



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Feather, Denis

Do lecturers delivering Higher Education in Further Education desire to conduct research?

Original Citation

Feather, Denis (2012) Do lecturers delivering Higher Education in Further Education desire to conduct research? *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 17 (3). pp. 335-347. ISSN 1359-6748

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/13818/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

Do lecturers delivering Higher Education in Further Education desire to conduct research?

Author: Denis Feather

Abstract:

This article considers the views and perceptions of lecturers delivering Higher Education Business Programmes (HEBPs) in Further Education Colleges (FECs) on whether they desire to undertake research, thus enabling them to both become, and be viewed as specialists in their subjects. The methodology employed was from an interpretivist perspective, with a view to understand how lecturers interpret research, and whether they see it as part of their role. Twenty-six in-depth interviews were conducted throughout the Yorkshire and Humber region in the United Kingdom (UK). Some of the key findings were that although some lecturers would like to undertake research to specialise in their subject area, they felt that they did not have neither the time, or support of their individual institution.

Key Words: Research, FECs, HE in FE, Practitioners, Further Education, Higher Education.

Affiliation: The Business School, University of Huddersfield

Introduction:

The purpose of this article is to consider (through the lens of lecturers delivering Higher Education Business Programmes (HEBPs) in Further Education Colleges (FECs) in the UK), whether they desire to undertake research. Further, whether they wish to be viewed more as practitioners. This was part of a study that was concluded in 2009, but still may have ramifications today, in that, the UK Government have now opened higher education (HE) to what is commonly referred to as a 'free market' (Woodhouse 2009; Wolf March 2011), where private providers, FECs, and commercial businesses can now offer degree programmes for study. Further emphasis is placed on this when one reads that various governments in the Western world appear to be looking to remove academic theory from education and to replace it with a more practice-based curriculum (Fisher 2009; Woodhouse 2009; Giroux 2010). Although this study is focused on FECs in the Yorkshire and Humber Region of the

*

UK; the inference is that it may be the same in the rest of the UK, and also within countries such as America, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada (Woodhouse 2009; Giroux 2010).

Relationship of teaching and research

On research and teaching, Barnett (2005) wrote that the debate on the relationship of teaching and research has become both tiresome and old. However, this article will show that due to government interventions (not just in the UK, but also Australia, America, and Canada (Woodhouse 2009; Giroux 2010)), have now given this debate a new lease of life. Especially in the UK, where research and the production of research papers for publication in quality journals, is not necessarily the norm for some FECs; nor are they expected to be (Parry and Thompson 2002). Additionally, that the managerialist concepts adopted by some FECs and higher education institutions (HEIs), may be having a detrimental impact on some educational institutions concerning teaching and research (Ritzer 2002; Deem et al. 2010). Furthermore, that the use of technology is the ‘Trojan Horse’ that managerialism uses to infiltrate academia to bring about policy changes and the subsequent removal of academic autonomy (Hodges Persell 2002). What Hodges Persell (2002) is arguing here, is that due to managerialist practices being adopted by educational institutions, that is, some institutions [especially in the UK] are diminishing the autonomy of lecturers to make decisions, and how they deliver their lessons? As such, they [some institutions] are becoming both more bureaucratic and prescriptive in what they deliver to students and how they operate. One way of bringing this about, is by the use of technology to measure and record everything that we do today under the guise of being more efficient and effective at what we as lecturers do – hence the term of ‘Trojan Horse’, like the Greeks, it was used to gain access into Troy to take

over from within the city. One could argue here, that this is what government and businesses in the UK are endeavouring to do with education.

Teaching and research an understanding

As Barnett (2005) identifies the debate on teaching and research is well documented and also complex (Knights 2006), in that no real conclusion has been agreed upon (See the works of: Truscot 1943; HEQC 1993; Elliott 1996; Martin 1997; Mehallis 1997; Henkel 2000; Brew 2003; Reid and Petocz 2003; Barnett 2005; Elton 2005; Nisbet 2005; Rowland 2005; Feather 2009; Grant and Wakelin 2009; Lemass and Stace 2009; Brew 2010), this list is not exhaustive. However, this study will explore some of these authors' views in relation to how the two concepts may influence some lecturers, who, one could say, are trying to serve two masters, one teaching, the second, research. For example, Knights (2006) argues that teaching and research are one and the same. Quoting Brew (1999), Knights (2006, 1) writes "...you cannot actually prise apart research and teaching. Scholarly activity and creative, critical, or analytical writing are the oxygen which subject specialists breathe." What Brew is arguing here is that research and teaching have an intimate relationship in that one serves the other, especially when viewed as a product of communication and negotiation (Brew 1999). Blaxter et al. (1998), Quiggin (2001), Doring (2002), and Feather (2009) identified that pursuing both research and teaching in tandem for some lecturers (remembering that not all lecturers in FECs wish to undertake research), was extremely difficult, almost to the point of impossible. Some lecturers interviewed in this study argued that it was difficult enough to get their head around switching from teaching a class of students at the FE level, and then in the next class, moving on to teach students at the HE level; without having to worry about undertaking research as well (Feather 2010, 2011b). Feather (2011b) highlighted how some lecturers in FECs separated research in to two individual parts, that is, one is research to develop new

knowledge; or the origination of knowledge (HEQC 1993). The other, he termed 'reading to teach', where the lecturers are, in some instances, just one chapter in front of the student, in the designated core text of the subject being delivered. That is, they [the lecturers] only have time to keep up to speed in the subject area(s) that they have to teach, and therefore may not be viewed as specialists (Parry and Thompson 2002; Harwood and Harwood 2004; Feather 2010), in that subject. However, King and Widdowson (2009) when writing about HE in FE, identify quite clearly the necessity for lecturers in FE delivering HE, should not be in a position where they are just teaching from a text book, especially if that text book is out of date. They argue that lecturers "...need to demonstrate not only mastery of their subject, but also currency of professional practice and conduct." (King and Widdowson 2009, 30). However, Feather (2009, 2010) has shown that lecturers in some FECs do not see themselves as specialists or masters in their subject area, nor want to be. Some lecturers are more interested in the pedagogy that enables the students to learn and understand the concepts, by being able to apply these concepts by undertaking more exercises that are practical. These lecturers, Feather (2009, 2010) writes, believe themselves to be, and prefer to be, seen as practitioners. Clegg (2008) writes along similar lines, and introduces a new term, that of 'pracademic'. However, this term is neither user friendly nor inspiring; the author is simply trying to marry together the terms 'Practitioner' and 'Academic'. This is very similar to another phrase that is commonly used in academic writing, that of 'Academician', where the words 'Academic' and 'Technician' are linked together. Using terms such as this simply obfuscates the understanding of research and teaching further. The individual terms of teaching and research are well addressed by other authors (See the works of: Boyer 1990; Glassick et al. 1997; Martin 1997; Mehallis 1997; Young 2002; Eggins and Macdonald 2003; Reid and Petocz 2003; Widdowson 2003; Elton 2005; King and Widdowson 2009; Feather

2011b), and as such will not be addressed here as the paper's remit is to focus on whether lecturers within FECs delivering HEBPs desire to undertake research.

Research expertise and the corporate influence

The lack of research expertise in Further Education (FE) is further evidenced when King and Widdowson (2009) comment that research was never a core product of the culture of FE, they write:

FECs do not set out to be research-intensive institutions – their purpose is to meet the immediate higher skill needs of local employers and to widen student participation in HE by offering appropriate vocational courses. (King and Widdowson 2009, 28)

The HEQC (1993, 19-20) made this explicitly clear when writing that:

Academic staff in HEIs are appointed as scholars for whom teaching, scholarship, subject development and research are normally part of their expected roles. FE lecturers have an obligation to keep abreast of developments in their subject, but have traditionally been interpreters of subject matter and modifiers of curricular rather than originators. These lecturers' strengths have typically lain in the ability to teach a broad range of cognate subjects to a variety of students at a number of levels. (Also quoted in: Young 2002, 281; Simmons 2003, 2; Harwood and Harwood 2004, 154; Feather 2009, 48).

When looking more closely at these quotes, King and Widdowson (2009) suggest that FECs do not set out to be seen as research institutions, as this is not part of their heritage. Nevertheless, the inference made by this study is that lecturers may need to become, or must become more research intensive, as they are now delivering higher education programmes. Further, that this could be just one of the possible expectations of students when signing up to these new HE degree programmes delivered within FECs. Although it is accepted that all lecturers must now have a teaching qualification in order to teach students (IfL 2008). Feather (2009) identified in his research, that at some FEC institutions, there were some lecturers delivering material to students whose highest qualification was an A-Level, or worse, had no qualifications at all, but were teaching based on experience of the industry

from which they had come. As such, it is like the HEQC (1993) points out, these lecturers are deemed only interpreters of knowledge, and they do not necessarily generate it.

Both Page (1997), and Gale et al. (2011) in their individual respective works, reach the same conclusion that lecturers in FECs may lack the necessary skills to undertake research, and that it is for this reason that research is not the norm in FE. However, it is not for this reason alone, that research may not be the norm, it is also because of the large amount of teaching hours that most lecturers find themselves delivering (Parry and Thompson 2002; Young 2002; Harwood and Harwood 2004; Feather 2009, 2010), for example in excess of 30 hours per week some terms (Feather 2009, 2010).

Fisher (2009) has argued that FECs have been used by respective UK governments as laboratories for testing new initiatives; hence today we have managerialism, corporatisation, and marketisation (Smith 2007). Where the focus is more on quantity and measurement, which further exacerbates lecturers feelings on how this impacts upon the quality of service they deliver, not just in FECs but also in HE (Feather 2010). The introduction of these concepts may now be starting to have a serious influence on some lecturers, their identity, the ability to conduct research, and in turn, the student experience. Rowland (2005, 101) writes that "...audits 'perverts' research (and teaching)." Bourdieu takes this a stage further when writing that academics are now "...training the nations' administrators' rather than...advancing the frontiers of knowledge." (Bourdieu 1988, 66), and that this increases "...when we move from the members of the subordinate fractions (intellectuals, etc.) to the members of the dominant fractions (executives, etc.)." (Bourdieu 1988, 66). What could be interpreted from this, is that, Bourdieu (1998) is saying there has been a shift of power away from knowledge and the research needed to acquire that knowledge, to one where governments and businesses appear to be now enforcing their demands upon education

(Quiggin 2001; Giroux 2010; Feather 2011a). That is, for a more practical and vocational delivery approach (Giroux 2010; Wolf March 2011); possibly with a view to removing academic theory altogether from education (Giroux 2010), and/or the removal of academic autonomy, which is replaced with corporate ideologies (Woodhouse 2009).

Wolf (March 2011), does identify that education is over managed to the point of micro management, especially in FECs in the UK. Nevertheless, this does not alleviate the angst some lecturers may feel in FECs, in that, they may not want to, nor desire to, undertake research. As one of Feather's (2009) interviewees identified, she entered FE to teach, not to undertake research, or to be an academic.

From this, Archer's (2008) view on academia being a contested territory, might have some credence, in that, people struggle to identify the once recognisable symbols and boundaries of their authenticity. She goes onto write that:

In other words, questions of authenticity and legitimacy are central to the formation of social relations within academy – with individuals and groups competing to ensure that their particular interests, characteristics and identities are accorded recognition and value. (Archer 2008, 386)

As FECs have taken on the additional load of delivering HE as well as FE, 14-19, become Centres of Vocational Excellence (COVE) delivering vocational qualifications, and many more qualifications and training programmes; how can its lecturers become specialists in their field? Once more, I refer to the HEQC's comments about lecturers in FECs being merely interpreters of knowledge; however, this does not apply to all lecturers in FECS, as some do find the time to produce research, even with heavy workloads. Like many of my interviewees stated, they saw their individual institutions and indeed themselves as a 'Jack of all trades'.

What has been established in this study is that not all lecturers in FECs wish to undertake research; but the time may come when they may have to, and as such, have no choice in the matter. Especially as discussed later in this paper, some lecturers had no choice about the CPD they undertook, and that in some instances their management forced this upon them.

Having discussed the above, it would appear that within academia, that HE has become a battle ground, with HE being the last bastion of education trying uphold traditional educational values, where research can be undertaken, debated, and published without fear or favour (Truscot 1943). That is, to defend its habitus (Bourdieu 1988) against the managerialist/market orientations and profit maximisation, which the current UK government and businesses wish to instil in its place (Poynter 2002; Ritzer 2002; Woodhouse 2009; Giroux 2010).

Managerialism is not just having an impact upon HE, but also FECs and Schools. Elliott and Hall (1994) comment on this, writing that:

Government [UK] policies which force colleges and schools to adopt quantitative, calculative approaches to resource management...fit uneasily into education cultures that have traditionally valued human beings as people, not assets and prefer “communication, motivation and leadership. (Elliott and Hall 1994, 4)

Quiggin (2001) writes along similar lines to Elliott and Hall (1994), but from an HE Australian/New Zealand perspective; arguing that the managerialist, marketisation and corporatisation of education was seen to be ‘Chimerical’, the view being one where there could be a marriage of the corporate and educational philosophies, and that this would bring about a cost effective reform. However, as he further identifies:

The ‘enterprise university’ has proved a dismal failure on all counts. Academic and ethical standards have declined, while desperately needed resources have been diverted from the core mission of teaching and research, into a bloated and overfunded managerial structure, and its wasteful exercises in competitive marketing. (Quiggin 2001, 38)

When considering this quote, the same could also be said of FE, it has also suffered at the hands of these new concepts, and as identified earlier, may have been used a test centres for these practices. Archer (2008) also writing from the corporatisation of education perspective in the UK, especially in HE, highlights that academics are not only expected to produce research but also to acquire research funding, she argues that:

Within the contemporary 'corporate' university, two of the key 'outcomes' that academics are increasingly expected (and demanded) to produce are the winning of external revenue for research (and consultancy) and the production of (at least) four 'high quality' publications for the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE, the major national research peer review process for UK universities). (Archer 2008, 389)

Again as already identified, FECs have been viewed by Fisher (2009) as the 'lab rats' for testing these new processes, that eventually became government policy in the UK. In turn, this is supported by Feather's (2009, 2011a) research. He identified that some lecturers in FECs referred to their institution as the 'Yosser Hughes' of education (this is a fictional character from a UK comedy programme, where he would relentlessly ask for a job from anyone he saw, with a view to being paid; or in this instance, to receiving funding). The problem that might arise here is that the current stream of managerialism, marketisation, and corporatisation, may not be a stream at all, but could instead be a tidal river. Eventually this tide may take a different route, in that, those in FE delivering HE, might also become expected (at some time in the future) by their management, to undertake research and produce papers, in order to provide additional further revenue streams. As Brew (1999) identifies, the production of papers is one way of quantifying output.

It is well documented that FECs are very adept at chasing funding, and research could be another funding stream for FECs. Having said this, as already highlighted earlier, some lecturers in FECs may not have the necessary skills to undertake research, nor the inclination to do so.

Method

The data provided in this article is part of a larger study conducted in England (that concluded in 2009), with lecturers delivering Higher Education Business Programmes (HEBPs) in FECs.

An ethnographical and interpretivist approach was adopted for this study; thereby employing triangulation of philosophies to offer some validity to the findings (Robson 2002; Silverman 2002). A sample of twenty-six participants were drawn from a survey questionnaire (n=150) sent out to lecturers delivering HEBPs in FECs (n=92 returned); the survey covered a large geographical area of England.

'Purposive' sampling was used to select twenty-six interviewees; these were drawn from the fifty-two lecturers (out of the ninety-two questionnaires received back), who self-identified (via the questionnaire), their willingness to participate further in this study. Purposive sampling ensured that a representative sample from the Yorkshire and Humber region of England was selected and, that certain variables such as age, ethnicity, time teaching (both in FE and in HE in FE), and gender were captured. Semi-structured individual interviews were conducted, which lasted for no more than one hour. The interviews were recorded and later fully transcribed; content analysis was then employed to identify recurring themes within the narratives collected.

The Principals of the FECs visited granted permission to conduct research at their individual institutions, and to approach their members of staff. The British Education Research Association (2004) guidelines on ethical research practice were adhered to, and the rights (concerning their anonymity), of staff and the institutions visited, were upheld and preserved in accordance with those guidelines (BERA 2004). To this end, interviewees are

identified in this article as 'Int. 1', 'Int. 2' and so on, and the institutions as 'ABC College', or 'XYZ College'.

Findings

From the analysis of the discourses of those interviewed for this study, the most significant factor impacting on some lecturers in FECs in regard to undertaking research, was that of time. All 26 of the interviewees stated quite clearly, that due to heavy teaching loads (on average 26 hours per week, some in excess of this), that they had no time left for research. For example Int. 24 states:

I don't have the time to do research. Erm I don't think I would be allowed to undertake research, if I wanted to. With a view to taking some extra hours off my timetable...if they'd have asked me to do it, I would have panicked, simply because I'm thinking, how am I possibly going to do any sort of writing, erm when I've got to teach 864 hours a year. And, I'm not just teaching HE erm students who have a bit more about them, I'm teaching level two students erm key-skills; numeracy. Yeah, so it's very difficult to do that when you have such a, a wide (almost shouts) breadth of teaching that you have to undertake.

Int. 24 makes it quite clear that in order to undertake research; she would need to lose some of the teaching from her timetable. Similarly, Int. 21 comments:

I don't have time to research and I think it takes enough of an effort to keep abreast as to what is changing in business....There's no time within the working timetable to sit. I mean to do research.....I mean, I do some research at home at the moment, and I've.....when you sit, I mean, when you sit down and you start to go through journals and things like that, you actually need concentration time. You need to know you've got a three or four hour block where you can start reading, and you can start making notes.

The rest of the interviewees' comments tended to mirror those above concerning time. Nevertheless, what is interesting about these quotes is that, Int. 24 said she would panic if she were asked to undertake some research, but more importantly, that she might not be allowed by her institution or management to undertake research, which is reified by Int. 21. This then

fits in with the views of some of the authors referenced above. That is, that some lectures in FE may not have the necessary skills or desire to undertake research (HEQC 1993; Harwood and Harwood 2004; Feather 2010) – probably due to not being trained or well versed in the practices of academic research, as opposed to reading to teach – teaching from a text book, rather from knowledge generated via primary research. This is evidenced when Int. 20 states: “...there were staff that preferred to teach and did not like research, and there was other staff who preferred research...I personally prefer the teaching, I prefer the contact with the students.” Int. 14’s comments took this a stage further, in that his institution was against lecturers undertaking research, and that they did not have the nuances to incorporate it into their environment; he said on research that “...it’s not, not allowed, it’s, it’s just not enabled...” Int. 14’s perception was that management viewed him as nothing more than a resource, and that they [management], expected him “...to be stood in front of students delivering classes and not researching.” A further point Int. 24 alludes to above, is the fact that some lecturers in FECs have a wide and varied timetable. They can be teaching a whole range of different modules, some of which they may have no knowledge in. For example, Int. 8 commented on how he had come in to his FEC has a specialist, but after a couple of years found himself teaching subjects he was not familiar with, or in his words “...you may come in as a specialist...after about two years, you’ll teach bloody anything (laughs).” This then fits with the ‘Jack of all trades’ scenario alluded to above (Parry and Thompson 2002; Young 2002; Harwood and Harwood 2004; Feather 2009, 2010).

Int. 18 approaches research from a different perspective, that of researching to keep abreast of her subject area. This fits with King and Widdowson’s (2009), and Feather’ (2010) views earlier, that lecturers in FECs need to keep abreast of their subject area, but tend to do this via a text book. However, one worrying aspect that came out of this research was that of

Int. 18's narrative, where she identified that she learnt more from the students' papers than what she was able to read in the time she had available, given her many and varied roles.

When asked if she does research to improve specialist knowledge, Int.18's reply was:

Right, we have to, there has to be some research erm, to prepare for lectures etc, etc and across the face.....whether that's reading books, whether that's on-line activities etc, etc. But erm, there's, there isn't the time for that, there should be, for that; so it literally is kind of.....I probably learn more from reading the kid's pieces actually. You do, don't you? (Starts laughing).

This evidences that the inference could be that some lecturers in FECs in the UK, struggle with understanding the finer nuances of research, probably, due to the fact, that at the time of the study, some lecturers were teaching undergraduate students, but did not hold a degree qualification themselves. As both Harwood and Harwood (2004), and Feather (2010) point out, the accepted 'rule of thumb' in the UK, is that lecturers can teach to the qualification below that of their own. For example, if the lecturer has a degree, they can teach up to Higher National Diploma (HND), or Foundation Degree. Further, the inference from Int. 18's discourse is that she is assuming the student has interpreted the material they have used in their assignments, correctly, and appears to accept their written evidence as is. Therefore, is this lecturer using this knowledge to grade other students' work? The inference could be yes, and therefore evidences that management within some FECs need to consider whether their staff are given, and allowed sufficient time, to undertake the necessary reading to acquire the depth of knowledge needed to teach their subject area(s) at any level, not just at HE level. It is well documented in the UK that lecturers in FECs often teach more than one subject (Young 2002; Harwood and Harwood 2004), sometimes, subjects they have no knowledge in whatsoever (Feather 2010), which fits with Int. 14's perceptions above about management in some FECs seeing their staff as nothing but resources to undertake teaching. Int. 7 adopts a similar approach in her interview; she states that at the college where she worked, the

management would not support her in becoming better qualified, or developing a deeper understanding of her subject area. She went on to say:

erm, because if you want to go on conferences generally, HE conferences are quite expensive, at the side of FE conferences, erm, and they see it as spending money unnecessarily, if you want to study further, erm, they're not prepared to fund you, because they don't particularly want you to have that level of qualification. Erm, time wise.....they're not prepared to allocate you any time for that sort of, either research or anything else; they don't see the importance of it.

However, developing oneself, either through qualifications or through attending conferences has now changed. Primarily due to the introduction of the 'Institute for Learning' (IfL) in 2002, the professional body for teaching that was given powers similar to those of professional bodies for law and medicine (IfL 2008). Lecturers in FE now have to be both well qualified, and hold a teaching qualification. In addition to this, lecturers in FE have to keep a record of their continuous professional development (CPD) and submit 30 hours of CPD every year to the professional body (IfL 2008). If not, the lecturer could be asked to stop teaching until these hours are made good. However, it needs to be remembered that CPD in some institutions were merely developmental meetings or classes on the use of PowerPoint, or Microsoft Word. For example Int. 22 States:

Erm what they.....have, the college is, we are allowed nine days in the academic year, which is put to CPD, of which the college have control of two. Erm and they put activities on, they bring in outside speakers. The other seven are for the staff, now for me it's quite easy, I clearly show that my seven days off erm, the timetable; I came to ABC university, whatever. Other colleagues I know it's just seven days onto their holiday entitlement (starts laughing), erm but nothing is checked; so the college do give us these seven days and they don't really push us to how we use them. I think they know that most people just have it as an extra seven days holiday...

On CPD Int.9 said it was something that was forced upon him by management, whether he wanted it or not, and that he had to attend. This then evidences that some managers, from the perceptions of their staff, give the impression that they [management] do not to want their staff to be too qualified in research, or anything else it would appear, from Int.22, Int. 7, and Int.9's comments. But at the same time both managers and lecturers have to comply with the

guidelines laid down by the IfL on being appropriately qualified to teach (IfL 2008). Int. 13 evidences further that some FECs are not interested in their staff researching and becoming better qualified and educated when she says, “The environment within the organisation isn’t overtly supportive of researching as an activity.” Int. 14 discussed qualifications and research from a similar perspective to Int. 13. Identifying at his FEC “...that, that, the dichotomy between research for keeping your notes up-to-date and research for erm, furthering the boundaries of, of your topic; that is a no-no...” However, Int. 22 approaches this from a teaching perspective, basically, she sees teaching as her primary role, but does acknowledge that research is important, but teaching comes first. She says “[very long pause] I think primarily we’re in teaching, and my primary role is to get students to achieve a formal academic qualification; to get an HND or a degree.” Int. 22, wished to undertake research, but felt her duty was to the students, and as such, felt she only had to keep abreast of her curriculum area, and focus more on her teaching skills. However, she did infer that if the opportunity of research came along she would welcome it.

Although some governments are reported as wishing to remove academic underpinning (Giroux 2010), the reality is that lecturers will still need to be well educated in the field or fields they are delivering. However, as higher education is about the quest for, and publishing of new knowledge, it is imperative that this higher level of education is maintained. For without theory and exploration, how does the field of knowledge move forward? As Int. 8 puts it, experience is no replacement for knowledge.

Conclusion

This study has looked at whether lecturers in FECs delivering HEBPs desire to undertake research, as would be expected of their cousins in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), in particular those identified as ‘Post 1992’ universities. It has been evidenced that education

around the world is being placed in a position where governments, businesses, and students, have a far greater expectation of the way HE is delivered, and that the person teaching them may be seen as an expert in their field. Additionally, that authors' like Giroux (2010) argue, some governments (the Obama Administration in this instance) are attempting to remove academic theory from higher education, for an education that is more practiced based.

The study has shown that many of the lecturers interviewed for this study perceived their primary role to be that of a lecturer. However, only five lecturers saw themselves as practitioners, and wished to be viewed as such. The remainder stated that they would like to undertake research, but did not have the time; or that their institution would neither wish this, nor support this. However, some lecturers did highlight that they would welcome opportunities to become specialists in their field, and hoped that management would, one day, see the value of this practice. That is, bringing new knowledge back into the classroom to pass onto and engage with students, and for lecturers to publish their findings to engage in discussion with other authors in the same area. Sadly, as shown, many perceived that the management at their individual institutions were not interested in whether they wished to do research, and that they [management] were only interested in them [lecturers] being stood in front of large numbers of students, rather than attending conferences, or using time to study. Int. 7 made this quite clear, when he perceived that the management at his college believed it was a case of 'spending money unnecessarily', and that management saw no point in her advancing her knowledge through additional qualifications. However, Int.22 in contradiction to her saying she would focus on her teaching, later said in regard to CPD that management turned a 'blind eye' to the 9 days allotted for CPD, and that they [management], only insisted on staff two. That she [Int.22] like others, would use the additional 7 day for extra holidays of other things. Whereas, for Int.9, he had no choice, he had to attend CPD as when

management told him to do so; whether he wanted to go or not, or whether it was useful or not. This clearly indicates that within FECs, although there are standard practices, those different cultures come into play. Culture was not a remit of this paper, but Feather (2011a) in his paper “*Culture of HE in FE – Exclave or Enclave?*” does highlight many of the factors that may impact upon teaching and researching within FECs.

Today, what has been discussed in relation to CPD may be out of kilter with the guidelines laid down by the IfL. That is, lecturers teaching in FE now have to undertake 30 hours of continuous professional development (CPD) annually, and evidence this by recording their CPD and sending it to the IfL, or uploading it to the IfL website (IfL 2008). If they fail to do this, this could mean that they would not be allowed to teach until they had acquired level of CPD.

The above discussion therefore, is an important consideration for management of some FECs to reflect upon (and possibly some HEIs as well), that is, that some staff *do* [my emphasis] desire to undertake research and see this as a challenge; this links into intrinsic motivation. However, some lecturers indicated that they did not desire to undertake research, as they preferred to be seen more as practitioners and interpreters of knowledge, as identified by the HEQC (1993). This also has links with motivation and job satisfaction, as management may be seen to be offering real consideration to their employees’ needs and expectations, if they were to contemplate this view.

From the discussion, it has been identified that many lecturers would like to undertake research, and this practice should be encouraged and not stifled by endeavouring to keep people on a level where they are just reading to teach. Equally, that those lecturers that have no desire to undertake research, should not be coerced or bullied into doing so, but instead

motivated to develop in other areas of expertise such as pedagogy or educational management.

Acknowledgements

I would like to take the opportunity to thank the reviewers for their constructive and helpful comments in improving this paper, and to Kath McDermott for her support and comments on the initial draft of this paper.

References

- Archer, Louise. (2008). Younger Academics' Construction of 'Authenticity', 'Success' and Professional Identity. *Studies in Higher Education* 33 (4), 383-403.
- Barnett, Ronald. (2005). Introduction. In *Reshaping the University - New Relationships between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*, edited by R. Barnett. 1-8. Maidenhead: SRHE and Open University McGraw-Hill Education.
- BERA. (2004). Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research (2004). 'Available at': www.bera.ac.uk/publications/pdfs/ETHICAL1.PDF, 'Accessed': [13/01/2008].
- Blaxter, Loraine, Christina Hughes, and Malcolm Tight. (1998). Writing on Academic Careers. *Studies in Higher Education* 23 (3), 281-295.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. Translated by P. Collier. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Boyer, Ernest. L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered - Priorities of the Professoriate, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brew, A. (2003). Teaching and Research: New Relationships and their Implications for Inquiry-based Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. *Higher Education Research and Development* 22 (1), 3-18.
- Brew, Angela. (1999). Research and teaching: Changing relationships in a changing context. *Studies in Higher Education* 24 (3), 291-301.
- Brew, Angela. (2010). Imperatives and challenges in integrating teaching and research. *Higher Education Research & Development* 29 (2), 139-150.
- Clegg, Sue. (2008). Academic Identities Under Threat? *British Educational Research Journal* 34 (3), 329-345.

Deem, Rosemary., Sam. Hillyard, and Mike. Reed. (2010). *Knowledge, Higher Education, and the New Managerialism - The Changing Management of UK Universities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doring, Allan. (2002). Challenges to the Academic Role of Change Agent. *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 26 (2), 139-148.

Eggins, Heather, and Ranald Macdonald. (2003). *The Scholarship of Academic Development*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Elliott, Geoffrey. (1996). Why is Research Invisible in Further Education? *British Journal of Educational Studies* 22 (1), 101-111.

Elliott, Geoffrey., and Valerie. Hall. (1994). FE Inc.—business orientation in further education and the introduction of human resource management. *School Organisation* 14 (1), 3-10.

Elton, Lewis. (2005). Scholarship and the Research and Teaching Nexus. In *Reshaping the University - New Relationships between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*, edited by R. Barnett. 108-118. Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Feather, Denis. (2009). *Academic Identities: Voices from the Edge*. Doctor of Education, [Doctoral Thesis], The Business School, University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield.

Feather, Denis. (2010). A Whisper of Academic Identity: An HE in FE Perspective. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 15 (2), 189-204.

Feather, Denis. (2011a). Culture of HE in FE - exclave or enclave? *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 16 (1), 15-30.

Feather, Denis. (2011b). Oh to be a Scholar - an HE in FE Perspective. *Journal of Further and Higher Education* iFirst Article, 1-19.

Fisher, Mark. (2009). *Capitalist Realism is There No Real Alternative*. Ropley: O Books Publishers.

Gale, K., R. Turner, and L. M. McKenzie. (2011). Communities of Praxis? Scholarship and Practice Styles of the HE in FE Professional. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training* 63 (2), 159-169.

Giroux, Henry. A. (2010). Dumbing Down Teachers: Rethinking the Crisis of Public Education and the Demise of the Social State. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 32 (4), 339-381.

Glassick, Charles. E., Mary. Taylor. Huber, and Gene. I. Maeroff. (1997). *Scholarship Assessed - Evaluation of the Professoriate, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grant, Kevin., and Sonia. J. Wakelin. (2009). Re-conceptualising the Concept of a Nexus? A Survey of 12 Scottish IS/IM Academics' Perceptions of a Nexus between Teaching, Research, Scholarship and Consultancy. *Teaching in Higher Education* 14 (2), 133-146.

Harwood, June., and David Harwood. (2004). Higher Education in Further Education: Delivering Higher Education in a Further Education Context - A Study of Five South West Colleges. *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 28 (2), 153-164.

Henkel, Mary. (2000). *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

HEQC. (1993). *Some Aspects of Higher Education Programmes in Further Education Institutions*. London: Higher Education Quality Council.

Hodges Persell, Caroline. (2002). Digital Technologies and Competing Models of Higher Education. In *The McDonalidization of Higher Education*, edited by D. Hayes and R. Wynyard.71-83. London: Bergin and Garvey.

IfL. (2008). *Member Handbook Version 2*. Institute for Learning, 'Available at': www.ifl.ac.uk, 'Accessed': [Date 2008].

King, Madeleine., and John Widdowson. (2009). Scholarly Activity Undertaken in HE in FE. *ESCalate news*, The Subject Centre for Education ESCalate - The Higher Education Academy, The Higher Education Academy - Bristol, Summer 2009.

Knights, Ben. (2006). Linking Teaching and Research Home Page. 'Available at': www.english.heacademy.ac.uk/explore/resources/linking/index.php, 'Accessed': [07/11/2006].

Lemass, Brett, and Ray Stace. (2009). Towards teaching and research parity. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education* 14 (1), 21-27.

Martin, Graham A. (1997). Teachers or Researchers? The Perceptions of Professional Role Among University Lecturers. *Innovations in Education and Training International* 34 (2), 154-159.

Mehallis, Mantha Vlahos. (1997). Teaching versus Research: An Outmoded Debate in the Knowledge Society. *Higher Education in Europe* 22 (1), 31-41.

Nisbet, John. (2005). What is educational research? Changing perspectives through the 20th century. *Research Papers in Education* 20 (1), 25-44.

Page, M. G. (1997). Forbidden Knowledge: The Research Process in a Further Education Setting. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 2 (1), 83-88.

Parry, Gareth., and Anne Thompson (2002) Closer By Degrees - The Past, Present and Future of Higher Education in Further Education Colleges, Learning and Skills Development Agency, R1164/04/02/2200, LSDA, 'Available at': www.LSDA.org.uk, 'Accessed': [14/10/2006].

Poynter, Gavin. (2002). Modules and Markets: Education and Work in the "Information Age". In *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*, edited by D. Hayes and R. Wynyard. 57-70. London: Bergin and Garvey.

Quiggin, John. (2001) Resolving the university crisis, Submission to the inquiry of the Senate Employment, Workplace Relations, Small Business and Education Committee into the capacity of public universities to meet Australia's higher education needs., 'Available at': <http://www.publicuni.org/documents/universi.pdf>, 'Accessed': [05/02/2011].

Reid, Anna, and Peter Petocz. (2003). Enhancing academic work through the synergy between teaching and research. *International Journal for Academic Development* 8 (1-2), 105-117.

Ritzer, George. (2002). Enchanting McUniversity: Toward a Spectacularly Irrational University Quotidian. In *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*, edited by D. Hayes and R. Wynyard. 19-32. London: Bergin and Garvey.

Robson, Colin. (2002). *Real World Research*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Rowland, Stephen. (2005). Intellectual Love and the Link between Teaching and Research. In *Reshaping the University - New Relations between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*, edited by R. Barnett. 92-102. Maidenhead: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Silverman, David. (2002). *Interpreting Qualitative Data - Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications Limited.

Simmons, Jonathan. (2003). Developing an 'HE Culture' in FE. Paper read at 7th Annual LSRN Conference, at Round Table Discussion, 10th December 2003.

Smith, Rob. (2007). Work, Identity and Quasi-Market: The FE Experience. *Journal of Education Administration and History* 39 (1), 33-47.

Truscot, Bruce. (1943). *Red Brick University*. London: Faber and Faber Limited.

Widdowson, John. (2003). HE in FE and Scholarly Activity - A Discussion Paper. 'Available at': www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2003/03_15/03_15sch.pdf, 'Accessed': [27/07/2006].

Wolf, Alison. (March 2011) Review of Vocational Education – The Wolf Report, Department for Education, DFE-00031-2011, HMSO, 'Available at': www.education.gov.uk/publications/.../The%20Wolf%20Report.pdf, 'Accessed': [21/08/2011].

Woodhouse, Howard. (2009). *Selling Out - Academic Freedom and the Corporate Market*. Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Young, P. (2002). "Scholarship is the Word That Dare Not Speak its Name" Lecturers' Experiences of Teaching on a Higher Education Programme in a Further Education College. *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 26 (3), 273-286.

Word Count: 5,686