fine, so be it. [PTF5 Transcript, lines 483-486].

To conclude, therefore, the interview data suggests that there is general optimism amongst the research participants in relation to career progression prospects. However, in terms of agency, there seems to be a binary division between the older

teaching-only academics who have been in the institution since before the introduction of the teaching-only role in 2006 and the younger teaching-only academics who were recruited directly to the role only after its establishment. Specifically, the older teaching-only academics tend to adopt a wait-and-see attitude, whereas the younger teaching-only academics tend to be more proactive in seeking out career progression opportunities.

7.6   Professional Identity in the teaching-only academic role

Ashforth et al. (2008) suggest that identity is a process by which people create a definition of who they are, communicate that definition to others, and use that definition to navigate their lives, workwise or otherwise.   When conceptualised in this way, identity can serve as a useful tool to explain why people think about their environment the way they do, and why they conduct themselves in these environments the way they do. Within the context of the workplace, it is the professional identity that is mostly referenced.

According to Bucher and Stelling (1997), professional identity can be defined as the perception of oneself as a professional and it is closely related to the knowledge and skills one has, the work one does, work-related significant others, and reference groups. In this section I use this concept of professional identity to explore further what it really means to be a teaching-only academic at the case university, and how this helps to shape and direct the views and actions of the research participants.

7.6.1 Professional identity as a teacher in higher education

PTF1, who joined Elite Southern University after retiring from industry and after doing a teacher training course (PGCE), describes herself as a professional teacher. PTF1 loves her teaching, and engages in teaching initiatives within the university, and with external partners as well. Of her role she says:

> I like my job I really do, I like it here, everything about it is good, yeah,
> I tell you I love my students, I get paid for having fun, this is my perfect
> job, teaching my students I love it. [PTF1 Transcript, lines 553-555]

PTF5 did a teacher training course before joining the computer industry where she developed an interest in communication and training. On retiring she took up a teaching assistantship with another university before joining Elite Southern

University as a teaching support person. She sums up her career at Elite Southern University as follows:

> I was taken on as a teaching fellow 12 years ago, I was promoted to senior teaching fellow 3/4 years after that, last year to principal teaching fellow. What I discovered along the way was that actually I did enjoy teaching, and I was interested in teaching. [PTF2 Transcript, lines 72-75]

PTF5 takes part in teaching initiatives across the university, and justifies her engagement as follows:

> People who are interested in learning and teaching spend time paying attention to the latest thinking in learning and teaching, so spending time with the Academic Development Department, spending time with the School of Education, understanding the research in learning and teaching, understanding the boundaries of our understanding of learning and teaching, working with that to improve our teaching. [PTF5 Transcript, lines 635-639]

Whilst they actively engage in teaching initiatives across the university, both PTF1 and PTF5 are not keen to engage in extensive scholarly research for its own sake:

> Oh yes yeah yes I do [scholarly research], I guess but only in a small way, not in a REF. … I haven't got the time in my loading to do it. We don't get any relief to do research. We are not expected to do it. [PTF1 Transcript, lines 404-413]

PTF5's interest in scholarly research is primarily to use it to inform her teaching, and not necessary to produce it:

> … understanding the research in learning and teaching, understanding the boundaries of our understanding of learning and teaching, working with that to improve our teaching. [PTF5 Transcript, lines 637-639]

7.6.2 Professional identity as a professional practitioner in higher education

PTF4 has spent the past 20 years teaching two days a week at Elite Southern University, and the rest of the week working in industry. He describes himself as somebody from industry that has taught.

PTF4 sums up his interests as follows:

> I have never been interested at all in research, I have been much more
> interested in a career that is a practitioner and somebody that can relay
> that to teaching as well. [PTF4 Transcript, lines 82-84]

PTF4 sees his role at Elite Southern University as contributing to undergraduate teaching in his area of expertise by "making a combination of academic and practical" teaching to ensure that by the end of the undergraduate programme, students are adequately prepared for careers in his field of practice.

PTF6 worked as an archaeologist before being invited to teach at Elite Southern University following her MSc with them. She sees herself as an archaeologist, and views her teaching as a means of improving the training in surveying, which is an integral part of archaeology:

> I suppose what brought me to Elite Southern University was that in my
> gut I always wanted to teach surveying, I wanted to teach surveying to
> archaeologists, I wanted to present it in a kind of logical clear,
> informative way, because I think, there was, there is still a little bit of a
> gap there I think in education. [PTF6 Transcript, lines 269-273]

Even though she is fully employed by Elite Southern University, PTF6 still engages in archaeology practice:

> I have always liked that kind of project work, and I love going to work
> in different countries … I think that helps in this line of work as well. so
> and I think I am very lucky here in that, I still, I keep all my contacts,
> my links, so I still go and work on projects in Egypt, and I do the GIS
> and I do surveying, I kind of keep my hand in there as well. [PTF6
> Transcript, lines 418-436]

PTF 6 believes that her engagement with her professional practice is of benefit to her teaching:

> I think the students quite like knowing that the person teaching them goes out into the field and does stuff. … . And then with undergraduates, a lot of them will go to work in engineering firms over the summer, and they will be given surveying jobs to do, and they come back in September, and they go, that stuff that you taught us, we actually had to do it. [PTF6 Transcript, lines 445-457]

PTF7 is in his early 30's and he came to Elite Southern University from industry where he worked in several capacities as a structural engineer. He identifies himself as follows:

> I am a structural engineer, I am a practising structural engineer, and I am a chartered engineer, and I think when I was at university I had the idea in my head that I could lecture, I would be good at lecturing [PTF7 Transcript, lines 9-11]

PTF7 would like to keep up with engineering practice to ensure that his skills remain relevant:

> I will do a stint in industry again, I don't think I will be here forever, I don't see myself here in ten years' time, I would like to spend more time doing what it is that I am already good at, keeping my skills up by keeping practising, working with industry. [PTF7 Transcript, lines 608-611]

PTF7 believes that going back and forth between industry and university is good for his teaching:

> I need to go back and forth, whether that is a couple days of a week here, a couple of days a week there, whatever it is, I will certainly need to move back, because I don't think I will be as good at what I do, which is teach engineering, unless I am practising it. [PTF7 Transcript, lines 616-619]

With regard to scholarly research none of the three participants is keen to engage in it:

… so PTF6 and I always have this discussion whether you need to do educational research in order to be promoted and saying no, basically, you shouldn't be dragged into this research path, it should be based on how good your teaching is, not how good your research on teaching is. [PTF7 Transcript, lines 324-327]

7.6.3 Professional identity as an academic

PTF3 has been at Elite Southern University for 26 years, first as a research-and-teaching academic before being transferred to the teaching-only academic role as a senior teaching fellow 10 years ago. Since he started working at Elite Southern University he has shown a preference for teaching over research [PTF3 Transcript, lines 18-27].

PTF3's aspiration is to secure a professorship based on his contribution to teaching at Elite Southern University, and in the interview he highlights the contributions that he has made to teaching at Elite Southern University.

I have been a keynote speaker at international conferences, I have travelled all over the world, couldn't see you last week because I was in Singapore external examining, and I have produced over 50 books, I have produced loads of conference papers, and loads of teaching initiatives as well. [PTF3 Transcript, lines 53-56]

PTF2 studied physics at Oxford before studying for an MSc and PhD at Elite Southern University. On completing her studies, she was employed by Elite Southern University in several capacities before moving on to her current role as a principal teaching fellow with responsibility for masters' programmes in engineering. She self-identifies as a physicist, as given by the numerous references she makes to physics in her interview:

I have done a physics degree. My dad is an engineer. [PTF2 Transcript, line 14]

The vast majority of people, certainly on my dad's side of the family, are either physical scientists or musicians, proper musicians and they make money out of it. So we got mathematicians, we got a chemist, we got me, we got an engineer, and we got musicians. [PTF2 Transcript, lines 40-43]

PTF2 feels that as an academic engaged in an educational role, she needs to engage with educational research:

> I need to get into educational research. people seem to think its dead easy for a teaching fellow to do that, but quite frankly most teaching fellows are employed because they have got PhDs or masters in engineering, in physics, not in social sciences so where I am perfectly capable of writing research grants, or supervising a PhD student in engineering, I am effectively at the same level as a good masters' student or first year PhD in social sciences, if you think about it from that perspective. [PTF2 Transcript, lines 568-574]

Moreover, PTF2, also believes that she needs to remain engaged her disciplinary area as she believes that this helps to make a her a better teacher:

> I do run the risk on the engineering side of falling out of touch a little bit, which I haven't done yet but I am aware that this is a problem. Keeping yourself in touch with what is going on is difficult. And I think it makes you a better teacher if you know what is happening. You do need to know your discipline and some combination of research and teaching or keeping in touch with the research is important. [PTF2 Transcript, lines 901-906]

7.6.4 A summary of the emerging teaching-only academic identities

An analysis of the interview data in this section has revealed three potential teaching-only academic identities in this case study. PTF1 and PTF5 embody and enact the first identity, that of a teacher in higher education. This identity is characterised by attainment of formal teaching qualifications, the pursuit of professional development and social networks aimed at improving teaching expertise, a self-professed love of teaching and students, and a rejection of academic research, including a rejection of teaching scholarship for the purpose of publication.

The second teaching-only academic identity, as embodied and enacted by PTF4, PTF6 and PTF7 is the identity of the professional practitioner in higher education. This identity is characterised by the valourisation of professional expertise, the perception of the educative role of the university as initiation of students into the professions, and an indifference to, or rejection of, academic research and scholarship of teaching.

The third academic identity revealed by the data is that of the academic. This identity is embodied and enacted by PTF2 and PTF3, and it is characterised by engagement in research activities, including PhD supervision, attendance at academic conferences, discipline specific publication, development and publication of teaching material, and the pursuit of teaching scholarship for the purposes of publication.

As this study shows, the identities adopted by the teaching-only academics in this study are closely linked to the occupational identities that the individuals held prior to entering higher education. Robson (1998) also made the same observation with respect to the professional identities of further education teachers who came into the role from other occupations. Robson suggests that the main reason for the further education teachers in his study retaining their previous occupational identity may be because it is that identity which gives them the credibility, knowledge and skills for which they have been recruited into their current teaching roles. In an earlier study on technical teachers at a technical college, Venables (1967) also noted that that these technical teachers viewed themselves primarily in terms of their previous occupational roles, and there was no shared corporate view of what their educational role entailed. As the findings of this section suggest, this also seems to hold true for the seven teaching-only academics who participated in this study.

7.6.5 Habitus as a self-reinforcing structure

As this study indicates, principal teaching fellows subscribing to the same academic identity tend to have similar socialisation behaviours and experiences that are rooted in their career trajectories. As an illustration, let us consider PTF1 and PTF5, who followed a similar career trajectory from professional practice into their current roles via training roles in industry, which were followed by part-time teaching roles in higher education institutions, and then by fairly lengthy periods as teaching-focussed academics before being transferred to the teaching-only role. Quotations from their interview transcripts that have been highlighted in this section indicate that both of them prefer to engage professionally with teaching-focussed individuals, and they both invest their time and effort in education-focussed activities. Similarly, PTF6 and PTF7, who both have recent professional practice backgrounds, value continued engagement with their professional practice, even though they have moved into academia. Also, PTF2, who came into the teaching-only role via the PhD route, still engages in discipline-based research, including writing for publication and

engagement in PhD supervision, even though both of these activities are not part of the remit of her current role. This tendency by the principal teaching fellows to remain engaged with activities and socialisations from their previous roles lends support to the notion that when faced with changed circumstances, such as entry into a new field, habitus tends to reinforce itself by "providing itself with a milieu to which it is as pre-adapted as possible, that is, a relatively constant universe of situations tending to reinforce its dispositions" (Bourdieu 1990b:61).

7.7   Self-identification with the institution

All the seven participants believe that there is space for teaching-focussed academics at Elite Southern University, and only one participant, PTF2, is open to the idea of moving on to another academic institution. PTF5 believes that as a research-intensive university, Elite Southern University is an ideal place for her:

> …people are shocked that there is space in a research-intensive university for somebody like me, but actually isn't it what this place is all about? It is about challenging and being disruptive, and it's not just disruptive research, its disruptive ways of thinking about things - I come from an environment where girls didn't go to university. [PTF3 Transcript, lines 14-17].

PTF6 believes that as a teaching-only academic, she would be more comfortable in a teaching-oriented university. However, she has been at Elite Southern University since 2000, and she has no intention of moving:

> This is the problem I guess. I have become institutionalised I guess. I have been a student here since 2000, I don't really know what life is like out there. [PTF6 Transcript, lines 895-896].

PTF3 also acknowledged that had he moved on to a teaching-oriented university, he would have achieved his goal of becoming a professor. However, having been at Elite Southern University for 26 years, he feels that he has become institutionalised and he likes it there. More importantly, however, he believes that Elite Southern University, as an institutional brand gives him a higher status than if he were to go and work for a teaching-oriented university:

… third there is the football analogy: Do you play for Arsenal or some small team? If you have been at a high value place you will move on when you have to, but you will play at that level for as long as you possibly can. There is no getting away from the fact that however big a cheese you are or you think you might be; the institution brands you. There is not the slightest doubt, and if I do something and I am asked who do you work for, I work for Elite Southern University. Who do you work for? I am a professor at Southern Teaching University. Right? Oh yeah, but you know there is prestige thing around this. The institution brands you. Again it's a football analogy. Who do you play for? I play for Real Madrid, I play for Arsenal, you are a good player [PTF3 Transcript, lines 333-342].

Academic identity with institutions is an aspect that is seldom covered in the literature on higher education. This section suggest that this aspect of academic identity has implications on the decisions by teaching-only academics to stay on or to leave for other institutions.

7.8   Concluding remarks

This study reveals the unintended impact of the RAE/REF on the teaching function within universities. Prior to the introduction of the RAE/REF, individual academics could exercise agency on whether to focus on research or teaching or both without any discernible negative consequences to their career progression and working conditions. However, the advent of the RAE/REF saw teaching-focussed academics being moved to the teaching-only role, with a detrimental impact on both their working conditions and career progression prospects. Moreover, as the study reveals, the introduction of the teaching-only role has exacerbated the separation between research and teaching, and between undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, with teaching-only academics tending to focus on undergraduate teaching and research-and-teaching academics tending to focus on postgraduate teaching and research.

 Another outcome of this chapter is that, by and large, career trajectories influence teaching-only academic identities, and hence the role is a non-homogeneous role.

The analysis also reveals that despite the pre-eminence of research, teaching remains important within the university, and individuals on the teaching-only role are able to

accumulate substantial, and valued, teaching-related academic capital. This capital enables them to secure and advance their positions within the same institution, and can also facilitate career advancement through employment in other institutions. In the next chapter, I explore the potential implications of the findings arising out of this study.

Chapter 8 – Study findings, implications and recommendations

In this work, I undertook a three-part study of the teaching-only academic role in higher education with the objective of shedding light on their perceptions of the role, their work-related experiences, as well as their academic identity constructions. The first part was a systematic review of the literature on teaching-only academics in the UK, Australia and Canada. The next part was an investigation of the virtual identity of teaching-only academics at a UK research-intensive institution. This comprised an analysis of how teaching-only academics self-represented and projected themselves on their institutional webpages. The last part of the study was a life-history study of senior teaching-only academics in the engineering faculty of the same institution.

8.1   Study findings

8.1.1 Pathways into the teaching-only academic role

A principal finding from this study, which is collaborated across all the three parts of the study, is that the teaching-only academic role is a non-homogeneous role comprising individuals who come from different backgrounds, and who have followed different career pathways into the role. These pathways include transfer from the research-and-teaching academic role, direct progression from PhD studies, career transition from an existing academic role in another higher education institution, or career transition from a professional role outside higher education. Professionals moving into the teaching-only academic role from outside higher education either do so at the end of their non-academic careers following retirement, or they do so early on in their careers. Those professionals who enter into the teaching-only academic role before reaching retirement either do so on a full-time basis, or they do so on a part-time basis whilst maintaining their positions in industry.

In this study, one of the key findings is that the career pathway followed by an individual into the teaching-only academic role is a key determinant in the academic identity that they will assume in the role. In turn, the academic identity that an individual assumes plays a significant role in shaping the individual's expectations of their role, as well as their positioning vis a vis other academic roles within their departments and the institution. This relationship between the academic identity assumed by a teaching-only academic, and the perceptions they have of themselves and their role is best

summed up by the statement by McNaughton and Billot (2016:644) that "identity can also be viewed as the 'being' that informs 'doing', where being is one's way of viewing the world and oneself based on certain values, beliefs and attitudes, and doing is the way of living preceding from this."

Specifically, individuals from the different pathways come into the role with different expectations, and they come equipped with different levels and types of career-enhancing and/or career-inhibiting capital, all of which are derived, in part, from prior study and occupational experiences, and, in part, from social background. For instance, in 2006 when the teaching-only academic role was first established in the case institution, the majority of individuals in the role had been transferred from the research-and-teaching academic role as a result of their research failing to meet the minimum conditions for inclusion in the RAE/REF assessment exercises. The literature suggests that individuals in this category mainly viewed this as a demotion from the traditional research-and-teaching academic role, and hence they often assumed a failed researcher identity upon being transferred.

However, this study also finds that, contrary to the failed researcher narrative discussed above, some of the individuals who were transferred into the role actually welcomed their new academic status. This was because they had already made a commitment to teaching, as opposed to research, even before they were transferred. In this case, their transfer to a teaching-only role actually served as tacit institutional recognition of their teacher identity. Hence, we can conclude from this that whilst individuals with a failed researcher identity tend to view their teaching-only role negatively, those with a teacher identity tend to view the role in a more positive light.

8.1.2 The evolution of the teaching-only academic role

The life-history study also reveals that since its inception in the early to mid-2000s, the teaching-only academic role itself has evolved, and has continued to evolve. At its onset, the role was viewed primarily by the case institution, and other research-intensive institutions, as a destination for academics whose research did not meet RAE/REF requirements. The role has since evolved to the point where it is now viewed primarily as a vehicle for the effective delivery of undergraduate teaching, as evidenced within the case institution by the increased recruitment to the role of individuals with relevant experience gained from professional practice, as well as

career moves by individuals with prior teaching-focussed academic experience from other universities. Whilst universities, particularly research-intensive institutions, have often been accused in the past of prioritising research at the expense of teaching, this evolution suggests that institutions are increasingly paying attention to the perceived shortcomings in their teaching.

As this study finds, the teaching-only academic role is evolving into a valued academic career in its own right, with individuals being recruited directly to the role solely on the basis of their ability to deliver the required teaching and learning function, and not on their research ability. Additionally, opportunities for career progression within the role are improving. This may point to an increasing focus by universities on teaching for its own sake, and suggests that universities may have realised that moving people to teaching-only roles because their research is deemed to be inadequate leads to a disaffected cadre of staff who cannot be guaranteed to deliver the required quality of teaching.

Whilst this study was undertaken prior to the introduction of the TEF, these findings are also important in shaping the development of institutional strategies for compliance with the TEF criteria. Government has touted the TEF as a performativity measure for learning and teaching aimed at providing "clear information to students about where the best provision can be found and to drive up the standard of teaching in all universities" (Department for Business Innovation & Skills 2016). Hence, if an institution is to meet the required TEF requirements in its teaching and learning provision, it would make sense to recruit directly into the teaching-only role, rather than transferring individuals from other roles without due regard to their teaching and learning competences.

Harley (2002) reports that the introduction of a separate teaching-only academic role at a non-research-intensive institution was inadvertently perceived by academics at the institution as being tantamount to turning the academic profession into a non-homogeneous profession comprising an elite sub-group of research active "academic high flyers" and another sub-group of non-research active "teaching drones". Whilst the higher education sector has indeed seen the emergence of a separate teaching-only role, this study suggests that this perception by some of Harley's research participants may be overly pessimistic.

As evidenced by the seniority of the senior teaching-only academics who participated in the life-history study, some teaching-only academics at the case institution now hold substantial administrative roles, and in the process they have accumulated valuable academic and social capital. This accumulated capital is empowering these teaching-only academics to secure and advance their positions within the case study institution. In addition, this accumulated academic and social capital, combined with a higher education field that is increasingly supportive of teaching, is transforming the teaching-only academic role into a bona fide career with opportunities for progression, both within the institution and outside of it. Hence, whereas the teaching-only role may have been viewed at its onset as, in the words of Levin et al. (2006:83), "a less skilled means to achieve efficiency, flexibility and control" for the furtherance of institutional research objectives, increasingly, teaching-only academics are becoming, a la Levin et al (2006:83), "highly skilled and trained assets" necessary for achieving institutional learning and teaching objectives.

However, despite the optimism expressed by the teaching-only academics in this cases study, working conditions and career progression prospects still lag behind those of the research-and-teaching academic role. In addition, there is a perception that the role tends to be characterised by heavy teaching workloads. These workloads make it difficult for individuals to access opportunities and professional experiences that facilitate career progression. Hence, the heavy workloads associated with the role are turning out to be structural impediments to career progression.

8.2   Recommendations and implications of this study

8.2.1 The non-homogeneity of the teaching-only academic role

As this study reveals, the teaching-only academic role is an umbrella term that encompasses a wide spectrum of academic identities that are shaped by individuals' personalities, expectations as well as their social, educational and prior career backgrounds. This leads to teaching-only academics having different values and perceptions of what it means to be a teaching-only academic. For instance, in this study, teaching-only academics from a professional background highly prize maintaining connections with their professions so as not to become professionally obsolete. Similarly, teaching-only academics who progressed into the route directly form PhD roles value opportunities to continue engaging with disciplinary research.

On the other hand, teaching-only academics who have taken on a professional teacher identity value highly opportunities to engage in learning and teaching initiatives, and with like-minded individuals, both within the department and across the institution. This therefore suggests that a single umbrella teaching-only academic job description, as is currently the situation in the case institution, cannot capture the diversities implied by the spectrum of academic identities making up the role.

At a minimum, therefore, to ensure that teaching-only academics remain engaged with their work, institutions can develop a range of teaching-only job descriptions designed to match ranges of academic identities to institutional requirements. For instance, an institution can develop job descriptions aimed at experienced professional practitioners, and separate job descriptions tailor-made for individuals progressing from PhD studies who wish to remain engaged with their research, and separate job descriptions to accommodate individuals who wish to engage with SoTL. In this way institutions can meet their education objectives whilst ensuring that they satisfy individuals' professional goals and job satisfaction. The creation of separate education-focused, teaching-intensive and teaching-only academic categories by some Australian universities (Flecknoe et al. 2017) may be indicative of moves in this direction.

A case in point in this study is PTF2, who has maintained her involvement in discipline-based research, PhD supervision, and academic support and pastoral care for students even though she is not contractually obliged to do so. In this way she is making a valued contribution to her department, including helping to achieve departmental RAE/REF objectives through her PhD supervision role. However, as Macfarlane (2007) suggests, her activities, which are aimed largely at students, have a low status in academe, and, as a consequence, do not contribute to promotion prospects. Hence, PTF2's service role is consistent with the view that early and mid-career female academics take on more administration and "caring, supportive and collegiate" roles which ultimately serve to inhibit their career progression (Grove 2016). One way of addressing this anomaly could be the development of appropriate job descriptions and reward structures that take into account an individual's contributions to administration and student support.

8.2.2 Implications of the teaching-only academic role on future PhD training

My analysis of teaching-only homepages in this study suggest that a considerable number of individuals are entering the teaching-only academic role following PhD studies and postdoctoral work. Finding ways for them to remain engaged with their academic research becomes more important, especially considering the fact that in the UK, 63% of research students intending to go into an academic career are primarily motivated by research, and only 30% per cent express a strong interest in teaching (Metcalf et al. 2005). Clearly, how the research habitus developed during the PhD process plays out with institutional expectations of the teaching-only academic role warrants further investigation. Given that the teaching-only academic role is becoming a feature of higher education, this may necessitate the redesign of PhD programmes to ensure that students are better prepared for the current and evolving higher education environment, as suggested by Austin (2002).

8.2.3 Design of promotion criteria for teaching-only academic roles

Because of the diversity of teaching-only academic identities, what counts as important may differ from one individual to another. For instance, in this study, individuals subscribed to different views on engagement with SoTL (Potter and Kustra 2011), with those from a research background expressing willingness to fully engage with SoTL to the extent of even writing for journal publication, whilst those subscribing to a professional teacher identity expressed willingness to engage with SoTL, but only as far as it contributed to their effectiveness as teachers, and not for the purpose of journal publication. On the other hand, those with a professional practice identity were not willing to engage with SoTL at all.

Given that the then existing promotion criteria at the case institution placed substantial emphasis on SoTL, this would suggest that those who were unable or unwilling to engage in SoTL were placed at a significant disadvantage when it came to promotion. This therefore calls for a more nuanced institutional approach to designing criteria for teaching-only academic career progression, together with the development of more targeted induction and academic support programmes for individuals on the role. One approach would be to review promotion criteria for teaching-only academics to enable them to progress to more senior roles on the basis of the strength and scope of their

contribution to the institution's educational mission, be it through education leadership, SoTL or some other criterion (Fung and Gordon 2016).

8.2.4 Integrating teaching-only academics into departmental teaching

In practice, teaching and learning encompasses a wide spectrum of activities, including engagement in widening participation, admissions, teaching, assessment, employability and even recruitment and retention of teaching staff. Hence, the effective discharge of the teaching and learning function requires that teaching-only academics, as well as other academics involved in teaching, should buy into the same departmental strategies for learning and teaching. This calls for the development of a shared teacher identity within the context of the department. Ideally, this shared identity should exist alongside the other professional identities that the teaching-only academics hold so as to give individuals a sense of personal agency and control over their own career trajectories (Murray et al. 2011). According to van Lankveld et al. (2017), the development of such a shared departmental teacher identity requires a collegial environment that facilitates a sense of community focussed on teaching, together with the provision of teaching development activities that are seen to be supportive, and not punitive.

8.2.5 Implications for the research and teaching nexus

As this study shows, institutional decisions to recruit research-and-teaching academics primarily on the basis of institutional research priorities, and recruiting teaching-only academics primarily to take over undergraduate teaching have exacerbated the separation between teaching and research functions, with undergraduate teaching increasingly being divorced from postgraduate teaching and departmental research. This suggests that contrary to the historical, and prevailing, perceptions of the academic role, the dictum that the relationship between teaching and research is embodied in the individual academic (Locke 2012) is no longer entirely valid, with research hand teaching expertise increasingly likely to be distributed amongst individuals within a department. By virtue of their concentration of research excellence, research-intensive institutions are well placed to offer research-based education at both undergraduate and postgraduate level (Fung and Gordon 2016). For them to be able to do so effectively, they have to look at collaborative ways of teaching between research active academics and teaching-focussed academics.

The dislocation of teaching and research could be mitigated by doing away with the teaching-only academic role altogether and reverting to a unitary research-and-teaching academic role. However, this may no longer be feasible, partly because of the historical lack of parity of esteem between research and teaching. For instance, in the present climate in higher education, research, and not teaching, is the primary medium for bestowing prestige on both individuals and institutions alike (Blackmore 2016). Were a unitary academic role to be introduced in such a climate, individual academics and institutions alike would persist with prioritising research over teaching. This, however, would defeat the intended goals of the TEF of driving up the standards and status of teaching. Hence, it's unlikely that a unitary academic role would survive in an environment where research is prioritised over teaching, and where both are simultaneously subject to both individual and institutional performative assessment.

Even if teaching were to assume parity of esteem with research, it would still be difficult for a unitary academic role to exist in higher education for as long as the separation of the assessment of the quality of teaching and research persists (Locke 2012). For instance, assuming that the TEF ultimately achieves its intended objective of having teaching quality having an impact on the number of students applying to institutions as well as the amount of fees that institutions can levy, then we may end up in a situation whereby teaching is increasingly moved up the agenda as universities seek to maintain or increase their fee income. Given the continued importance of the RAE/REF, were this scenario to occur, then institutions and individuals alike would have to reconsider their position on the research-teaching nexus. One likely outcome of this would be the de facto separation of teaching and research at the individual level.

A second reason why a unitary academic role is unlikely to persist is the recently introduced requirement for REF2021 that institutions should enter all their research-and-teaching staff for assessment (HEFCE 2017). This means that institutions can no longer hide anyone on the research-and-teaching academic role who does not do any research, or whose research is deemed to be poor, by choosing not to return them for the REF. Institutions are thus faced with three options, namely (i) returning all their research-and-teaching staff, which has the potential to pull down unit scores; (ii) remove non-performing individuals from the research-and-teaching role prior to entering the REF exercise, which has the potential to lead to a messy performance

management process; or (iii) re-allocating non-performing individuals from the research-and-teaching role to the teaching-only job family, which has the potential to replicate all the errors of the past associated with direct transfer of staff to the teaching-only role.

A third reason why it may no longer be feasible to have a unitary academic role is that REF2021 now requires the number of research-and-teaching staff to be correlated to the number of Impact Case Studies that are required for REF. Where an institution has a limited number of case studies, it may be more strategic to limit the number of research-and-teaching academics to ensure compliance with REF2021. Hence it is likely that REF2021 may constrain the maximum number of research-and-teaching staff, with institutions having to compensate for this by increasing the number of teaching-only academic staff. Hence, the current higher education climate points to a dislocation of the academic role into separate teaching and research roles.

8.3   Further work

Apart from the systematic literature review on the current status of the teaching-only academic role that I undertook, the core of my work was a case study on teaching-only academic staff in the engineering faculty of a UK research-intensive university. These findings therefore may not extend to other institutions or faculties whose socio-cultural settings, norms, values and structures differ from those obtaining at the case study institution.

However, this study can be usefully extended in several ways. One approach would be to extend the same single-institution case study to cover all the teaching-only academic grades within the same faculty. One objective for such an approach would be to shed light on how career level impacts the academic identity, experiences and perceptions of individuals employed in the teaching-only academic role. Alternatively, one could choose to explore either a single career level, or multiple career levels, across all the academic disciplines in one institution. This would help to shed light on the impact that individual academic departments and disciplines have on the teaching-only academic role in the context of a single institution.

The study can also be extended across multiple institutions in several ways. For instance, to explore the impact of institutions on the role whilst controlling for discipline

influences, a same-discipline study can be conducted, either across individual sectors such as all the research-intensive universities in England, or across the Russell Group of universities, or across the entire UK higher education sector. This would help to give a multi-institutional perspective on the teaching-only academic role within a specific discipline. In addition, one can choose to run the study across multiple disciplines and multiple institutions to shed light on the entire UK higher education sector. Ultimately, the study that I have undertaken is, at best, only an initial step into a much wider endeavour to understand the teaching-only academic phenomenon within higher education.

In this study I have focussed on the perceptions, lived experiences and academic identity constructions of senior teaching-only academics who are predominantly in full-time, permanent roles, or who work on a part-time basis in the institution but are employed on a full-time basis elsewhere. These academics therefore have relatively secure employment. However, alongside the emergence of the teaching-only role, casualisation has also become another feature of current higher education (Bryson and Barnes 2000; Kimber 2003; University and College Union 2016). Casualised teaching-only academics are unlikely to share the same experiences and perceptions as the participants investigated in this study. Consequently, future research studies focussing on early career casualised teaching-only academics would go a long way to furthering our understanding of the changes that are currently taking place within the teaching-only academic role.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Ethics Application Form

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

When completing this form please remember that the purpose of the document is to clearly explain the ethical considerations of the research being undertaken. As a generic form it has been constructed to cover a wide-range of different projects so some sections may not seem relevant to you. Please include the information which addresses any ethical considerations for your particular project which will be needed by the SSIS Ethics Committee to approve your proposal.

Guidance on all aspects of the SSIS Ethics application process can be found on the SSIS intranet:

https://intranet.exeter.ac.uk/socialsciences/staff/research/researchenvironmentandpolicies/ethics/

All staff and postdoctoral students within SSIS should use this form to apply for ethical approval and then send it to one of the following email addresses:

ssis-ethics@exeter.ac.uk   This email should be used by staff and postdoctoral students in Egenis, the Institute for Arab and Islamic Studies, Law, Politics, the Strategy & Security Institute, and Sociology, Philosophy, Anthropology.

ssis-gseethics@exeter.ac.uk   This email should be used by staff and postdoctoral students in the Graduate School of Education.

Applicant details	
Name	**Abel Nyamapfene**
Department	**Graduate School of Education**
UoE email address	**azn201@exeter.ac.uk**

Duration for which permission is required
You should request approval for the entire period of your research activity. The start date should be at least one month from the date that you submit this form. Students should use the

anticipated date of completion of their course as the end date of their work. Please note that retrospective ethical approval will never be given.

Start date:10/02/2016	End date:30/04/2016	Date submitted:28/01/2015

Students only

All students must discuss their research intentions with their supervisor/tutor prior to submitting an application for ethical approval. The discussion may be face to face or via email.

Prior to submitting your application in its final form to the SSIS Ethics Committee it should be approved by your first and second supervisor / dissertation supervisor/tutor. You should submit evidence of their approval with your application, e.g. a copy of their email approval.

Student number	580024117
Programme of study	**Doctor of Education (EdD) casework** If you selected 'other' from the list above please name your programme here
Name of Supervisor(s)/tutors or Dissertation Tutor	**Dr Nigel Skinner, Dr Lindsay Hetherington**
Have you attended any ethics training that is available to students?	Yes, I have taken part in ethics training at the University of Exeter For example, the Research Integrity Ethics and Governance workshop: http://as.exeter.ac.uk/rdp/postgraduateresearchers If yes, please give the date of the training:20/07/2012

Certification for all submissions

I hereby certify that I will abide by the details given in this application and that I undertake in my research to respect the dignity and privacy of those participating in this research.I confirm that if my research should change radically I will complete a further ethics proposal form.

Abel Nyamapfene

Double click this box to confirm certification X

Submission of this ethics proposal form confirms your acceptance of the above.

TITLE OF YOUR PROJECT

> **The work experiences, perceptions and expectations of teaching-only academic staff at a UK research-intensive university: A narrative enquiry**

ETHICAL REVIEW BY AN EXTERNAL COMMITTEE

> No, my research is not funded by, or doesn't use data from, either the NHS or Ministry of Defence.
>
> If you selected yes from the list above you should apply for ethics approval from the appropriate organisation (the NHS Health Research Authority or the Ministry of Defence Research Ethics Committee). You do not need to complete this form, but you must inform the Ethics Secretary of your project and your submission to an external committee.

MENTAL CAPACITY ACT 2005

> No, my project does not involve participants aged 16 or over who are unable to give informed consent (e.g. people with learning disabilities
>
> If you selected yes from the list above you should apply for ethics approval from the NHS Health Research Authority. You do not need to complete this form, but you must inform the Ethics Secretaryof your project and your submission to an external committee.

SYNOPSIS OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT

As a guide - 750 words.

> **Introduction**
>
> The teaching-only academic category is a comparatively recent and growing phenomenon in UK higher education and elsewhere (Bryson, 2004; Cummings et al., 2014; Probert, 2013; Vajoczki et al., 2011; Willmott, 1995). The main driver behind this growth are the recent and ongoing changes within higher education. This includes the massification of higher education, funding cuts, selectivity in research funding and the marketisation of higher education. These changes have led to institutions restructuring and adopting new strategies to ensure survival. One such institutional survival strategy is the increased reliance on teaching-only academics, mainly on a casual basis, but also on full time fixed term and permanent basis.

The teaching-only academic role is not homogeneous. Rather, it comprises different strands that are largely dependent on the entry route to the role. At least five strands of teaching-only academics can be identified from the emergent literature. These are:

- Current and recently graduated PhD students to short-term teaching roles to enable them to gain experience whilst writing up their dissertations and looking for academic job openings (White, 1996).
- Academics who have been transferred from research-and-teaching roles because of failure to meet the performance criteria needed to participate in prevailing national research assessment exercises(AUT 2005; Fazackerley 2004; Harley 2002; Henkel 2007; Willmott 1995).
- Individuals on casual appointments who have been brought in to take on the increased teaching load arising out of increased student number as a result of massification (Kimber 2003; Probert 2013; Shelton et al. 2001).
- Teaching-only academics who have been brought in to improve to manage and improve the quality of teaching within universities. This group comprises academics hired on the basis of their proven teaching and administrative competence.
- Practising or retired practitioners hired by university departments to impart industry specific skills to students. Such appointments are common in the medical, engineering and architectural departments (Graham 2015; Gull 2010; Kumar et al. 2011).

What it means to be a teaching-only academic is directly dependent on the particular strand to which an individual belongs. This includes such aspects as status within the academic community, academic professional identity, the nature of the tasks undertaken within the role, and also the demography of the people making up the role. For instance, academics who have been transferred from research-and-teaching roles may feel that they have failed as academics, and may view the role as a stigmatised role for failed academics. In contrast, individuals hired to the teaching-only academic role may view it positively as an acknowledgement of their teaching expertise.

Research Question

1. What are teaching-only academics' perceptions of their past, present, and future career experiences and prospects?
   a. To what extent are these perceptions influenced by
      - Discipline;
      - Career stage;
      - Entry route into the teaching-only academic role?

2. What are the critical moments in the career histories of teaching-only academics?
   a. In what way does choice, chance and opportunity (or lack thereof) influence the decision to pursue a teaching-only academic career?

References

Association of University Teachers, (AUT) (2005). *The rise of teaching-only academics: Changes in the employment of UK academic staff.* London, Association of University Teachers.

Bryson, C. (2004). "What about the workers? The expansion of higher education and the transformation of academic work." *Industrial Relations Journal*, 35(1), 38-57.

Cummings, R., Stoney, S., Tucker, M. B., and de St Jorre, T. J. (2014). "Australian University Teaching Criteria and Standards Project Ref: SP12-2335."

Fazackerley, A. (2004). "Staff at risk in RAE run-up." *Times Higher Education Supplement*(1641), 1-1.

Fitzmaurice, Marian. 2011. "Constructing professional identity as a new academic: a moral endeavour." *Studies in Higher Education*:1-10. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2011.594501.

Graham, R. (2015). *Does teaching advance your academic career? Perspectives of promotion procedures in UK higher education*. A report for the Royal Academy of Engineering Standing Committee for Education and Training, Royal Academy of Engineering.

Gull, K. (2010). *Redressing the balance: the status and valuation of teaching in academic careers in the biomedical sciences* The Academy of Medical Sciences, London,UK.

Harley, S. (2002). "The Impact of Research Selectivity on Academic Work and Identity in UK Universities." *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(2), 187-205.

Henkel, M. (2007). "Shifting boundaries and the academic profession." *Key challenges to the academic profession*, 65, 192-220.

Kimber, M. (2003). "The tenured 'core' and the tenuous 'periphery': the casualisation of academic work in Australian universities." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 25(1), 41-50.

Kumar, K., Roberts, C., and Thistlethwaite, J. (2011). "Entering and navigating academic medicine: academic clinician-educators' experiences." *Medical Education*, 45(5), 497-503.

Probert, B. (2013). "Teaching-focused academic appointments in Australian universities: recognition, specialisation, or stratification?". City: Office for Learning and Teaching: Sydney.

Shelton, N., Laoire, C. N., Fielding, S., Harvey, D. C., Pelling, M., and Duke-Williams, O. (2001). "Working at the Coalface: Contract Staff, Academic Initiation and the RAE." *Area*, 33(4), 434-439.

Vajoczki, S., Fenton, N., Menard, K., and Pollon, D. (2011). *Teaching-Stream Faculty in Ontario Universities*. Toronto.

White, P. (1996). "Issues in the use of teaching fellows." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 20(1), 117.

Willmott, H. (1995). "Managing the Academics: Commodification and Control in the Development of University Education in the U.K." *Human Relations*, 48(9), 993-1027.

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH

Not Applicable as my research is entirely UK based

The following sections require an assessment of possible ethical consideration in your research project. If particular sections do not seem relevant to your project please indicate this and clarify why.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Method

I will carry out semi-structured interviews that focus specifically on the work-life histories of research participants. Through the use of appropriate open-ended questions, I will encourage participants to talk about what they feel is most important to themselves, and to frame their life-stories in a manner which is most appropriate to them. Adopting such a narrative approach will help the participants to take ownership of the interview and thereby help to mitigate any bias arising out of my inside-researcher status.

Participant Selection

The target group for this project are the teaching-only academics employed within Engineering disciplines at the case university. Within this university teaching-only academics fall into three career grades, namely the teaching fellow, senior teaching fellow and principal teaching fellow grades. The objective of the research is to investigate the work experiences, perceptions and expectations of teaching-only academics across career stages within Engineering disciplines. As such, all my study participants will be drawn from the Faculty of Engineering Science.

I will use random sampling to select two participants from each teaching-only academic career grade, which will give me six research participants.

Project Outputs:

Dissertation report to be submitted in partial fulfilment of the EdD degree;

Seminars and Conference papers

Journal publications

Sensitivity of Study

This study focuses on the work experiences, perceptions and expectations of teaching-only academics within the case university. The study does not involve discussion of any sensitive topics such as sexual activity or drug use. The study involves no repetitive testing, and is unlikely to induce pain, discomfort and psychological stress for both the participants and myself as the researcher.

In line with BERA guidelines, I will

Immediately inform all the participants of any unexpected detriment to participants, which arises during the research;

Seek to minimize the impact of the research study on the normal working and workloads of the participants;

Take all necessary steps to reduce any sense of intrusion on the participants and desist immediately from any actions arising from the research process that may cause emotional or other harm.

PARTICIPANTS

See Above

THE VOLUNTARY NATURE OF PARTICIPATION

The following approach will be used to recruit research participants:

a) A list of potential participants will be identified from the websites of all the departments within the Faculty of Engineering Science
b) The list of potential participants is then separated out in accordance with the existing employment categories: Teaching Fellow, Senior Teaching Fellow and Principal Teaching Fellow categories.
c) Two participants will be randomly selected from each employment category.
d) Verbal invitations will be made to the selected participants.
e) Each selected participant who accepts the verbal invitation will be sent an invitation email accompanied by an information sheet and a consent form. The invitation email will also inform potential participants of the date by which they must respond if they are to be considered for participation in the project.
f) Further invitations will be sent out until there are two participants per employment category.
g) The invitation email, information sheet, and consent form will highlight the voluntary nature of the project, and will emphasise the right of participants to withdraw from the project at any stage, in which case their data will be excluded from the project data.

SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Project documentation aimed at the participants will be available in normal font as well as large font. This includes the information sheet, the consent form, transcribed interview data, and draft reports.

The participants will be invited to participate in an interview of about an hour's duration. This interview will be held at a time and venue convenient to the participants, including away from the employer's premises if they so choose. Participants also have the option of undertaking the entire interview at one go, or to segment the interview into manageable time intervals, depending on their requirements.

THE INFORMED NATURE OF PARTICIPATION

I will send out an invitation email to all prospective study participants who have agreed verbally to participate. This email will include an information sheet giving a brief overview of the project and a consent form that each participant will fill and sign if they agree to participate in the project. The information sheet will also identify any possible disadvantages that the participants may experience through their participation in the project. These disadvantages are highlighted below in the section "Assessment of possible harm". Both the information sheet and consent form will highlight the fact that participation in the project is completely voluntary, and that participants reserve the right to withdraw from the project at any stage, in which case their data will not form part of the project data.

ASSESSMENT OF POSSIBLE HARM

As a teaching-only academic working within the same institution as my own participants I can be considered an insider researcher. This means that I may be acquainted with the prospective participants to varying levels of familiarity. This may affect the rapport between myself and individual participants during interviews, and my personal experiences, as well as my personal relationships with the participants, may end up influencing the type of information collected as well as subsequent analysis of interview data. To guard against this I have to be persistently aware of my insider status, and to adopt reflexive approaches to ensure the integrity of the data.

As an insider who has to work with the research participants in day to day professional roles, I may end up being privy to information that I would not necessarily acquire through day to day work practices. To ensure that my research does not impinge on the professional practice of both the research participants and myself I have to uphold a high degree of personal integrity pertaining to participants' personal information. This includes ensuring that participants never get to identify each other through the research data I am going to collect as such identification may affect working relationships, especially if individual participants hold divergent views regarding aspects of the teaching-only academic role.

For this project I will anonymise the identity of the institution in line with best practice. However, as an insider researcher, any publications that I write may end up inadvertently revealing the name of the institution. This means that I will have to pay particular attention to the anonymity of participants' data, as the anonymity of the institution is not guaranteed. In line with practice in narrative enquiry and life-history research (see, for example, Muchmore (2002)[1]), I will not include:

- any personal information that might cause someone undue embarrassment
- any personal information that a participant wishes to keep off the record
- any gossip about the work colleagues and students of the participants that I may overhear when I go into their workplaces to interview them even if it may be relevant to this study.

[1] Muchmore, J. A. (2002). "Methods and ethics in a life history study of teacher thinking". *The Qualitative Report*, *7*(4), 1-19.

Given my insider status, participants may be reluctant to participate in the project out of the above confidentiality concerns. To allay these fears, I also applied for ethical approval from the host institution. However this was not deemed necessary by the host institution as they felt that the ethical and confidentiality guidelines and procedures of the University of Exeter adequately addressed their concerns. Notwithstanding this, I will emphasise the right of each participant to withdraw from the project at any time, and to guarantee non-use of their data should this occur.

DATA PROTECTION AND STORAGE

a) Maintenance of Participant Confidentiality and Anonymity
To maintain the confidentiality and anonymity of participant data I will comply with the UK Data Archive guidelines for creating and managing data as follows:

- I will store any participant personal information separately from the interview data, in a password-protected file on Drop Box.
- Interview data will be stored on the University of Exeter U-drive in a password-protected file.
- To keep track of the participants, I will use a simple alphanumeric identity code to number the participant as well as encoding their academic career grades. For instance the two teaching fellow records will be numbered as TF1 and TF2. Similarly all participants at principal and senior teaching fellow level will be numbered as PTF1, PTF2 and STF1, STF2 respectively.

Secondly, to make it more difficult for participants to be identified, I will make their departmental affiliation anonymous.

Finally, I will make sure that information recorded for each category is not so specific that it would identify an individual. For example:

- To identify participants' responsibilities, I will use generic titles like "module coordinator", "programmer lead", "tutor" instead of the precise titles associated with their specific administrative responsibilities.
- With regard to academic publications, I will use numerical ranges such as 0 -5; 6-10; 11-15; etc. instead of stating the exact number
- With regard to research grants, instead of recording specific details I will simply record whether the grant has been sponsored internally or externally, whether it is a discipline-based research grant, or a teaching and learning grant, whether or not it has been received within the past five years, the range of its monetary value: £0 - £500; £ 500 - £1000, £1000 - £5000, £5000 - £10000 etc.
- With regard to any other institutions or organisations the participant was previously or currently associated with: For higher education institution I will simply identify whether it was a research-intensive institution or not, and for any other organisations I will simply identify it by the nature of its business e.g. further education college, financial institution, utilities organisation etc.

b) Guaranteeing the security of all data
- No data will be stored on physical devices such as laptops, memory sticks or memory cards
- Hard copy transcripts and signed consent forms will be stored in a locked filing cabinet.
- All the project material will be retained for five years from the end of the project, after which it will be destroyed in accordance with guidance from the UK Data Archive
- All voice, video or personal identifiable data will not be published or shared outside the research team in any way (e.g. in publications, conferences, training materials).

c) Written privacy notice

I will use a standard Graduate School of Education consent form with the following privacy notice:

"Data Protection Act: The University of Exeter is a data collector and is registered with the Office of the Data Protection Commissioner as required to do under the Data Protection Act 1998. The information you provide will be used for research purposes and will be processed in accordance with the University's registration and current data protection legislation. Data will be confidential to the researcher(s) and will not be disclosed to any unauthorised third parties without further agreement by the participant. Reports based on the data will be in anonymised form."

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

I am a teaching-only academic working within the same institution as the study participants, and hence I am an insider so far as the study is concerned. To ensure the validity of this research, I will adopt a reflexive approach regarding my position as a researcher at all stages of the project – data gathering, analysis and report writing. I will do this in line with recommendations from the literature on insider research (See, for example, Mercer (2007)[2]).

USER ENGAGEMENT AND FEEDBACK

All participants will receive a typed copy of their transcript. I will also invite interested participants to review the transcript together with me, and to identify what the transcript might mean to the research project.

---

[2] Mercer, J. (2007). "The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: Wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas". *Oxford Review of Education*, *33*(1), 1-17.

I will also invite participants to a focus group style meeting to discuss the research findings. Attendance at this meeting will be entirely voluntary, and its purpose will be to validate my analysis, and to dig further into comparisons at different teaching fellow levels and across the different academic departments.

Participants will also have access to the project report, prior to its publication in dissertation report form, and will have the opportunity to voice their concerns pertaining to the need for their continued anonymity following publication.

INFORMATION SHEET

An information sheet to be issued to prospective project participants is attached.

CONSENT FORM

A consent form to be used with the project is attached.

SUBMISSION PROCEDURE

Staff and students should follow the procedure below.

In particular, students should discuss their application with their supervisor(s) / dissertation tutor / tutor and gain their approval prior to submission.Students should submit evidence of approval with their application, e.g. a copy of the supervisors email approval.

This application form and examples of your consent form, information sheet and translations of any documents which are not written in English should be submitted by email to the SSIS Ethics Secretary via one of the following email addresses:

ssis-ethics@exeter.ac.uk   This email should be used by staff and postdoctoral students in Egenis, the Institute for Arab and Islamic Studies, Law, Politics, the Strategy & Security Institute, and Sociology, Philosophy, Anthropology.

ssis-gseethics@exeter.ac.uk This email should be used by staff and postdoctoral students in the Graduate School of Education.

Appendix 2: Information Sheet

Title of Research Project

The work experiences, perceptions and expectations of teaching-only academic staff at a UK research-intensive university: A narrative enquiry

Details of Project

My name is Abel Nyamapfene and I am undertaking this project as part of my studies towards attaining an EdD from the University of Exeter. My dissertation supervisors are Dr Nigel Skinner and Dr Lindsay Hetherington. Both are based in the University of Exeter Graduate School of Education.

The number of teaching-only academics employed within UK higher education institutions and elsewhere is rising. However, despite this increase in the number of teaching-only academics, little or no research has been undertaken to shed light on what it means to be a teaching-only academic, especially with research-intensive institutions.

To fill this gap in knowledge, I would like to find out the nature of work that teaching-only academics undertake on a day to day basis, as well as their thoughts and feelings regarding the teaching-only academic role. I am also interested in finding out the extent to which teaching-only academics employed across the university feel they are value and regarded by the university, their academic departments, and by fellow academics, management and the professional services staff whom they work and interact with in their day to day work. In addition, I would also like to find out the extent to which teaching-only academics feel they are valued within their own disciplines and by the higher education sector as a whole.

I also intend to find out how current teaching-only academics progressed into their roles from PhD studies, or from employment within and outside the higher education sector. In addition, I am also interested in finding out the factors and motivations that prompted academics to take this career route. Finally, I also want to find out what teaching-only academics think about their job security, as well as their thoughts on their prospects for progression and promotion within the role, and towards other roles within and outside the university.

I hope that you will kindly agree to take part in this project. As part of gathering data for the project, I intend to interview you and to record the interview for the purpose of analysis. I will store the interview audio recordings and transcripts securely in accordance with the University of Exeter policy on the UK Data Protection Act. I will ensure that the identity of those interviewed will remain anonymous both for the purposes of the project and any publications that arise out of it. Any personal details will be password protected for the duration of this study and destroyed at the end of it. I anticipate that the findings will be of value and interest to individual teaching-only academics, individual academic departments and higher education institutions, and to the rest of the higher education community as a

whole. I will provide each research participants with copies of their interview transcripts as well as with copies of any published material.

I would like to ask you to sign a form consenting to the interview, and to inform you that you may withdraw from the study at any time and your data will not be used. The consent form is attached, and I can collect the signed copy when we meet. The interview will consist of open-ended questions deigned to encourage you to talk about your career experiences and what you feel is important to you regarding the teaching-only academic role. The interview will last about an hour.

Title of Research Project: The work experiences, perceptions and expectations of teaching-only academic staff at a UK research-intensive university: A narrative enquiry

CONSENT FORM

I have been fully informed about the aims and purposes of the project.

I understand that:

> there is no compulsion for me to participate in this research project and, if I do choose to participate, I may at any stage withdraw my participation and may also request that my data be destroyed

> I have the right to refuse permission for the publication of any information about me

> any information which I give will be used solely for the purposes of this research project, which may include publications or academic conference or seminar presentations

> if applicable, the information, which I give, may be shared between any of the other researcher(s) participating in this project in an anonymised form

> all information I give will be treated as confidential

> the researcher(s) will make every effort to preserve my anonymity

..............................………………..   ……………………………

(Signature of participant)   (Date)

……………………

(Printed name of participant)

One copy of this form will be kept by the participant; a second copy will be kept by the researcher

Contact phone number of researcher: 00 44 (0) 7882234781……………………………………..

If you have any concerns about the project that you would like to discuss, please contact:

Abel Nyamapfene. Email: azn201@exeter.ac.uk…………………………………………………………….

OR

Dr. Nigel Skinner, The Graduate School of Education, University of Exeter, St Luke's Campus, Heavitree Road, Exeter, Devon, EX1 2LU,United Kingdom . Email: N.C.Skinner@exeter.ac.uk ……………………………….

* when research takes place in a school, the right to withdraw from the research does NOT usually mean that pupils or students may withdraw from lessons in which the research takes place

Revised March 2013

Glossary

Academic	An employee of a university or other higher education institution who is employed to engage in teaching, or research, or both
Research-and-teaching academic	An academic employed on a research-and-teaching contract who are expected to engage in both research and teaching
Teaching-focused academic	An academic employed on a research-and-teaching contract who engages in both research and teaching, but with a primary focus on teaching
Research-focused academic	An academic employed on a research-and-teaching contract who engage in both research and teaching, but with a primary focus on research
Russell Group	A self-selected association of twenty-four public research universities in the UK
Teaching-only academic	An academic employed on a teaching-only contract who engages exclusively on teaching
Research-intensive institution	A higher education institution which has high level of involvement in pure and applied research, a high proportion of postgraduate research programmes, and has a high level of external income supporting its research
Teaching-intensive institution	A higher education institution which focusses primarily on undergraduate teaching, although it may be involved in research as well
Research assessment exercise (RAE)	An academic peer quality assessment exercise for research introduced by the UK government in 1986 for the purposes of determining the distribution of government research funding amongst higher education institutions
Research excellence framework (REF)	An academic peer quality assessment exercise for research for UK higher education institutions that replaced the RAE in 2010

Scholarly teaching	teaching grounded in critical reflection using systematically and strategically gathered evidence, related and explained by well-reasoned theory and philosophical understanding, with the goal of maximizing learning through effective teaching (Potter and Kustra 2011)
Scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL)	The systematic study of learning and teaching, using established or validated criteria of scholarship, to understand how teaching (beliefs, behaviours, attitudes, and values) can maximize learning, and/or develop a more accurate understanding of learning, resulting in products that are publicly shared for critique and use by an appropriate community (Potter and Kustra 2011)

References

Achinstein, B., Ogawa, R. T., and Speiglman, A. (2004). "Are We Creating Separate and Unequal Tracks of Teachers? The Effects of State Policy, Local Conditions, and Teacher Characteristics on New Teacher Socialization." *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 557-603.

Anfara Jr, V. A., and Mertz, N. T. (2006). *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Archer, L. (2008). "Younger academics' constructions of 'authenticity', 'success' and professional identity." *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(4), 385-403.

Archer, M. S. (2000). *Being human: The problem of agency*: Cambridge University Press.

Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., and Corley, K. G. (2008). "Identification in Organizations: An Examination of Four Fundamental Questions." *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 325-374.

Asselin, M. E. (2003). "Insider research: Issues to consider when doing qualitative research in your own setting." *Journal for Nurses in Professional Development*, 19(2), 99-103.

Association of University Teachers, (AUT). (2005). *The rise of teaching-only academics: Changes in the employment of UK academic staff*. Association of University Teachers, London.

Austin, A. E. (2002). "Preparing the Next Generation of Faculty." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122.

Ball, S. J. (2008). "Performativity, Privatisation, Professionals and the State", in B. Cunningham, (ed.), *Exploring Professionalism*. London: Institute of Education, University of London, pp. 50–72.

Barrett, L., Barrett, P., Lucinda, B., and Peter, B. (2011). "Women and academic workloads: career slow lane or cul-de-sac?". City: Netherlands, pp. 141-155.

Bassey, M. (1999). *Case study research in educational settings*: McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Bauder, H. (2006). "The segmentation of academic labour: A Canadian example." *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 4(2), 228-239.

Bearman, M., Smith, C. D., Carbone, A., Slade, S., Baik, C., Hughes-Warrington, M., and Neumann, D. L. (2012). "Systematic review methodology in higher education." *Higher Education Research & Development*, 31(5), 625-640.

Bennett, D., Roberts, L., Ananthram, S., and Broughton, M. (2017). "What is required to develop career pathways for teaching academics?" *Higher Education*.

Bettis, P. J., and Mills, M. R. (2006). "Liminality and the study of a changing academic landscape", in V. A. Anfara Jr, (ed.), *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 59-71.

Bexley, E., Arkoudis, S., and James, R. (2013). "The motivations, values and future plans of Australian academics". City: Netherlands, pp. 385-400.

Bexley, E., James, R., and Arkoudis, S. (2011). *The Australian academic profession in transition : addressing the challenge of reconceptualising academic work and regenerating the academic workforce*. University of Melbourne. Centre for the Study of Higher Education, Melbourne.

Blackmore, P. (2016). ""Why research trumps teaching and what can be done about it", in P. Blackmore, R. Blackwell, and M. Edmondson, (eds.), *Tackling wicked issues: Prestige and employment outcomes in the Teaching Excellence Framework*. Oxford: Higher Education Policy Institute pp. 9–37.

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., and Tight, M. (1998). "Writing on academic careers." *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(3), 281-295.

Bogdan, R. (1974). *Being Different: The Autobiography of Jane Fry*: Wiley.

Bourdieu, P. (1979). *Algeria 1960: The Disenchantment of the World*: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1985). "The social space and the genesis of groups." *Social Science Information*, 24(2), 195-220.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). "The forms of capital", in J. Richardson, (ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood, pp. 18.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). "Social space and symbolic power." *Sociological theory*, 7(1), 14-25.

Bourdieu, P. (1990a). "In other words: essays towards a reflexive practice". City: Polity Press Cambridge.

Bourdieu, P. (1990b). *The logic of practice*: Stanford university press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *On Television and Journalism*, P. P. Ferguson, translator, London: Pluto Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2003). "Participant Objectivation." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 9(2), 281-294.

Bourdieu, P., and Collier, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus*: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., and Wacquant, L. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Cambridge: Polity.

Brannick, T., and Coghlan, D. (2007). "In defense of being "native": The case for insider academic research." *Organizational research methods*, 10(1), 59-74.

Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2006). "Using thematic analysis in psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Breen, M. P. (2007). "Appropriating Uncertainty: ELT professional development in the new century", in J. Cummins and C. Davison, (eds.), *International Handbook of English Language Teaching, Part II*. Springer US, pp. 1067-1084.

Brennan, J., Locke, W., and Naidoo, R. (2007). "United Kingdom: an increasingly differentiated profession", in W. Locke and U. Teichler, (eds.), *The Changing Conditions for Academic Work and Career in Selected Countries*. Kassel, Germany: International Centre for Higher Education Research.

British Educational Research Association. (2011). "Ethical guidelines for educational research", B. E. R. Association, (ed.). City: British Educational Research Association: London.

Brosnan, C. (2010). "Making sense of differences between medical schools through Bourdieu's concept of 'field'." *Medical Education*, 44(7), 645-652.

Brown, R., and Carasso, H. (2013). *Everything for sale?: the marketisation of UK higher education*: Routledge.

Bruner, J. (1991). "The Narrative Construction of Reality." *Critical Inquiry*, 18(1), 1-21.

Bryson, C. (2004). "What about the workers? The expansion of higher education and the transformation of academic work." *Industrial Relations Journal*, 35(1), 38-57.

Bryson, C., and Barnes, N. (2000). "The casualisation of employment in higher education in the United Kingdom", *Academic work and life: What it is to be an academic, and how this is changing*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 187-241.

Bucher, R., and Stelling, J. (1997). *Becoming Professional* Beverley Hills Sage Publications.

Bukvova, H. (2011). "Scientists online: A framework for the analysis of Internet profiles." *First Monday*, 16(10).

Canadian Association of University Teachers, (CAUT). (2015). *CAUT ALMANAC of Post-Secondary Education in Canada, 2014-2015*. Canadian Association of University Teachers.

Carnegie Foundation. (2001). "The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education". City: Carnegie Foundation: California.

Cashmore, A., Cane, C., and Cane, R. (2013). *Rebalancing promotion in the HE sector: is teaching excellence being rewarded?* , Genetics Education Networking for Innovation and Excellence: the UK's Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in Genetics (GENIE CETL), University of Leicester, The Higher Education Academy.

Chalmers, D. (2010). "Progress and challenges to the recognition and reward of the Scholarship of Teaching in higher education." *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(1), 25-38.

Chandler, D. (1998). "Personal home pages and the construction of identities on the web." *URL (consulted June 2015): http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/short/webident.html*.

Chase, S. E. (2007). "Multiple lenses, approaches, voices." *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*, 57(3), 651-679.

Clandinin, D. (2006a). *Composing Diverse Identites: Narrative inquiries into the interwoven lives of children and teachers*: Routledge.

Clandinin, D. J. (2006b). "Narrative inquiry: A methodology for studying lived experience." *Research Studies in Music Education*, 27(1), 44-54.

Clarke, M., Drennan, J., Hyde, A., and Politis, Y. (2015). "Academics' Perceptions of Their Professional Contexts", in T. Fumasoli, G. Goastellec, and B. M. Kehm, (eds.), *Academic Work and Careers in Europe: Trends, Challenges, Perspectives*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 117-131.

Clegg, S. (2008). "Academic identities under threat?" *British Educational Research Journal*, 34(3), 329-345.

Coates, H., Dobson, I. R., Goedegebuure, L., and Meek, L. (2009). "Australia's casual approach to its academic teaching workforce." *People and Place*, 17(4), 47-54.

Coates, H., Goedegebuure, L., Van Der Lee, J., and Meek, L. (2008). "The Australian Academic Profession : a first overview". City.

Coldron, J., and Smith, R. (1999). "Active location in teachers' construction of their professional identities." *Journal of curriculum studies*, 31(6), 711-726.

Craig, N., Tennant, S., Murray, M., Forster, A., and Pilcher, N. "The role of experienced practitioners in engineering education: the end of an era?" *Presented at 6th International Symposium for Engineering Education*.

Cummings, R., Stoney, S., Tucker, M. B., and de St Jorre, T. J. (2014). "Australian University Teaching Criteria and Standards Project Ref: SP12-2335."

Dearlove, J. (2002). "A Continuing Role For Academics: The Governance of UK Universities in the Post–Dearing Era." *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(3), 257-275.

Deem, R., and Brehony, K. J. (2005). "Management as ideology: the case of 'new managerialism' in higher education." *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(2), 217-235.

Denzin, N. K., and Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). *The landscape of qualitativwe research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Department for Business Innovation & Skills, (BIS). (2016). "Success as a knowledge economy: teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice", Department for Business Innovation & Skills, (ed.). City: Her Majesty's Stationery Office: London.

Department for Education, (DfE). (2017). "Participation Rates In Higher Education: Academic Years 2006/2007 – 2015/2016 (Provisional)". City: Department for Education: London.

Department for Education and Skills, (DfES). (2003). "The future of higher education", Department for Education and Skills, (ed.). City: HMSO: London.

Dhunpath, R. (2000). "Life history methodology:" Narradigm" regained." *International journal of qualitative studies in education*, 13(5), 543-551.

Dogaru, C. M. (2008). *Applying Theories of Capital to Understand Parent Involvement at School as a Component of Family-school Interaction: The Special Case of Children with Special Needs*, Oregon State University.

Döring, N. (2002). "Personal Home Pages on the Web: A Review of Research." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 7(3), 0-0.

Dumont, K., and Frindte, W. (2005). "Content analysis of the homepages of academic psychologists." *Computers in Human Behavior*, 21(1), 73-83.

Dwyer, S. C., and Buckle, J. L. (2009). "The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research." *International journal of qualitative methods*, 8(1), 54-63.

Elder-Vass, D. (2010). *The Causal Power of Social Structures: Emergence, Structure and Agency*: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, C. (2007). "Telling secrets, revealing lives relational ethics in research with intimate others." *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(1), 3-29.

Ellis, C. S. (1986). *Fisher folk: Two communities on Chesapeake Bay*: The University Press of Kentucky.

Elton, L. (2008). "Collegiality and Complexity: Humboldt's Relevance to British Universities Today." *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(3), 224-236.

Erickson, T. (1996). "The world-wide-web as social hypertext." *Communications of the ACM*, 39(1), 15-17.

Evans, J., and Benefield, P. (2001). "Systematic Reviews of Educational Research: Does the medical model fit?" *British educational research journal*, 27(5), 527-541.

Faraday, A., and Plummer, K. (1979). "DOING LIFE HISTORIES." *The Sociological Review*, 27(4), 773-798.

Fazackerley, A. (2004). "Staff at risk in RAE run-up." *Times Higher Education Supplement*(1641), 1-1.

Fitzmaurice, M. (2011). "Constructing professional identity as a new academic: a moral endeavour." *Studies in Higher Education*, 1-10.

Flecknoe, S. J., Choate, J. K., Davis, E. A., Hodgson, Y. M., Johanesen, P. A., Macaulay, J. O., Murphy, K., Sturrock, W. J., and Rayner, G. M. (2017). "Redefining Academic Identity in an Evolving Higher Education Landscape." *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 14(2), 2.

Flowerdew, J., and Wang, S. H. (2015). "Identity in Academic Discourse." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 81-99.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). "Five misunderstandings about case-study research." *Qualitative inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.

Fowler, F. C. (2006). "Struggling with theory: A beginning scholar's experience with Mazzoni's arena models", in V. A. Anfara Jr, (ed.), *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fry, J., and Talja, S. (2007). "The intellectual and social organization of academic fields and the shaping of digital resources." *Journal of information science*, 33(2), 115-133.

Fung, D., and Gordon, C. (2016). *Rewarding educators and education leaders in research-intensive universities*. Higher Education Academy York, UK.

Gemme, B., and Gingras, Y. (2012). "Academic careers for graduate students: a strong attractor in a changed environment." *Higher Education*, 63(6), 667-683.

Gilbert, N. (2008). *Researching social life*, London: Sage Publications Limited.

Goffman, E. (1959). "The presentation of self in everyday life." *Garden City, NY: Anchor*.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* Prentice-Hall.

Gonzales, L. D. (2014). "Framing Faculty Agency Inside Striving Universities: An Application of Bourdieu's Theory of Practice " *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(2), 193-218.

Goodson, I. (2008). *Investigating the teacher's life and work*, Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishing.

Goodson, I. F., and Sikes, P. (2001). *Life History Research in Educational Settings: Learning from Lives*, Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Gough, D. (2007). "Weight of Evidence: a framework for the appraisal of the quality and relevance of evidence." *Research Papers in Education*, 22(2), 213-228.

Graham, R. (2015). *Does teaching advance your academic career? Perspectives of promotion procedures in UK higher education*. A report for the Royal Academy of Engineering Standing Committee for Education and Training, Royal Academy of Engineering.

Greene, M. J. (2014). "On the inside looking in: methodological insights and challenges in conducting qualitative insider research." *The Qualitative Report*, 19(29), 1-13.

Grenfell, M. (1996). "Bourdieu and Initial Teacher Education: A Post-Structuralist Approach." *British Educational Research Journal*, 22(3), 287-303.

Grenfell, M., and James, D. (1998). "Conclusion", *Bourdieu and education: Acts of practical theory*. London: Falmer Press, pp. 179-181.

Grove, J. (2016). "Female professors 'pay price for academic citizenship'"*Times Higher Education*. City.

Gull, K. (2010). *Redressing the balance: the status and valuation of teaching in academic careers in the biomedical sciences* The Academy of Medical Sciences, London,UK.

Hammersley, M. (2002). "Systematic or unsystematic: Is that the question? Some reflections on the science, art, and politics of reviewing research evidence." *Public Health Evidence Steering*

Group of the Health Development Agency (www. hda. nhs. uk/evidence/sys_unsys_phesg_hammersley. html).

Harley, S. (2000). "Accountants divided: research selectivity and academic accounting labour in UK universities." *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 11(5), 549-582.

Harley, S. (2002). "The Impact of Research Selectivity on Academic Work and Identity in UK Universities." *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(2), 187-205.

Harris, E. L. (2006). "Mary Douglas's typology of grid and group", in V. A. Anfara Jr, (ed.), *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 129 - 154.

HEFCE. (2012). "Research Assessment Exercise (RAE)". City: HEFCE.

HEFCE. (2017). *Decisions on staff and outputs (2017/04)*. Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE).

Henkel, M. (1997). "Academic values and the university as corporate enterprise." *Higher Education Quarterly*, 51(2), 134-143.

Henkel, M. (2005). "Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment." *Higher education*, 49(1-2), 155-176.

Henkel, M. (2007). "Shifting boundaries and the academic profession." *Key challenges to the academic profession*, 65, 192-220.

Hess, M. (2002). "A Nomad faculty: English professors negotiate self-representation in university Web space." *Computers and Composition*, 19(2), 171-189.

Higher Education Academy, (HEA). (2013). *Promoting Teaching: Making evidence count*. HEA.

Higher Education Statistics Agency, (HESA). (2011a). "HESA SFR 154: Staff at Higher Education Institutions in the United Kingdom 2009/10". City: HESA.

Higher Education Statistics Agency, (HESA). (2011b). *Performance Indicators in Higher Education in the UK*. HESA.

Higher Education Statistics Agency, (HESA). (2014). "HESA SFR 198: Staff at Higher Education Institutions in the United Kingdom 2012/13". City: HESA.

Higher Education Statistics Agency, (HESA). (2016). *Higher Education Statistics for the UK 2014/15*.

Higher Education Statistics Agency, (HESA). (2018). *Higher Education Statistics for the UK 2016/17*. HESA.

Hubbard, K., Gretton, S., Jones, K., and Tallents, L. (2015). "Challenges and opportunities for early-career Teaching-Focussed academics in the biosciences " *F1000Research*

Hyland, K. (2011). "The presentation of self in scholarly life: Identity and marginalization in academic homepages." *English for Specific Purposes*, 30(4), 286-297.

Ipsos Mori, and Office for Students. "The National Student Survey (NSS)". City.

Jawitz, J. (2009). "Learning in the academic workplace: the harmonization of the collective and the individual habitus." *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(6), 601-614.

Jenkins, A. (1995). "The Research Assessment Exercise, funding and teaching quality." *Quality Assurance in Education*, 3(2), 4-12.

Jones, G. (2013). "The Horizontal and Vertical Fragmentation of Academic Work and the Challenge for Academic Governance and Leadership." *Pacific Education Review*, 14(1), 9.

Kant, I. (1785/1959). *Foundations of the metaphysics of morals: and What is enlightenment?*, L. W. Beck, translator: Macmillan.

Kimber, M. (2003). "The tenured 'core' and the tenuous 'periphery': the casualisation of academic work in Australian universities." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 25(1), 41-50.

Kitchenham, B., and Charters, S. (2007). *Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering*. Technical Report.

Kloot, B. (2009). "Exploring the value of Bourdieu's framework in the context of institutional change." *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(4), 469-481.

Kok, S. K., Douglas, A., McClelland, B., and Bryde, D. (2010). "The Move Towards Managerialism: Perceptions of staff in "traditional" and "new" UK universities." *Tertiary Education and Management*, 16(2), 99-113.

Kolsaker, A. (2008). "Academic professionalism in the managerialist era: a study of English universities." *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(5), 513-525.

Krause, K.-L. D. (2014). "Challenging perspectives on learning and teaching in the disciplines: the academic voice." *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(1), 2-19.

Kumar, K., Roberts, C., and Thistlethwaite, J. (2011). "Entering and navigating academic medicine: academic clinician-educators' experiences." *Medical Education*, 45(5), 497-503.

Lasky, S. (2005). "A sociocultural approach to understanding teacher identity, agency and professional vulnerability in a context of secondary school reform." *Teaching and teacher education*, 21(8), 899-916.

Levin, J., Kater, S., and Wagoner, R. L. (2006). *Community college faculty: At work in the new economy*: Springer.

Lewis, J., and Ritchie, J. (2003). "Generalising from qualitative research", in J. Lewis and J. Ritchie, (eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Dehli: Sage Publications, pp. 264-286.

Liamputtong, P., and Ezzy, D. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods*: Oxford University Press, Incorporated.

Lillie, J. (1998). "Tackling Identity with Constructionist Concepts." *M/C: A Journal of Media and Culture* 1(3).

Locke, W. (2012). "The dislocation of teaching and research and the reconfiguring of academic work." *London Review of Education*, 10(3), 261-274.

Locke, W., and Bennion, A. (2009). "Teaching and research in English higher education: New divisions of labour and changing perspectives on core academic roles", *RIHE International Seminar Reports*. pp. 231 - 252.

Locke, W., and Bennion, A. (2011). "The United Kingdom: Academic Retreat or Professional Renewal?", in W. Locke, W. K. Cummings, and D. Fisher, (eds.), *Changing Governance and Management in Higher Education: The Perspectives of the Academy*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, pp. 175-197.

Loveday, V. (2017). "'Luck, chance, and happenstance? Perceptions of success and failure amongst fixed-term academic staff in UK higher education'." *The British Journal of Sociology*, 0(0).

Macfarlane, B. (2007). "Defining and Rewarding Academic Citizenship: The implications for university promotions policy." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 29(3), 261-273.

Macfarlane, B. (2011). "The Morphing of Academic Practice: Unbundling and the Rise of the Para-academic." *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(1), 59-73.

Marchant, T., and Wallace, M. (2013). "Sixteen Years of Change for Australian Female Academics: Progress or Segmentation?" *Australian Universities' Review*, 55(2), 60-71.

Más-Bleda, A., and Aguillo, I. F. (2013). "Can a personal website be useful as an information source to assess individual scientists? The case of European highly cited researchers." *Scientometrics*, 96(1), 51-67.

Maton, K. (2005). "A question of autonomy: Bourdieu's field approach and higher education policy." *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(6), 687-704.

McNaughton, S. M., and Billot, J. (2016). "Negotiating academic teacher identity shifts during higher education contextual change." *Teaching in Higher Education*, 21(6), 644-658.

Measor, L. (1985). "Critical incidents in the classroom: Identities, choices and careers." *Teachers' lives and careers*, 61-77.

Menon, M. E. (2003). "Views of Teaching-focused and Research-focused Academics on the Mission of Higher Education." *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), 39.

Mercer, J. (2007). "The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: Wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas." *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(1), 1-17.

Metcalf, H., Rolfe, H., Stevens, P., and Weale, M. (2005). *Recruitment and Retention of Academic Staff in Higher Education*. National Institute of Economic and Social Research.

Mishler, E. G. (1991). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*: Harvard University Press.

Mishler, E. G. (1999). *Storylines: Craftartists' narratives of identity*: Harvard University Press.

Moore, R. (2008). "Capital", in M. Grenfell, (ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*. London: Acumen Press.

Muchmore, J. A. (2002). "Methods and ethics in a life history study of teacher thinking." *The Qualitative Report*, 7(4), 1-19.

Müller, R., and Kenney, M. (2014). "Agential Conversations: Interviewing Postdoctoral Life Scientists and the Politics of Mundane Research Practices." *Science as Culture*, 23(4), 537-559.

Murray, J., Czerniawski, G., and Barber, P. (2011). "Teacher educators' identities and work in England at the beginning of the second decade of the twenty-first century." *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37(3), 261-277.

Newman, M. (2007). "Bradford tears up teach-only contracts." *Times Higher Education Supplement*(1812), 1-1.

Nolan, K. (2013). "Brush Fires in the Field: Schooling Novice Mathematics Teachers on Structures and Strategies of Classroom Practices"*2nd Manchester Conference on Mathematics Education and Contemporary Theory (MECT2)*. City: Manchester.

Norton, A., Sonnemann, J., and Cherastidtham, I. (2013). *Taking university teaching seriously*. Grattan Institute.

Nyamapfene, A. (2014). "The teaching-only academic role in research intensive universities: a case of spoiled identity?"*HEA STEM Annual Learning and Teaching Conference 2014: Enhancing the STEM Student Journey*. City: The Higher Education Academy: Edinburgh, pp. 6.

O'Brien, K. R., and Hapgood, K. P. (2012). "The academic jungle: ecosystem modelling reveals why women are driven out of research." *Oikos*, 121(7), 999-1004.

Oakley, A. (2002). "Social Science and Evidence-based Everything: The case of education." *Educational Review*, 54(3), 277-286.

Oancea, A., Furlong, J., and Bridges, D. (2010). *BERA/UCET Review of the Impacts of RAE 2008 on Education Research in UK Higher Education Institutions*. British Educational Research Association, Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers.

Olsen, B. (2015). *Teaching what they learn, learning what they live: How teachers' personal histories shape their professional development*: Routledge.

Omoniyi, T. (2011). "Discourse and identity", in K. Hyland and K. Paltridge, (eds.), *The continuum companion to discourse analysis*. pp. 260-276.

Oxford, E. (2008). "A Lesser Breed?"*Times Higher Education*. City.

Paye, S. (2011). "Convergence and divergence of career paths in the labour market: The case of British academia"*SASE international conference*. City: Madrid.

Perkins, J. A. (1972). "Organization and Functions of the University." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 43(9), 679-691.

Peters, K., and Turner, J. (2014). "Fixed-term and temporary: teaching fellows, tactics, and the negotiation of contingent labour in the UK higher education system." *Environment and Planning A*, 46(10), 2317-2331.

Petticrew, M. (2001). "Systematic reviews from astronomy to zoology: myths and misconceptions." *BMJ : British Medical Journal*, 322(7278), 98-101.

Potter, M. K., and Kustra, E. D. (2011). "The relationship between scholarly teaching and SoTL: Models, distinctions, and clarifications." *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(1), 23.

Probert, B. (2013). "Teaching-focused academic appointments in Australian universities: recognition, specialisation, or stratification?". City: Office for Learning and Teaching: Sydney.

Reay, D. (1998). "Cultural reproduction: Mothers involvement in their children's primary schooling", in M. Grenfell and D. James, (eds.), *Bourdieu and Education: Acts of Practical Theory*. London: Falmer Press, pp. 55-71.

Reay, D. "Cultural capitalists and academic habitus: Classed and gendered labour in UK higher education." *Presented at Women's Studies International Forum*.

Rix, A., Chenery, H., Feeney, D., Gallois, C., Hamilton, S., Keniger, M., Litster, J., Shaw, N., Terry, D., and Martin, M. (2007). *Report of the Working Party on the Diversity of Academic Roles*. The University of Queensland.

Roberts, P., Priest, H., and Traynor, M. (2006). "Reliability and validity in research." *Nursing Standard (through 2013)*, 20(44), 41-45.

Robson, J. (1998). "A profession in crisis: status, culture and identity in the further education college." *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 50(4), 585-607.

Rowland, S. (1996). "Relationships Between Teaching and Research." *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1(1), 7-20.

Schau, Hope J., and Gilly, M. C. (2003). "We Are What We Post? Self-Presentation in Personal Web Space." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(3), 385-404.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*: Teachers college press.

Sfard, A., and Prusak, A. (2005). "Telling Identities: In Search of an Analytic Tool for Investigating Learning as a Culturally Shaped Activity." *Educational Researcher*, 34(4), 14-22.

Shelton, N., Laoire, C. N., Fielding, S., Harvey, D. C., Pelling, M., and Duke-Williams, O. (2001). "Working at the Coalface: Contract Staff, Academic Initiation and the RAE." *Area*, 33(4), 434-439.

Sikes, P. (2006). "Working in a 'new' university: in the shadow of the Research Assessment Exercise?" *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(5), 555-568.

Silver, P. (1983). *Educational administration: Theoretical perspectives on practice and research*, New York: Harper and Row.

Skelton, A. (2011). "Value conflicts in higher education teaching." *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1-12.

Skelton, A. (2012a). "Colonised by quality? Teacher identities in a research-led institution." *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1-19.

Skelton, A. (2012b). "Teacher identities in a research-led institution: in the ascendancy or on the retreat?" *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(1), 23-39.

Steensen, J. (2009). "On the Unacknowledged Significance of Teachers' Habitus and Dispositions", in M. Bayer, U. Brinkkjær, H. Plauborg, and S. Rolls, (eds.), *Teachers' Career Trajectories and Work Lives*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, pp. 71-91.

Stein, A. (2001). *The Stranger Next Door: The Story of a Small Community's Battle over Sex, Faith, and Civil Rights*, Boston: Beacon Press.

Stein, A. (2010). "Sex, truths, and audiotape: Anonymity and the ethics of exposure in public ethnography." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 39(5), 554-568.

Strauss, A. (1995). *A qualitative analysis for social scientists*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Presss.

Strike, T. (2010). "Evolving English academic career pathways", in G. Gordon and C. Whitchurch, (eds.), *Academic and professional identities in higher education: The challenges of a diversifying workforce*. New York: Routledge, pp. 77-97.

Swanborn, P. (2010). *Case study research: what, why and how?*: Sage.

Tang, J., Zhang, D., and Limin, Y. "Social Network Extraction of Academic Researchers." *Presented at Data Mining, 2007. ICDM 2007. Seventh IEEE International Conference on*.

Taylor, J. (2006). "Managing the unmanageable: the management of research in research-intensive universities." *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 18(2), 9.

Tennant, S., Murray, M., Forster, A., and Pilcher, N. (2015). "Hunt the shadow not the substance: the rise of the career academic in construction education." *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(7), 723-737.

The British Psychological Society. (2010). "Code of Human Research Ethics ". City: The British Psychological Society: Leicester

Thomas, J., and Harden, A. (2008). "Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews." *BMC medical research methodology*, 8(1), 45.

Thoms, L., and Thelwall, M. (2005). "Academic home pages: Reconstruction of the self." *First Monday*, 10(12).

Thornton, M. (2013). "THE MIRAGE OF MERIT." *Australian Feminist Studies*, 28(76), 127-143.

Tight, M. (2010a). "Are Academic Workloads Increasing? The Post-War Survey Evidence in the UK." *Higher Education Quarterly*, 64(2), 200-215.

Tight, M. (2010b). "The Golden Age of Academe: Myth or Memory?" *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 58(1), 105-116.

Trahar, S. (2009). "Beyond the Story Itself: Narrative Inquiry and Autoethnography in Intercultural Research in Higher Education." *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 10(1).

Turner, N., Oliver, M., McKenna, C., Hughes, J., Smith, H., Deepwell, F., and Shrives, L. (2013). *Measuring the impact of the UK Professional Standards Framework for Teaching and Supporting Learning (UKPSF)*. The Higher Education Academy.

UK Data Archive. (n.d.). "Create and Manage Data". City: UK Data Archive, University of Essex: Colchester.

UK Data Service. "Manage Data: Legal and ethical issues". City: UK Data Service,.

UK Information Commissioner's Office. (2012). *Anonymisation: managing data protection risk code of practice*. Wilmslow, Cheshire.

University and College Union. (2016). *Precarious work in higher education: A snapshot of insecure contracts and institutional attitudes*. University and College Union, London.

University College Union, (UCU). (2016). *Precarious work in higher education: A snapshot of insecure contracts and institutional attitudes*. London.

Vajoczki, S., Fenton, N., Menard, K., and Pollon, D. (2011). *Teaching-Stream Faculty in Ontario Universities*. Toronto.

Valderas, J. M., Ricci, N., C., S., and Campbell, S. (2012). *Patient Experiences of Patient Safety in Primary Care. A systematic review of qualitative studies*. Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford,UK.

van Lankveld, T., Schoonenboom, J., Volman, M., Croiset, G., and Beishuizen, J. (2017). "Developing a teacher identity in the university context: a systematic review of the literature." *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(2), 325-342.

Venables, E. (1967). *The Young Worker at College: a study of a local tech*, London: Faber & Faber.

Wacquant, L. (2016). "A Concise Genealogy and Anatomy of Habitus." *The Sociological Review*, 64(1), 64-72.

Walsham, G. (1995). "The Emergence of Interpretivism in IS Research." *Information Systems Research*, 6(4), 376-394.

Walsham, G. (2006). "Doing interpretive research." *European Journal of Information Systems*, 15(3), 320-330.

Webb, J., Schirato, T., and Danaher, G. (2002). *Understanding Bourdieu*: SAGE Publications.

Whitchurch, C. (2012). "Expanding the parameters of academia." *Higher Education*, 64(1), 99-117.

White, P. (1996). "Issues in the use of teaching fellows." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 20(1), 117.

Wilkinson, D., and Thelwall, M. (2011). "Researching Personal Information on the Public Web: Methods and Ethics." *Social Science Computer Review*, 29(4), 387-401.

Willmott, H. (1995). "Managing the Academics: Commodification and Control in the Development of University Education in the U.K." *Human Relations*, 48(9), 993-1027.

Young, P. (2006). "Out of balance: lecturers' perceptions of differential status and rewards in relation to teaching and research." *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(2), 191-202.

Zevenbergen, R. L. (2006). "Teacher Identity from a Bourdieuian Perspective", P. Grootenboer, R. Zevenbergen, and M. Chinappan, (eds.), *Identities, Cultures and Learning Spaces. Proceedings of the 29th Annual Conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia*. City: MERGA.