Diversifying Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education: Some Management Challenges

Celia Whitchurch and George Gordon

Abstract

This paper draws on an international study of the management challenges arising from diversifying academic and professional identities in higher education. These challenges include, for instance, the introduction of practice-based disciplines with different traditions such as health and social care, the changing aspirations and expectations of younger generations of staff, a diffusion of management responsibilities and structures, and imperatives for a more holistic approach to the 'employment package', including new forms of recognition and reward. It is suggested that while academic and professional identities have become increasingly dynamic and multi-faceted, change is occurring at different rates in different contexts. A model is offered, therefore, that relates approaches to 'people management' to different organizational environments, against the general background of increasing resource constraint arising from the global economic downturn.

Introduction

This paper reviews issues arising from a diversification of contemporary academic and professional identities, and the implications of these for the way that management is conceived in higher education. Contemporary concepts of identity, rather than implying essential, given elements, tend to take the view that it is a cumulative project, involving a relationship between individuals and the social structures in which they are located (Delanty, 2008; Taylor, 2008). For the purposes of this paper, professional identity will be understood as the interplay of the agency of the individual with the structures and boundaries that they encounter. Thus, it is something that is situated and contingent, involving interpretation and negotiation on the part of an individual, and identities are seen increasingly as being multiple, overlapping and provisional (Barnett & di Napoli 2008; Delanty 2008; Henkel 2007, 2010; Taylor 2008). These views corroborate the sense that fixed frames of reference no longer do justice to the diversity and complexity of contemporary identities in higher education. At the heart of these are key tensions and dynamics involving, for instance, the fact that:

- Some academic staff have the opportunity to be involved in business-facing activity such as spin-out and research enterprise, whereas others remain more focused on teaching and a 'public service' orientation.

- Professional staff are becoming more specialised in terms of their expertise, while at the same time are becoming involved in cross-boundary areas such as teaching and learning support (Whitchurch 2009; 2010 forthcoming).

- Although academic staff may see themselves as burdened with administrative activity, they are sometimes reluctant to delegate this (Dearlove 1998).

- Individuals tend to be much more positive when asked about their current project than when asked about how things are 'at work' (Watson 2009).

There are, therefore, dynamics within the university that create both common purpose and tensions between diverse groupings of staff who may in the past have worked independently of each other. This phenomenon results in both convergence and divergence between academic and professional identities, and also opens up spaces for new types of identity to emerge, with associated activities. The latter include, for instance collaborative work in relation to the design of appropriate content and delivery in relation to new forms of virtual learning.

Key management challenges arise from these dynamics, including the incorporation of new forms of practice-based discipline, changing staff expectations and aspirations, the dispersal of management and leadership activity, and pressure for more fluid structures and processes, for instance in relation to project- and team-working. The global economic downturn provides a further challenge, as resource constraints are likely to reduce opportunities for development at all levels, fostering competition as well as the imperative for collaboration between institutions and the individuals working in them. A more detailed account of the findings of the study on which this paper is based, with contributions from twelve international authors, is given in Gordon & Whitchurch (2010).

Under these conditions, it is not surprising that questions are raised in the literature about what it means to be an academic or a professional in contemporary higher education. On the one hand, a separation and fragmentation of functions has been

noted, for instance, that responsibility for some aspects of learning has been removed from academic roles, particularly in relation to the design and implementation of online programmes (Rhoades 2007). At the same time, however, new spaces are being colonised by both academic and professional staff, who work together in teams in areas such as community and business partnership, widening participation, outreach, and the student experience. Thus, while narratives of 'exclusion' exist in relation to both academic and professional staff (see for instance, Deem, Hillyard & Reed 2007; Kogan & Teichler 2007; Stromquist 2007b; Enders & de Weert 2009, in relation to academic staff, and Dobson & Conway 2003; and Szekeres 2004, in relation to professional staff), these co-exist alongside a convergence of interests and activities. While for some this may imply an identity crisis, for others it enables new identities to be forged.

Management contexts

The concept of 'management' has been subject to significant contestation and critique in academic contexts. Commentators such as Trowler (2002); Deem, Hillyard & Reed (2007); Marginson & Considine (2000); Amaral, Jones & Karseth (2002); Bok (2003); and Peters (2004) reflect a broader literature on New Public Management, a government approach that obliged public sector organisations to operate in accordance with market imperatives. In universities this form of management has come to be known as "managerialism" and involves:

- The introduction of an ethos of 'enterprise', whereby institutions are expected to foster activities the prime aim of which is to generate income.
- Government policies that stress the role of universities in serving socio-economic agendas, and require them to become more market-oriented.

- Within institutions, increased competition (and competitive behaviour) for resources.

- Increased control and regulation of the work of academic staff by those with management responsibilities, be they professional or academic managers, reflecting increased accountability by government via, for instance, national teaching and research assessment processes.

- A perceived transfer of authority from academic staff to managers, accompanied by a weakening of the professional status of academics.

- The separation and even polarisation of academic and management activity.

At the same time, universities as organisations are seen as having shifted from the "Bureaucracy" and "Collegium" quadrants of the model devised by McNay, to the quadrants representing "Corporation" and "Enterprise" (McNay 1995, p. 106). Furthermore, a polarisation of management and academic activity implies that association with one type of activity would preclude association with another. Thus, Middlehurst (1993, p. 190) notes "clear fault-lines … between, for example, academics and administrators, staff and 'management'", and Rowland (2002, p. 53) "fracture or fault lines" across staff groupings. Views that polarise academic and management activity persist, whereby both academic and professional staff each see the other as more powerful, and themselves as marginalised.

However, this literature tends not to distinguish between different types and levels of manager within institutions. These can include, for instance:

- People in academic management roles, such as pro-vice-chancellors, deans and heads of department.

- Professional managers, undertaking general or specialist management roles.

- Mainstream academic staff, who may be managing a research or teaching programme and a team of staff.

Nor does this literature disentangle the spread of roles and responsibilities that are characteristic of distributed management arrangements across schools and faculties (Bolden, Petrov & Gosling 2008; Kennie & Woodfield 2007). The multiple locales of management in any one institution may include, for instance:

- Top management teams and groups.

- Academic or functional departments.

- Research settings (laboratories, libraries, research units).

- Faculties and schools, with their own management teams.

Thus, management is not confined to the top of the institution, nor does it occur solely from the top down.

Informal structures and networks, such as heads of school fora, and teaching and research teams, can influence the operation of formal institutional systems and processes. Contemporary management activity is also likely to involve individuals who may have significant influence, such as principal investigators and programme co-ordinators, but who are "only partially recognised in formal organisational structures" (Bolden, Petrov & Gosling 2008, p. 72). New understandings are required, therefore, on the part of the managers, about the contribution of informal spaces and networks to the social capital of an institution. Furthermore, research suggests (Whitchurch 2008a) that more academic and professional staff are involved in management at the school or faculty level and are likely to experience greater anxiety about managing people than about, for instance, managing budgets. There would

therefore appear to be a need to review what 'management' might mean in the contemporary university.

Watson (2009) draws on a broad range of literatures to illustrate contemporary expectations arising from, for instance, an increasingly consumer-oriented culture accompanied by a sense of entitlement, philosophies associated with New Public Management, the displacement of responsibility, and the approaches of younger generations. He argues that the culture of higher education comprises a mesh of psychological contracts with different groups and stakeholders, again suggesting that binary understandings of 'managers' and 'academics' are increasingly misplaced. Similarly, Barnett (2000) visualized institutions as complex mosaics, with the whole structure constructed from the totality of the parts. A critical challenge, therefore, may be in shifting the attention of senior managers from control mechanisms to enabling, motivating and facilitating the effective performance of each inter-connecting part (or set of psychological contracts) to meet developing demands and achieve a coherent whole. Thus, for instance, awareness of demotivators such as lack of autonomy, uncertainty, a sense of loss of community, and lack of appreciation, may be equally significant as improved pay and conditions of service. Modified perceptions of identity and adjustments to value sets are likely to depend on whether perceived benefits are seen to outweigh perceived limitations; the degree of acceptance of new structures; and the suitability of new frameworks to meet individual and collective needs. Nevertheless, there is likely to be ongoing tension between, for instance, the collective good in optimising research quality assessment scores for an institution and individual perceptions (Brew, Boud & Namgung 2009). Although agreed systems and frameworks are essential for purposes of communication and equity, individual

perceptions and morale need to be handled by senior and line managers such as deans and heads of department on a one-to-one basis, for instance by offering action plans tailored to the individual that will optimise motivation and morale within a given situation or context.

At the same time, higher education systems worldwide are undergoing change, partly because of environmental pressures, and partly because of the aspirations and approaches of new generations of staff. Not only is the central 'core' of academic faculty diversifying as a result of new entrants to the academy, for instance from the health and social fields, but also, alongside them, a 'penumbra' of highly qualified professional staff is emerging, contributing in areas as diverse as teaching and learning, information services, institutional research and development, enterprise, and community partnership. The activities of all these groups increasingly overlap, with two-way traffic occurring between them, and this has implications for the identities of a range of staff. Close partnerships arise, for instance, between heads of department and professional managers in trying to maximise opportunities for colleagues with what are often severe resource constraints. Management and leadership responsibilities (which may be lateral, and between peers, as well as hierarchical) are also occurring at an earlier stage of people's careers, for instance in project teams. The 'people dimension', therefore, comprising relationships that are constructed between, for instance, senior management teams, managers such as deans and heads of academic and functional departments, and colleagues who contribute different forms of expertise to cross-institutional projects such as widening participation and business partnership, are increasingly critical to institutional survival.

There is a significant literature on changing academic identities, particularly in the context of "managerial" approaches (for instance, Henkel 2000; Kogan & Teichler 2007; Deem, Hillyard & Reed 2007; Stromquist 2007a and b); Barnett & di Napoli 2008), and the case is well made for special considerations to apply to management and leadership in higher education, particularly in the face of the specialization of professional services in areas such as planning, finance, estates, human resources, and student services. However, higher education institutions are also facing pressures from wider societal trends. These include the desire of younger generations to achieve work-life balance, more flexible working patterns, and more project-oriented, portfolio careers (Strauss & Howe 1991; Florida 2002; Middlehurst 2010). Furthermore, the not insignificant traffic of both academic and professional staff between higher education and other sectors suggests that influences from elsewhere are likely to permeate.

Kolsaker (2008), in exploring the impact of "managerialism" on academic professionalism in six English universities, concluded that "much of the literature is overly negative in claiming proletarianisation and demoralization" (Kolsaker 2008, p. 523), while Harman (2003) qualified prevailing negative views of the impact of change in an Australian study. Although he acknowledges that "the transition to the new higher education environment has been painful and damaging for the profession, with many academics feeling deeply frustrated, disillusioned and angry", he also comments that "Many have made successful transitions to productive involvement in research links with industry and in other entrepreneurial activities without jeopardizing their academic integrity" (Harman 2003, p. 121). At the same time, a cautious welcome was given by Stromquist et al (2007a) to the diversification of the

contemporary professoriate, provided that safeguards were put in place over academic standards of programmes and working conditions of staff. Elsewhere, Stromquist notes that "movement toward both homogenisation and divergence [of social status, recognition and rewards] is paradoxical indeed" (Stromquist 2007b, p. 223).

Changes have impacted upon higher education systems, institutions and structures worldwide, albeit with differences in precise details, profiles, timing, and accommodations. While there are substantial cohorts of academic staff who continue to perform primarily research or teaching roles, combinations of management and teaching and/or research roles have also increased over the last twenty years, as have examples involving service, commercialization, community and other third-stream roles and links. The question may not be so much are academic identities changing, but rather how widespread is the trend and what are the principal manifestations and implications.

Authors such as Dowd and Kaplan (2005) point to "boundaryless" and "boundaried" careers and identities, suggesting that Whitchurch's (2008b) typology of "bounded", "cross-boundary", "unbounded" and "blended" identities have potential relevance for academic as well as for professional staff. "Boundaried" academic staff are strongly influenced by the rules, opportunities and recognition criteria of the institution in which they work, whereas "boundaryless" staff take a more freewheeling approach and are less constrained by such factors. However, careers and identities are not necessarily synonymous. The relationship between them is often nuanced, complex and even contested. In an increasingly competitive higher education environment, institutional managers may focus overly on tasks and performance measures such as

numbers of publications, rather than taking a more holistic view of the careers or identities of individuals, which can have demotivating effects. Such situations add further complexities to perceptions and understandings within the institutional community.

It may also be that a new 'trinity' of activity is emerging, incorporating an individual's academic interests, any specialist expertise or involvement in areas such as outreach, e-learning or enterprise, and management or leadership responsibilities, albeit the latter may be in a local setting such as a research, project or course team. Thus, programme leaders and principal investigators are likely to encounter 'people' challenges as part of their day-to-day responsibilities, for instance in relation to demands for flexible working alongside heavier teaching loads. Addressing such challenges may result in solutions that are tailored to local circumstances, but can also be shared with, and adapted to, other locales. It may be that new identities will emerge from these developments, in turn creating pressure for new organisational space. Such developments may require more permissive structures that can accommodate multiple partnerships and lines of communication, as opposed to singular reporting routes and chains of command, as exemplified by Whitchurch's concept of "Third Space" (Whitchurch 2008a, 2009). Such arrangements are reflected in the increasing use of partnership teams, involving representatives of external bodies such as the UK National Health Service, professional bodies who safeguard standards of practice, regional development agencies and local business.

Challenges arising

A changing external environment impacts not only on formal contracts of

employment, but also on what is known as the psychological contract, which has been defined as "The perceptions of… two parties, employee and employer, of what their mutual obligations are towards each other" (Guest & Conway 2002, quoted in Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development [CIPD], 2009). This, more informal, contract is based on interpretations and understandings by both employer and employees of formal terms and conditions of employment. Expectations and aspirations are likely to be influenced by staffing policies and working practices in institutions that have authority for decisions about staff, as well as by relationships between colleagues and membership of a disciplinary or professional community. The significance of the psychological contract is recognised by the increasing use of, for instance, surveys of staff satisfaction in higher education (eg Knight & Harvey 1999).

In higher education, the changing psychological contract is leading to new forms of:

- Recognition and reward, for instance, the use of titles such as director of teaching and learning, and discretionary responsibility allowances at local (school or faculty) level, to provide recognition for people who may not be able to achieve immediate promotion.

- Role portfolio, incorporating activities that are adjacent to teaching and research such as widening participation, business partnership and community outreach.

- Career track, with the possibility of multi-choice career pathways (Strike 2010).

- Professional development, for instance, mentoring, sabbaticals, and tailored opportunities (Middlehurst 2010).

Within a single institution, therefore, there may exist individuals who see themselves as having different academic or professional identities, and different concepts of, for instance, academic autonomy, what constitutes applied research, relationships with students and teaching methods. Thus, programme teams may wish, because of their traditions and/or clientele, to have different criteria and procedures for recruitment and progression. This can create operational, and even policy complexities, which have to be managed at both unit/department and institutional levels. There may, for instance, be implications for workload models and promotion criteria that take account of different contributions, not only teaching and research, but academic citizenship (Macfarlane 2007; 2011 forthcoming), network and partnership building, consultancy and income generation. Such models may also be adapted to give recognition to mixed or 'blended' roles in an area such as learning partnership (Whitchurch 2009). Thus an individual with a doctorate, and a background of teaching in the school, further or adult education sectors, might be encouraged to develop a research project on outcomes for the institution and students of a regional outreach policy. While it may not be possible to give them an academic title, they might be given an attachment of associateship to, for instance, an institutional centre for teaching and learning.

The changing psychological contract, therefore, increasingly involves a partnership between employers and employees, understandings of which are not necessarily fixed or stable. A 'push' from those with responsibilities for shaping institutional activities and aspirations is likely to be balanced by a 'pull' from those whose activities contribute to an institution's specific mission. This is an ongoing and iterative process, the outcome of which accounts for an institution's precise character and

shape at any one time. Thus, while institutions are subject to pressures from governments and markets, individuals are subject to a matrix of relationships and cross cutting strands, at the same time interpreting, yet seeking to influence, the demands being made on them. Senior managers interpret external requirements as they shape the internal operating environment, and line managers interpret, and also seek to influence, the cultures and strategies of their institutions.

A trend towards devolved management (Bolden, Petrov & Gosling 2008), particularly in large institutions with a well-developed "periphery" (Clark 1998), has resulted in more individuals having 'people' responsibilities, whether as heads of academic or functional departments, or as team or project leaders. Furthermore, there is a tendency for management and leadership skills to be required at an earlier stage in people's careers, so that they are not confined to the most senior levels of staff, and 'management' is no longer something that is undertaken solely by a minority of people. It may also occur laterally among peers, so that one person may be leading a team in one setting, but be 'managed' by another member of that team in another setting. In such conditions, there may be a 'cascade' effect, whereby 'management' capacity, including self-management, is spread laterally across an institution. It therefore becomes integral to the work of a range of people, including 'rank-and-file' academic faculty. Thus it would appear that clear distinctions between 'managers' and 'managed' are increasingly difficult to maintain, reflecting Kolsaker's suggestion that "dichotomous analyses of managerialism and professionalism are now outmoded" (Kolsaker 2008, p. 523).

On the one hand, it would seem that the need for management and leadership capability is unlikely to diminish in a world that is not only less certain, but also more risk-laden. On the other hand, whether or not such activities are given the labels of 'management' or 'leadership', the opportunity to take responsibility for, for instance, elements of a research project, is likely to be valued as an opportunity for development. Thus, a relatively junior member of a self-managing team might take on responsibility for the health and safety aspects of work in a specific laboratory. As a result, demand for management development programmes dedicated to managers from both academic and professional backgrounds is likely to continue.

Possible futures

It would appear that, notwithstanding the specifics of individual systems and institutions, forces for both continuity and change continue to co-exist in higher education. Challenges therefore arise from the inherent tensions traditionally associated with institutional "complexity" (Barnett 2000) including, for instance:

- Allegiance to a discipline through which it is anticipated an academic reputation will be built vs becoming a 'good citizen' at institutional level.

- Reward structures that may or may not incentivise academic faculty via, for instance, return of overhead income to fund conference attendance.

- Increased functional specialisation alongside the emergence of team and project working.

- The balance of research and teaching activity, and incorporation of new forms of academic and professional activity, particularly with the introduction of workload models (Barrett & Barrett 2007).

- Making the case for promotion on the basis of such new forms of activity, as well as teaching and research.

Furthermore, new dynamics arise within changing institutional communities. While these may, on the one hand, be developmental, they may also, on the other hand, foster tension or dissonance. Nevertheless, they are at the heart of the management challenge for institutions and their leaders, and include, for instance:

- Imperatives for continuity, adaptation and change.
- Lateral relationships and networks that overlay more formal and hierarchical structures.
- Pressures for both inclusivity and separation of different professional groups.
- Incorporation of Mode 1, Mode 2 and research consultancy activity.
- Changing understandings of management including direction, facilitation, conciliation, negotiation, and/or partnership.

These dynamics do not necessarily present themselves as dualities, and are likely to involve multiple strands. For instance, an acknowledgement of the different missions of an institution, or departments within it, may result in different emphasis being accorded to Mode 1 and Mode 2 forms of research (Gibbons et al 1994), Mode 1 representing pure forms of research, and Mode 2 applied knowledge relating to 'real world' problems and professional practice. Such an adjustment of emphasis would be particularly relevant in relation to practitioner subjects such as health and social care. Change may, therefore, occur at different speeds across different dimensions and across various locales, and institutions find themselves having to manage these differentials. In turn, this can lead to issues of consistency and comparability, for

instance, in relation to rewards and incentives across different disciplines or departments. Managers need to be able to accommodate this, and also recognize when to change gear and progress new initiatives as appropriate. Further challenges arise from the fact that these phenomena occur concurrently, and alongside each other. Thus, critical elements for contemporary leaders and managers would seem to be:

- How far change might be allowed to occur incrementally, and when to stimulate a major shift in approach.

- Management strategies that might be adopted in response to pressures from local and global environments, and/or whether these might be pre-empted.

- How new spaces and legitimacies in the university might be accommodated.

- The degree of legitimacy (and indeed respect) that might be accorded to new forms of academic and professional identity, and associated activity.

Rhoades' "invisible workforce" (Rhoades 2010), comprising academic staff on time-limited contracts and also professional staff, are under-represented in research on identities in higher education. Identifying such staff would be a helpful step towards enhancing understandings of their roles and contributions, and of opening appropriate career pathways. 'One size fits all solutions' are unlikely to satisfy the expectations of individuals, or the evolving needs of institutions. Movements in academic and/or professional identities are, therefore, complex, varied and contested, raising a key question for managers and leaders as to how the university can become a place where all roles and identities are valued in adding to the achievement of the reputation and success of the institution.

Rather than describing an increasingly diverse workforce solely in terms of organisational structures, be they hierarchical or matrix in form, it may be helpful to

think in terms of the relationship between the institution, the cultures of its increasingly diverse components, and the individual. To this end, a model of possible institutional environments, adapted from a report by PricewaterhouseCoopers, is offered in Table 1. Such environments may well co-exist, and need not be mutually exclusive.

[Insert Table 1 here]

Table 1: *Approaches to People Management (adapted from PricewaterhouseCoopers 2007)*

As with all such models, this one is intended as a conceptual tool to assist with thinking about organisational cultures, and what might be appropriate in a specific institution or institutional segment. In the context of higher education, this model also maps on to existing conceptualisations. Thus, the Blue World might be seen as reflecting "managerial" approaches, in which individuals are regarded as a resource, in same way as other resources, and there is a focus on performance management. In this scenario, individuals adopt a negotiating position in relation to their roles and careers on the basis of their perceived value. The Green World might be seen as reflecting traditional ideas of collegiality, and also as incorporating concepts of "democratic professionalism" (Whitty 2008) and "ethical leadership" (Mendonco & Kanungo 2007). The Orange World reflects ideas about the " "casualisation" of the workforce (Slaughter & Rhoades 2004), and the emergence of project and portfolio

working in "Third Space" (Whitchurch 2008a). At the same time as networks are developed that improve external contacts and access to knowledge (Stromquist, 2007b), these may also foster "The growth of multi-disciplinary identities, the emergence of 'trading zones', the development of multi-task teams..." (Nowotny, Scott & Gibbons, 2001, p. 252). Furthermore, "Mode 2" knowledge itself "is an open system in which 'producers', 'users', 'brokers' and others mingle promiscuously" (Scott 1997, p. 22). This may involve external partnerships and even outsourcing of activity, so that "…boundaries between the cognitively worthy and less or (un-) worthy… become difficult to identify" (Scott 1997, p. 20).

Although it is not possible to predict the way that higher education systems will evolve, it could be that one response to increased financial stringency will be a stronger steer from the corporate centre in a Blue World, at the same time as further casualisation of the workforce fosters ways of working characteristic of the Orange World. Such a scenario would create further institutional dynamics, and could also have the effect of squeezing opportunities to develop more sustainable and ethical forms of activity in a Green World. However, whatever transpires, it seems likely that tension between pressure for a more controlled operating environment, and one that is more fluid and networked, will be a challenge for the higher education sector and people working in it, particularly if this tension is to be used to positive effect. Nevertheless, those with responsibilities for people are likely to seek the spaces and flexibility to develop approaches that are appropriate to their locale in relation to, for instance, workloads and schemes of recognition and reward. This is likely to involve not only the creative use of existing mechanisms, but also a search for opportunities that assist individuals in extending their reach for the future.

Concluding remarks

A number of questions arise such as: how might perceived changes to academic and/or professional identities be characterised? Are they identifiable by comparatively small, but crucial changes in key indicators and relationships? Are they comparable to a sandy beach, constantly modified by the daily tide, but more significantly altered by occasional storms? Or is the appropriate metaphor one of an adaptive living organism, which can adjust to alterations to habitat? Becher & Trowler (2001) articulate the continuing, though evolving, significance of academic tribes and territories in higher education. It would appear that evolution continues and may be accelerating. Notwithstanding national differences, there appear to be common issues with respect to, for instance, a diversification of institutional communities to accommodate more recent entrants such as colleagues from the practice-based disciplines, staff recognition and reward mechanisms, and the changing expectations of younger generations, for instance in relation to work-life balance. Stable understandings about academic and/or professional identities and career paths are likely to be increasingly difficult to sustain, and higher education institutions are accommodating to systemic change at local level by, for instance, offering flexible employment packages, developing enabling frameworks such as workload models, and finding innovative opportunities in relation to career development.

Thus, diversification gives rise to further complexities, including:

- Multiple institutional agendas, for instance in relation to professional education and new forms of applied research, alongside traditional teaching and research in mainstream disciplines.
- Less commonality around professional understandings and histories.

- A broadening base of institutional activity, interest groups and networks.

- Interest groups that may compete as well as rely on each other.

- Less clarity about the boundaries between such groups.

- Higher levels of political activity with respect to goals, and means of achieving them.

- New influences exerted by external agendas and collaborations.

Diversification also carries with it the potential for extension and enhancement of academic and institutional activity through, for instance, external links and partnerships, at the same time as higher levels of risk from an increasing spread of activities, interests and stakeholders. All this raises the game for those in universities with people responsibilities in their endeavours to engage and motivate their colleagues.

Accommodating these complexities, in ways that do not disenfranchise sections of a diverse academic and professional community, requires senior management teams to consider issues of culture very carefully, accommodating, for instance, public service activities such as outreach and widening participation alongside more market-oriented initiatives such as business partnership and supporting local enterprise (Whitchurch 2010 forthcoming). This is likely to mean respecting different contributions to institutional reputation, from international indicators of esteem to regional 'friend raising', and a variety of relationships with internal and external constituencies, with sustained attention to "intensive (and continuous) interaction between … people and environments, applications and implications" (Nowotny, Scott & Gibbons 2001, p. 258). Not only are institutional activities and profiles likely to be subject to ongoing revision in the context of local environments, but continuing attention is required to

factors that motivate and create satisfaction for individuals who occupy a broader range of roles than hitherto, particularly in raising esteem for 'blended' roles and careers that do not follow a traditional academic or professional pattern. In practical terms, the 'employment package' will provide levers for achieving such a culture change.

Thus, multiple and parallel changes are occurring. While formal organisation charts, hierarchies, and line management relationships continue to exist, these are likely to be overlaid with lateral forms of working. Since it is often not possible to change or adapt structures sufficiently quickly, 'management' may be a question of being creative with existing mechanisms, and/or bringing local practice and formal frameworks into accommodation. In this situation, 'management' and 'leadership' might be seen more as a joint enterprise among colleagues. It may also be that understandings of professionalism drawn from sets of competencies and behaviours will be increasingly complemented by ideas about generic 'people' skills. Structures and processes may lag behind practice as individuals make their own decisions about their futures. Institutions may, therefore, wish to consider how they might, through local initiatives, increase awareness amongst their staff of opportunities that exist to influence these structures and processes. On the one hand, the diversification of the workforce has the potential to add value both in relation to the lateral reach of staff inside and outside the university, and also in relation to the experience available at different levels of disciplinary and institutional hierarchies. On the other hand, as noted above, this can increase the potential for risk, not least because of a multiplication of interest groups who may create additional synergy, but may also pull in different directions.

It may well be that the implications of the global economic downturn will cause some of the phenomena that have been observed, such as the casualisation of the workforce (Rhoades 2010), to gather pace. What seems clear is that financial levers for attracting and rewarding staff are likely to be increasingly scarce in the foreseeable future, and that other aspects of the employment 'package' will continue to assume importance, for instance, opportunities for career development, conference attendance, secondments, coaching and mentoring, or responsibility at local level for teaching and learning. There is evidence of a freeze on faculty salaries and early retirement schemes in the US (Smith 2009), at the same time as calls for government to undertake "sustained, systematic investment" (Rhoades 2009) in higher education, not only as part of a stimulus for economic recovery, but also to encourage "social innovation" and "[expand] the capacity of our intellectual capital". However the current signs are that, despite increased demand for student places as a result of the downturn, governments have so far been unwilling to absorb the additional costs. At the same time, tuition fees in private institutions in the US have risen (Gill 2009). Even if additional public investment takes place in one form or another, ongoing pressures on the higher education workforce, including casualisation involving part-time and fixed term labour, seem likely, as institutions seek the flexibility to deal with increasingly uncertain levels of funding. This will in turn engender renewed focus by managers, and those involved in their professional development, on the employment 'package' as a whole, including issues around motivations, rewards and incentives, and the means by which individual aspirations might be met.

References

Amaral, A., Jones, G. & Karseth, B. (2002). *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance.* Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the University in an Age of Supercomplexity.* Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Barnett, R. & di Napoli, R. (Eds.) (2008). *Changing Identities in Higher Education: Voicing Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Barrett, L. & Barrett, P. (2007). Current Practice in the Allocation of Academic Workloads. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 61(4), 461-478.

Becher, T. & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the Marketplace: the Commercialisation of Higher Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bolden, R, Petrov, G. & Gosling, J. (2008). *Developing Collective Leadership in Higher Education*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Brew, A., Boud, D., & Namgung, S. U. (2009). *The challenges of understanding academic identity.* Paper delivered at the Conference of the Society for Research into

Higher Education, 8-10 December 2009, Newport, UK.

Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) (2009). *The Psychological Contract* [http://www.cipd.co.uk/subjects/emptreltns/psycntrct/psycontr.htm].

Clark, B. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organisational Pathways of Transformation.* Paris: International Association of Universities Press and Elsevier Science.

Dearlove, J. (1998). The deadly dull issue of university 'administration'? Good governance, managerialism and organising academic work. *Higher Education Policy* 11(1): 59-79.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S. & Reed, M. (2007). *Knowledge, Higher Education, and the New Managerialism: The Changing Management of UK Universities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Delanty, G. (2008). *Academic Identities and Institutional Change. Changing Identities in Higher Education: Voicing Perspectives*. Eds. R. Barnett and R. di Napoli. Abingdon: Routledge.

Dobson, I. & Conway, M. (2003). Fear and loathing in university staffing: the case of Australian academic and general staff. *Higher Education Management and Policy* 15(3): 123-133.

Dowd, K. O. & Kaplan, D. M. (2005). The career life of academics: Boundaried or boundaryless? *Human Relations*, 58(6), 699-721.

Enders, J. & de Weert, E. (2009). *The Changing Face of Academic Life: Analytical and Comparative Perspectives.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class.* New York: Basic Books.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge, the Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.

Gill, J. (2009). Applicants are Denied Shelter from the Storm. *Times Higher Education*. 5 February.

Gordon, G. & Whitchurch, C. (Eds.) (2010). *Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education: The Challenges of a Diversifying Workforce*. International Studies in Higher Education. New York: Routledge.

Guest, D. & Conway, N. (2002). *Pressure at Work and the Psychological Contract*. London: CIPD.

Harman, G. (2003). Australian academics and prospective academics: Adjustment to a more commercial environment. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 15(3), 105-122.

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

Henkel, M. (2007). Shifting Boundaries and the Academic Profession. In M. Kogan and U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key Challenges to the Academic Profession.* Paris and Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel.

Henkel, M. (2010). Change and Continuity in Academic and Professional Identities. In G. Gordon & C. Whitchurch (Eds.), *Changing Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education: The Challenges of a Diversifying Workforce*. New York: Routledge.

Kennie, T. & Woodfield, S. (2007). Top team structures in UK higher education institutions: Composition, challenges and changes. *Tertiary Education and Management* 13(4): 1-18.

Knight, P. & Harvey, L. (1999). The use of a staff satisfaction survey at the University of Central England in Birmingham. *perspectives: policy and practice in higher education*, 3(2), 56-62.

Kogan, M. & Teichler, M. (2007). *Key Challenges to the Academic Profession*. Paris and Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel.

Kolsaker, A. (2008). Academic professionalism in the managerialist era: A study of English universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(5), 513-325.

Macfarlane, B. (2007). *The Academic Citizen: The Virtue of Service in Academic Life.* New York: Routledge.

Macfarlane, B. (2011 forthcoming). Professors as intellectual leaders: Formation, identity and role. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(1).

Marginson, S. & Considine, M. (2000). *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McNay, I. (1995). From the Collegial Academy to Corporate Enterprise: The Changing Culture of Universities. In T. Schuller (Ed.), *The Changing University.* Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Mendonca, M. & Kanungo, R. N. (2007). *Ethical Leadership*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Middlehurst, R. (1993). *Leading Academics*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Middlehurst, R. (2010). Developing Higher Education Professionals. In G. Gordon & C. Whitchurch (Eds.), *Changing Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education: The Challenges of a Diversifying Workforce*. New York: Routledge.

Nowotny, H., Scott, P. & Gibbons, M. (2001). *Re-thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Peters, M. (2004). Higher Education, Globalization and the Knowledge Economy. In M. Walker and J. Nixon (Eds.), *Reclaiming Universities from a Runaway World*. Maidenhead: SRHE/Open University Press.

PricewaterhouseCoopers (2007). *Managing Tomorrow's People: The Future of Work 2020*. London: PricewaterhouseCoopers [http//www.pwc.co.uk/pdf/managing_tomorrows.pdf].

Rhoades, G. (2007). Technology-enhanced courses and a Mode III organization of instructional work. *Tertiary Education and Management* 13(1): 1-17.

Rhoades, G. (2009). Open Letter to the President and Members of Congress. [http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/about/gensec/feb09open+let.htm].

Rhoades, G. (2010). Envisaging Invisible Workforces: Enhancing Intellectual Capital. In G. Gordon & C. Whitchurch (Eds.), *Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education: The Challenges of a Diversifying Workforce*. New York: Routledge.

Rowland, S. (2002). Overcoming fragmentation in professional life: The challenge for academic development. *Higher Education Quarterly* 56(1): 52-64.

Scott, P. (1997). The changing role of the university. *Tertiary Education and Management* 3(1): 5-14.

Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, H. (2009). The Midas Touch Eludes Harvard. *The Guardian*. 10 March.

Strauss, W. & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069*. New York: William Morrow.

Strike, T. (2010). Evolving English Academic Career Pathways. In G. Gordon & C. Whitchurch (Eds.), *Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education: The Challenges of a Diversifying Workforce*. New York: Routledge.

Stromquist, N. P., Gil-Anton, M., Colatrella, C., Mabokela, R. O., Smolentseva, A. & Balbachevsky, E. (2007a). The contemporary professoriate: Towards a diversified or segmented profession? *Higher Education Quarterly*, 61(2), 114-135.

Stromquist, N. P. (Ed). (2007b). *The Professoriate in the Age of Globalisation.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Szekeres, J. (2004). The invisible workers. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 26(1): 7-22.

Taylor, P. (2008). Being an Academic Today. In R. Barnett and R. di Napoli (Eds.), *Changing Identities and Voices in Higher Education.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Trowler, P. (2002). *Higher Education Policy and Institutional Change: Intentions and Outcomes in Turbulent Environments*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Watson, D. (2009). *The Question of Morale: Managing Happiness and Unhappiness in University Life.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Whitchurch, C. (2008a). Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: The emergence of *Third Space* professionals in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(4), 377-396.

Whitchurch, C. (2008b). Beyond administration and management: Reconstructing the identities of professional staff in UK higher education. *Higher Education Policy and Management*, 30(4), 375-386.

Whitchurch, C. (2009). The rise of the *blended professional* in higher education: A comparison between the UK, Australia and the United States. *Higher Education*, 58(3), 407-418.

Whitchurch, C. (2010 forthcoming). Some implications of 'public/private space' for professional identities in higher education. *Higher Education*. DOI: 10.1007/s10734-010-9320-z.

Whitty, G. (2008). Changing Modes of Teacher Professionalism: Traditional, Managerial, Collaborative and Democratic. In B. Cunningham (Ed.), *Exploring Professionalism*. London: Bedford Way Papers.