



University of Huddersfield Repository

Feather, Denis

Time! What's that? You're joking, I don't have any!

Original Citation

Feather, Denis (2017) Time! What's that? You're joking, I don't have any! Journal of Further and Higher Education, 41 (5). pp. 706-716. ISSN 0309-877X

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/28440/>

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/>

Time! What's that? You're joking, I don't have any!

Author: Denis Feather

Affiliation: The Business School, University of Huddersfield

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to understand how lecturers delivering college based higher education (CBHE) viewed their workloads, and how this (if at all), influenced their engagement in scholastic activities, which may then enable them to become more knowledgeable in their chosen field of study. The research was of a qualitative nature; where semi-structured, in-depth interviews were undertaken with twenty-six individual lecturers employed at different Further Education Colleges (CBHE), throughout the Yorkshire and Humber region. It was found that time, and the amount of administration on top of their current workload, were some of the major issues these lecturers were facing in their current roles. To this end, a recommendation of an independent audit be conducted to ascertain the actual contact time lecturers in CBHE have, and how to possibly reduce the levels of administration in line with the HEFCE (2009) report.

Key words: Time, Administration, HE in FE, CBHE, Managerialism, Scholastic

Introduction

Time is a crucial factor that affects everyone to varying degrees, more so, lecturers who deliver College Based Higher Education (CBHE). Each year greater demands are placed upon Further Education Colleges (CBHE) to deliver more with less resources (Hall 1990, Higher Education Academy 2004, Simmons and Lea 2013). Therefore, if the UK government require CBHE to take on different remits concerning the delivery of Higher Education (HE) (King and Widdowson 2009, Medcalf 2014), and if lecturers in CBHE are to deliver high quality higher education programs (HEBPs) (Parry 2013). Then the government will need to convince senior management in CBHE to provide more time for scholarly activity, research, and the preparation/delivery of lessons (Medcalf 2014), thus offering egalitarianism with their HE cousins. More importantly, to provide the financial resources needed to accomplish one of their objectives, that of a Higher Education (HE) ethos within CBHE (Simmons and Lea 2013). As Simmons (2010, 365) argues ‘The ‘footprint’ of any FE college is shaped, to

some degree, by local partners and competitors and surrounding institutional landscape.” Subsequent, one could argue that the foot has grown, and needs a new and better fitting shoe to accommodate this change.

This study draws on the perceptions of twenty-six lecturers based in CBHE around the Yorkshire and Humber region, and how, through their lenses, they make sense of these new expectations by government, funding bodies, and other interested parties. That is, how time influences their workload, working environment, via the intensification of delivering CBHE whilst being constrained by their CBHE existing policies, practices, and procedures.

Theory

The lack of time provided to lecturers delivering CBHE is well documented (Harwood and Harwood 2004, Feather 2010, Medcalf 2014), this is further evidenced when Parry et al. (2009, 33) writes:

Teaching staff in colleges [sic] support students extremely well, with substantial amounts of contact time, but this approach occasionally means that students become dependent on their teachers and do not develop the skills of independent learning: they need to spend time accessing external sources too.

Simmons and Lea (2013) may concur when discussing how the present Further Education (FE) culture may militate against the introduction of an HE ethos. They acknowledge that CBHE staff in the UK are somewhat time deficient, but further identify that that an HE ethos may “...compromise their status as employees of corporations, where first and foremost they will be judged by their ability to meet targets laid down in strategic plans.” (Simmons and Lea 2013, 3). Medcalf (2014, 13) also refers to the HE ethos, arguing, “Staff are commonly asked to teach both FE and HE courses, and often lack the time or space to consider the changing ethos of each provision.” However, this is nothing new, Feather (2010, 2011) identified this in his research; inferring the same may be true elsewhere in the UK and other

countries, for example, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States. From this, one could argue that having to switch from the different levels of delivery could impact upon some individual lecturers in terms of the quality of teaching and their own perceived professional standing (Tummons, Orr, and Atkins 2013). This is likely to intensify, as Medcalf (2014) identifies, the student experience is a key performance indicator, both in HE, FE and CBHE. As such, ‘customerisation’ (Medcalf 2014, Love 2008), or arguing from an American perspective, ‘McDonaldization’ (Ritzer 2011), are likely to force greater accountability onto lecturers’ to meet these hedonistic targets of keeping students happy. This is further evidenced when universities are seen to jockey to be amongst the top places in the National Student Survey (NSS) scores published each year in the UK, or similar league tables in other countries around the world. Love (2008), when discussing HE in general, may concur with the above when he writes that within the academe, the language of the day is that of the economic spreadsheet and the ‘Fordist’ modes of production. Applying this to CBHE, Feather (2010) argued how lecturers were seen as production operatives, and as a result, had little time for anything other than the teaching allocated to these lecturers.

Mather, Worrall, and Seifert (2007), and Smith (2015), consider how the labour in CBHE are both managed and controlled via ever changing managerialist practices and ‘Taylorite’ strategies. Further, Love (2008, 21) argues, that “...the adages of corporate business, once so foreign, now seem to apply without effort to higher education.” That is, for employers (in this instance government pressure on CBHE), to “...cheapen the cost of labour while intensifying work.” (Mather, Worrall, and Seifert 2007, 111). As Davies (1997, 7) wrote at the time “...FE is still unable to define its place in any other sense than its recently required corporate status.” Yet today, this lack of identity still seems to be the case (Simmons and Lea 2013). Subsequently, it is of little wonder that CBHE is still referred to as a ‘hybrid’

(Parry and Thompson 2002), or the ‘Cinderella’ service of education (Simmons 2008, Feather 2013).

Smith (2015) when researching the effects of the new contracts initiated by the College Employers Forum (CEF), identified how these new contracts were ‘centred’ on hours per week/year. This new contract further identified how many hours’ lecturers were expected to be on site; as were other issues such as redundancy and holiday periods. Having said this, as Doring (2002) identifies, ‘time’ is the enemy, that is, one cannot meet the demands of quality in both teaching and research at the same time. Young (2002, 281) expands on this when writing:

Whilst it is no doubt true that all lecturers, wherever they work, feel they have insufficient time to read as much as they would like, or truly reflect on their reading, there are particular pressures on staff in FE colleges with annual teaching loads of 800 hours and often a wide range of courses requiring preparation, teaching, marking, and administration.

This is further qualified when Tummons, Orr, and Atkins (2013, 84) argue that a lecturer delivering HE in FE have “... barely enough time to draw breath, never mind to engage in research and scholarship.”

Both Harwood and Harwood (2004), and Feather (2010) have identified that the average contact time is higher than when Young (2002) published her work; Feather (2010) based on his research findings argued that it was nearer an average of twenty-six hours per week contact time; Harwood and Harwood (2004) identified that it was twenty-five hours in their research. The views on contact time seem to fluctuate depending on whose research you read, for example, Tummons, Orr, and Atkins (2013) argue that twenty-five hours are the average contact hours for a lecturer, whereas, Parry and Thompson (2002) argue it is twenty-

three. This latter contact time is the standard time that each of those interviewed for this study identified were written in their individual contracts. Whichever view one takes, the contact hours for lecturers delivering HE in FE are substantial, and this does not include lesson preparation, marking, or other duties/roles these lecturers have to undertake as part of their day-to-day work commitments (Tummons, Orr, and Atkins 2013). Contrary to this, the QAA (2008) suggest that there is sufficient time provided by CBHE for lecturers to keep abreast of their subject, and that lecturers are well supported in this. Feather's (2014a, 2010) research identified that in reality, many of the lecturers interviewed self-identified that they 'read to teach', which does not allow for deeper reflection, and in some instances, depending on the subject; some lecturers identified that they were one chapter in front of the students. This then appears to be out of kilter with the comments laid down in the report by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) who stipulated that CBHE should demonstrate:

...a clear rationale for the college's provision of higher education within a local, regional and national policy context, addressing identifiable needs and adding value.

This revision of the guide has taken into account the guidance offered for the CBHE' higher education strategy pilot (see HEFCE web-site), which requires strategies to address partnerships, staff development and scholarly activity, management and resourcing, curriculum development and relationships with employers (HEFCE 2009, 11).

When HEFCE (2009, 11) discusses '...addressing identifiable needs and values', this is somewhat ambiguous, as it does not identify whose needs and values it is relating to. For example, it could be those of the colleges, the students, the community, management, employers, or lecturers. In this instance, when discussing resourcing, the colleges and HEFCE must look to meeting the needs and values of all, but mainly the lecturers, as these are the individuals that are 'front facing', and have daily contact with students. As a result, these lecturers need time to prepare for lessons, undertake scholarly activity, and possibly undertake research. This in turn will have a 'ripple' effect in that the students should be better serviced, better educated, and the college, community, employers and any other stakeholders,

may see real value in the quality of the education delivered to the student, and as a result, enable the students to gain the necessary ‘life skills’ (DfES 2006) needed to gain employment.

In relation to time, the HEFCE (2009) report also identified that lectures in CBHE were spending substantial amounts of time supporting students, whereby the students became dependent on this contact time, rather than becoming independent, and moving towards becoming self-autonomous learners. The report also identifies the vast amount of administration that lecturers within CBHE have responsibility for, and acknowledge that management need to reduce this to free up some of the time for lecturers to focus on the core skills of their role (HEFCE 2009). However, the aporia occurs when HEFCE is comparing the different colleges in their research and identify that there should be flexibility of delivery. HEFCE discusses how ‘blended learning’ should be adopted in the form of online delivery. They argue that this will allow tutors to “...maintain telephone and e-mail contact when appropriate.” (HEFCE 2009, 107). However, as highlighted earlier in the paper, students become accustomed to having contact time, with e-mail and telephone calls; this in reality could mean that the student may expect the lecturers to be available 24/7, when learning online. A further aporia is where HEFCE states:

Staff teaching HE in CBHE [CBHE] has their hours calculated in many different ways, but they are all likely to have different conditions of service from their counterparts in HEIs. The differences include contact hours, the amount of administrative support available, and the allocation of time to research and scholarly activity. For example, staff in colleges may have more contact hours overall, but so do their programmes. (HEFCE 2009, 155)

If lecturers in CBHE were to deliver higher education programmes to the standards that the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and HEFCE require in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), then one would expect these programmes in CBHE’s to be egalitarian with those in

HEIs. Further, lecturers in CBHE should have the same contact hours and resources as their cousins in HEIs. However, Child (2009), when echoing the views of the HEQC (1993), argues that academics (Child's label for an HE lecturer) are expected to research and create knowledge, whereas lecturers (Child's label for CBHE lecturers) are viewed as having no time to undertake scholarly activity, let alone research to create knowledge. From this statement, it is clear that Child (2009) (a lecturer in an HEI), does not see lecturers in CBHE as academics. However, as Simmons (2010) identifies, since incorporation in 1992, CBHE have gone through major changes, not only were there mass redundancies via restructuring, but "Funding was severely constrained...colleges became far more taxing places in which to work...Workloads increased greatly, pay and conditions deteriorated and levels of professional autonomy were significantly curtailed." (Simmons 2010, 366). This then, evidences the enormity of some of the pressures that many CBHE and CBHE lecturers are facing on a daily basis. Nevertheless, it is not all doom and gloom, according to Simmons (2010), colleges are now (he argues), 'outward-looking', responsive to communities, and now functions in a more customer orientated manner. The problem here is that, in reality he is identifying that colleges have adopted the neo-liberalised managerialist philosophy, and this would be in agreement with the comments made earlier in the paper by Mather, Worrall, and Seifert (2007), and (Smith 2015).

Method

The study was undertaken from an axiological, interpretive perspective, where one wished to gain an understanding of how lecturers within CBHE delivering CBHE made sense of their workload and working environment. Moreover, how this and other factors such as stakeholder expectations and neo-liberalist managerial practices, were possibly affecting the time lecturers needed to comply with, and meet, UK Government initiatives.

Sample

Colleges that delivered CBHE were identified using the ‘Higher Education Research Organisation’ (HERO Ltd 2007) internet site. One hundred and four colleges in England were identified, as delivering CBHE – Wales, Scotland, and Ireland were not included, due to differing policies and practices concerning CBHE. A letter was posted to the Principals of these colleges asking for permission to conduct research at their individual institutions. Twenty-nine Principals gave their permission, and provided a list of names (150) to contact within their Business School/Department – colleges used the titles of ‘Business School’ or ‘Business Department’ interchangeably to mean the same thing. A semi-structured questionnaire was designed, comprising of: closed- and open-ended questions, Likert, scaling, and opinion questions (Oppenheim 2001). These were then posted to the 150 identified lecturers, of which ninety-six were returned; of these, four were spoilt and could not be used.

From the remaining ninety-two questionnaires, fifty-two individual lecturers ‘self-identified’ that they would be willing to take further part in the research by agreeing to be interviewed. A purposive sampling method (Jones 1955, Robson 2002) was employed as I wished to capture the youngest and oldest participants; have equity across the genders, and representatives in each of the following categories: ethnicity, length of service, and the number of years teaching at both the HE and FE level. From using a purposive sampling technique a final representative sample of twenty-six individuals were identified, and subsequent in-depth interviews were conducted. These interviews largely took place at the interviewee’s institution (geographically dispersed around the Yorkshire and Humber region of England), however, two interviewees travelled to the interviewer’s own institution, as these two interviewee’s (from different institutions), feared reprisals from their respective managers, if these managers were to find out they were taking part in this study.

The interviews lasted for approximately sixty minutes, were digitally recorded (with the interviewee's permission), and transcribed as soon as practicable. A random sample of the transcribed interviews were sent to the respective individuals to check for accuracy of the transcription, and to afford the interviewees the opportunity to remove or add information – no changes were made – and the transcripts were signed and retuned.

Ethics

The rights and identities of both the individuals and their respective CBHE are preserved, as such, their names were changed to comply with guidelines as laid down by the British Education Research Association (BERA 2011), and the researcher's own institution, who provided approval for the research to be undertaken.

Guidelines of the interview process

The interview schedule was designed from the literature reviewed for the study, and from the subsequent research objectives set for this study. The core areas set for the research were to look at how lecturers within business schools were delivering College Based Higher Education (CBHE), and whether their current workloads affected their ability to meet other role commitments expected of them. For example, how the amount of time allowed in their current working environment may not allow some to undertake research, and/or to meet the demand on them [lecturers] to be seen as having, or gaining specialist knowledge in their field.

Discussion

It would appear that from discussions in the literature review part of this paper that one of the major impediments of working in a Further Education College (FEC) may be that of 'time' (HEFCE 2009, Child 2009). That is, not having enough time to undertake the

necessary reading to become a specialist in their chosen field of delivery; a factor that students today are looking for, and indeed expecting when undertaking a higher education course of study. Diane (a woman in her early forties), when asked about time for undertaking research or scholarly activity was angry at not having enough time to do anything she wanted to; from one's observations, she appeared frustrated that her college would not afford her the necessary time. She stated:

Right! Well, when you teach 23 hours a week [contact time]...you're literally preparing lessons, and you, you, your time, the reading, the research, and everything you do is very much focused on marking, preparing lessons. [As such,] there isn't time to look wider to pick up on new things, or new ideas or something of interest, or something you'd want to move into.

Thomas (nearing retirement), when asked the same question at his interview, commented on how he did not have time for similar reasons identified by Diane. However, in the case of his institution, he added "...I don't think the future at this particular institution is HE." The reason given for this statement was that he and other lecturers at the institution had high contact hours, across a range of courses at different levels. Whereby, he felt that his institution could not offer the students the HE experience, or adopt a HE ethos. Simon (a man in his early fifties) provided similar views, adding that at times he felt like "...a hamster on a wheel, constantly fighting to keep up." Martin (a man in his early forties) echoed the above comments when he stated that:

...there is not enough time, you know, at, I think we've had this conversation before, numerous times, you know there is not the time...erm...certainly not within the contract to keep abreast of the latest text books, let alone look at papers and research stuff. ...because you, you know, you are viewed as a resource, and that resource has to be utilised to its maximum efficiency – a place like this, sees that resource has being the provision of a body in front of as many erm, students as they can.

Martin went on to discuss how long it took him to prepare for his classes, arguing that for every hour he taught, it took him seven hours of preparation time, and that when teaching twenty-four hours a week, one does not have to be too intelligent to conclude that it leaves

very little time for anything else. Many of the lecturers interviewed for this study reflected the above views in one way or another in their interviews, many arguing that they only had enough time to ‘read to teach’, a phenomenon identified by (Feather 2014a).

Martin further identified how he had to deliver classes that he had little or no knowledge in, and certainly did not regard himself as a specialist in those subjects he was teaching presently. He stated:

...I've taught management information systems; this time I'm teaching erm, finance and I know I'm not a subject specialist. So I; I present it in forms of discussions in forums, trying to draw out the students' experiences and erm, send them to research; rather than erm, deliver it myself, in which case, in many ways, probably more educationally sound.

This may raise concerns, as it appears that this lecturer is endeavouring to justify his lack of knowledge on the subject, and the way he is delivering it, as an educationally sound form of delivery. However, finance is an area where education is based on practical work within the classroom, for example, calculating profit and loss reports, and balance sheets. Moreover, any other necessary financial practices students may need to know, more so if they intend to take a professional qualification such as the ‘Association of Accounting Technicians’ (AAT). This then would fit with Mather, Worrall, and Seifert’s (2007) views discussed earlier in the paper, and applied here. That is, management could be reducing the costs of delivery by having someone with no knowledge of the subject covers the delivery of the lesson to the students by having, has Martin says, “... someone, anyone, stood in front of a class delivering.” This is just one individual’s story of how he is trying to survive in a ‘Taylorist’ environment (Mather, Worrall, and Seifert 2007).

Karen (a woman in her mid forties), on this same subject, appears to be out of kilter with the views of Martin. She argues that despite the high levels of contact hours, for one’s own credibility “...you need to go into the classroom prepared”, not at a level that would be

disrespectful of "...either yourself or the students that you're going to teach." However, in truth, it might be a fear factor that Martin is involuntarily displaying, similar to Christopher (a man in his early sixties) who identifies the management at this college as similar to the that of the coating 'Teflon', basically, nothing sticks to it. Christopher relates the following story of a business investing £1,100 in one of its employees to study for a diploma at his institution, but at the end of the year, the student failed the diploma:

"Because we've made that investment, we want a qualified member of staff". Erm, your employee didn't submit any work, you know. "Well what did you do to make them or help them to submit their work?" Well, they just didn't actually write anything.

Christopher goes on to identify that despite this, there is still an onus on the lecturer to explain why the student failed. Further, why the lecturer did not achieve the set targets, and that a lot of energy and bad temper had been expended when things went wrong at his particular institution. He likens the punishment as similar to a "...public execution at dawn" if deadlines were missed. Further, that because lecturers at his institution are expected to record everything on some form of documentation, made him feel that someone was always looking over his shoulder. Is this paranoia, or reality? Christopher relates another example; this time on student retention and what can occur if a student was to leave the course:

...with just twenty students on the course, percentages, this is a problem with any target, they're usually expressed in terms of percentages or numbers, and the smaller the group, you've only got to have one extra student go wrong. For example, why did this student leave? Well err, they moved away from the area, you know what I mean. There's always the fear of management asking why did you let them move away from the area? But I mean, I know they don't think like that, but there is that sort of, you're left feeling.....you have to explain the blindingly obvious (starts laughing nervously).

On reflecting on these comments, maybe the opposite is true, and that he does perceive that management take this view. Dubiously, the story could be true, otherwise, why make the statement, which, has he points out, is blindingly obvious; but this statement, conjoined with the nervous laugh, may suggest otherwise. The observations of the interviewee's whole

demeanour whilst being interviewed evidenced a state of unease. He did ask (mid-way through the interview), for reassurances (which were given), that the information provided would not be fed back to the management at his institution. Revisiting Simmons (2010) views discussed earlier, where he believes that colleges are now outward facing, becoming more customer and community focused, is not supported by this research in terms of inward facing, that is, where its staff could also be customers. More so when considering that some lecturers actually live and work in fear of reprisals from management if they do not pass students. This in turn is supported by Ritzer (2002, 2011) when he discusses how higher education has become to be expected as a hedonistic experience for the students, and ‘all accommodating’ for the students, society, and business alike; be it HE or CBHE.

Another point raised, was that of ‘being allowed by management to attend conferences’; on this Duncan (a man in his mid forties) identified, that he never attends conferences; again due to the lack of time due to his other commitments. His teaching comprised of twenty-eight contact hours per week, and as such “...everything is geared towards teaching ... it’s not in the contract that we were expected to attend conferences or not. It is not there, conferences are unheard of.” He stated that he asked management if he could continue with his PhD and given time to research, their reply was “...no your priority is the teaching.” This then is in direct opposition to the statement made in the report by HEFCE (2009, 155), where they suggested that CBHE institutions should be offering “... staff development and scholarly activity” Similarly, Linda (a woman in her early fifties) stated:

...if you want to go to conferences; generally HE conferences are quite expensive at the side of FE conferences, erm, and they [her college] see it as spending money unnecessarily; if you want to study further, erm, they’re not prepared to fund you, because they [her college] don’t particularly want you to have that level of qualification. Erm, time wise...they’re [her college] not prepared to allocate you any time for that sort of – either research or anything else. They [her college] don’t see the importance of it...err, I don’t think they [her college] really see the importance of HE; beyond the money it brings in.

From this individual lecturer's perspective, it would suggest that her particular college at least appears to be evidencing a Machiavellian or Narcissistic approach to their partnership with HEI's or with HE funding and awarding bodies. This brings to mind the old adage of 'time is money', that is, could this be the approach some CBHE are taking? It would appear so from what Carl (a man in his late forties) relates to in his interview. This lecturer had twenty-seven contact hours per week, along with other course responsibilities. He commented that:

...colleges became run more like a business, and I mean this is, this is, this is *serious business* [my emphasis]. ... erm, I mean it's run by business people in this college ... erm, the, the learners, or the, or what we call, we call the learners [says with a sarcastic tone], but it's actually the funding that the learners bring that is central to what we do. ...I mean, we find ourselves, we find ourselves erm, pressured to get your three R's – Recruitment, Retention, and Results, and that final ten percent of whatever funding, erm you know, there's a lot of pressure, a lot of pressure to err, to do that.

Carl evidences this further, when identifying that his particular college has placed no 'cap' on recruitment: "...we've got a ND [National Diploma] course, erm, that had forty-five students on it; this year, err, it has got sixty-five students on it next year, and they haven't told them to stop recruiting yet." He identified another course that had forty-three students this year, but had recruited seventy-two students for the following year. This was good news for the college as Carl indicated, each student brought in "... £2,500 - £3,500 per student, depending on what they're thinking of signing up to [which course the prospective student intended taking].

Simon appears to have the same issues at his institution, here he states:

... erm, it.....you, you're kind of coming in and, you come in and do your job, and erm, you hope to do your best by your students, and all the rest of it [other duties he has to perform]. However, it doesn't, it doesn't feel as the whole of the rest of the institution is actually working to that aim necessarily. That different parts have their own agendas, erm, I mean (coughs), excuse me, my manager, every time we meet wants to know about recruitment, retention, achievement, end of, you know. Well it's very black and white isn't it? It's figures and it's, and in many of the ways we can massage the figures to draw down the maximum funding and all those things.

This then would support the views of Love (2008), where it is argued that the language of the academe is that of the economic spreadsheet. From Christopher, Carl, and Simon's

viewpoints, time on the job (to the management), is money; that is, there appears to be a culture of ‘Pack them in, teach them, and get them out’, where lecturers are not given time to prepare for lessons, but teach the students from experience. Daisy (a woman in her mid forties) would be in accord with this statement, she argues that there is no time for reading, even reading to teach (Feather 2010, Tummons, Orr, and Atkins 2013), “I probably learn more from reading the kid’s pieces actually.”, (Daisy).

Daisy makes another interesting comment, which is paradoxical to her comments above, where she identifies how she learns from reading the student’s work; but later in the interview, she identifies that:

...you almost end up writing the stuff for them, don’t you? It becomes this literaturist [this is not a word that is found in the standard everyday dictionary, but is the word the interviewee uses], process doesn’t it, you refer the work and you think miss this, this, and this, and I’ll come back and do a bit more. Not so much perhaps on HE, but certainly on FE kinda stuff with lower levels.

No matter how Daisy portrays this, there is no getting away from the fact, that the inference is that Daisy [a programme manager] (and may be other lecturers), appear to be almost writing some students’ scripts, which is not aiding in either the students’ learning or their development. For example, Daisy argues that students derive all sorts of excuses to gain extra time to undertake the assessment [paper-based assignment], and then outlines how this would not be accepted in business, arguing that if a report was not in on time, the student would be reprimanded or at worst fired from their job. Therefore, it would appear from what Daisy has stated in her interview, that it appears there are some ‘double standards’ being practiced in her department. She blames this in part, on a ‘them and us’ type of culture in her department. That is, there are the younger members of staff who are eager to try new ways of teaching; then there are (how Daisy states it), those members of staff:

... who have been with us a long, long, time, and perhaps it would be probably more difficult, erm, probably because they think they know it [their subject], they've done it, they've seen it, but there's a difference between five years experience and five years of one year; the same experience if you follow my drift.

If Daisy and other members of her staff are writing and/or proofreading their students' scripts, it is little wonder that there is little time left for anything else.

Administration

A further impediment and major irritation for many of the lecturers interviewed for this study were the large amounts of administrative work they are expected to undertake (Feather 2014b, Feather 2010). Davina (a woman in her late twenties) stated that:

I've got all the admin to do, and the paperwork is arduous; so it isn't just things such as registers, we have a form for everything. We fill in a form to request any kind of information.....erm, and your time is just taken with trying to keep your head above water.

Geoff (a man in his late fifties) commented that it was impossible to undertake any scholarly activity, as the rest of the time (after his contact hours) was "...taken up with marking and administration...) and as a result, he felt his knowledge was out of date. For Diane it was the bureaucracy and amount of administration of being a course leader, which was stifling her personal scholastic plans, in that, after teaching, she had only 14 hours in which to undertake the administration for the course, personal tutor meetings, student support, marking, and preparing for lessons. Karen outlined another factor, that of the expectancy of covering other lecturer's classes if they were off work with stress or any other long-term sickness, and the administration that was attached to that. Further, Stephen (a man in his mid fifties) was not happy about the amount of administration he had to undertake, and in truth, summed up what may be the other interviewees may have been thinking, but did not voice at their interviews. Stephen argued that "...the admin, any admin aspects really need to be taken away completely."; this is in line with the views of Young (2002) and HEFCE (2009), (outlined

earlier in this paper). Having said this, Annie (a woman in her late forties) saw administration as part of her job, but still, it was frustrating as it affected everything else she was expected to do; she commented:

...one of the things that as a teacher that I get very frustrated about is the amount of time that I have to spend on administration, and I see it as being an important part of my job because that's essentially how funding comes down to the classes that I teach. Nevertheless, I do feel sometimes that it's not; it's not achieving the standards that I think that people want to achieve in terms of government and perhaps the funding bodies.

From the discussions in this section, it can be seen that what these lecturers are evidencing is that what HEFCE (2009) stipulated in their report about reducing the amount of administration these lecturers were involved with; as a result it appears to not have been addressed by the management of CBHE. Further, from what has been evidenced in this study, FECs (and many HEIs) appear to be adopting a culture of ‘corporatisation’, where auditing and targets are the drivers of education today (Giroux 2010, Higher Education Academy 2004). Perhaps it is as Hill (2000, 74) identified in his study that the management and governing bodies appear to have “... limited trust and confidence in their core teaching staff – full-time further education lecturers.” Therefore, the culture of both HE and CBHE is as Barnett (2003) suggests, if it moves audit it, if it does not, audit it anyway.

Conclusions

This paper, from the research undertaken, infers that time is a major factor to consider when one is a lecturer delivering CBHE. In reality, if one reads leading authors’ views on HE in universities; especially the post 1992, and newer universities, one could argue the same is true here (Barnett and Di Napoli 2008, Furedi 2002, Taylor 2008, Barnett 2000). The study has further evidenced that time (although one of the main issues), is not a singular problem for lecturers delivering CBHE, but as the interviewee Davina points out; ‘... there is a form for everything’. There is also the amount of administration that needs to be undertaken as part

of their ongoing duties, which hinders their endeavours to develop their knowledge, find time manage courses, cover for colleagues. As (Feather 2010) identified, a practice of ‘read to teach’ may transpire, this is evidenced by the interviewee Annie, who becomes frustrated at the amount of administration she has to undertake. As a result, it is only by reading to teach (that is, keeping one chapter in front of the students), that allows these lecturers any kind of breathing space, no matter how limited (Tummons, Orr, and Atkins 2013). As many of the lecturers identified, it is better to have some breathing space, rather than none at all.

A further inference from this study is that some lecturers within CBHE seemed to be afraid, which in turn caused them stress. This appeared to be the case with Christopher, who, whilst being interviewed showed signs of anxiety and kept looking over his shoulder. This angst also manifested in the way Christopher kept looking for assurances that his managers would not be privy to the data collected in the interview. When reflecting on this, one asked himself, was Christopher really afraid, or was it just a case of misinterpretation; not being a clinical psychologist, one could not answer this, but there is evidence of bullying in some higher and further education institutions (Lewis 1999).

The recommendation one puts forward for consideration (based on the inferences from the discussions in this paper), are that the government, and the various funding bodies undertake their own independent audit of lecturers’ workloads delivering CBHE courses, and the ‘real’ amount of administration these lecturers have to complete as part of their role. It is important that time is given to CBHE lecturers to develop their knowledge, and be allowed to engage in scholastic practice, which in turn may enable these lecturers to deliver the quality of lesson they endeavour to do at present, with very limited resources.

References

- Barnett, Ronald, and Roberto Di Napoli, eds. 2008. *Changing Identities in Higher Education - Voicing Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Barnett, Ronald. 2000. *Realizing the University in an Age of Supercomplexity*. Maidenhead: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Barnett, Ronald. 2003. *Beyond All Reason - Living with Ideology in the University*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- BERA. *Ethical guidelines for educational research*. BERA, 29/09/2013 2011 [cited 29/09/2013]. Available from <http://www.bera.ac.uk/publications/guides.php>.
- Child, Sue. 2009. "Differing relationships to research in higher and further education in the UK: a reflective account from a practitioner perspective." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* no. 14 (3):333-343. doi: 10.1080/13596740903139453.
- Davies, David. 1997. "From the further education margins to the higher education centre? Innovation in continuing education." *Education and Training* no. 39 (1):4-13. doi: 10.1108/00400919710157114.
- DfES (2006) *Further Education: Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances*, London, Cm6768.
- Doring, Allan. 2002. "Challenges to the Academic Role of Change Agent." *Journal of Further and Higher Education* no. 26 (2):139-148.
- Feather, Denis. 2014a. "Defining academic – real or imagined." *Studies in Higher Education*:1-14. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2014.914921.
- Feather, Denis. 2014b. "Research to improve specialist knowledge: an HE in FE Perspective." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* no. 19 (3):310-322. doi: 10.1080/13596748.2014.920583.
- Feather, Denis. 2010. "A whisper of academic identity: an HE in FE perspective." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* no. 15 (2):189-204. doi: 10.1080/13596741003790740.
- Feather, Denis. 2011. "Culture of HE in FE - exclave or enclave?" *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* no. 16 (1):15-30. doi: 10.1080/13596748.2011.549724.
- Feather, Denis. 2013. "Has Cinderella become so fragmented that she can no longer identify her area of expertise?" *European Journal of Education: Research, Development and Policy* no. 48 (4):586-596. doi: 10.1111/ejed.12047.

- Furedi, Frank. 2002. "The Bureaucratization of the British University." In *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*, edited by Dennis. Hayes and Robin. Wynyard, 33-42. London: Bergin and Garvey.
- 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* no. 32 (4):339-381.
- Hall, Vince. 1990. *Maintained Further Education in the United Kingdom*. Blagdon: The Further Education Staff College.
- 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* no. 28 (2):153-164. doi: 10.1080/0309877042000206723.
- HEFCE (2009) *Supporting higher education in further education - Policy, Practice and prospects*, Higher Education Funding Council for England, Bristol, 2009/05.
- HEQC. 1993. *Some Aspects of Higher Education Programmes in Further Education Institutions*. London: Higher Education Quality Council.
- HERO Ltd. *Official Gateway to Universities, Colleges, and Research Organisations in the UK*. HERO Ltd., 03/01/2008 2007 [cited 03/01/2008. Available from <http://www.hero.ac.uk/uk/home/index.cfm>.
- Higher Education Academy. 2004. HE in FE. www.ics.heacademy.ac.uk/HEinFE/index.htm.
- Hill, Ron. 2000. "A study of the views of full-time Further Education lecturers regarding their college corporations and agencies of the Further Education Sector." *Journal of Further and Higher Education* no. 24 (1):67-75. doi: 10.1080/030987700112327.
- Jones, Howard. L. 1955. "The Application of Sampling Procedures to Business Operations." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* no. 50 (271):763-774.
- King, Madeleine., and John Widdowson (2009) *Scholarly Activity in Higher Education Delivered in Further Education: a Study by the Mixed Economy Group of Colleges*, The Higher Education Academy, York, No Number.
- Lewis, Duncan. 1999. "Workplace bullying - interim findings of a study in further and higher education in Wales." *International Journal of Manpower* no. 20 (1/2):106-119. doi: 10.1108/01437729910268696.
- Love, Kevin. 2008. "Higher education, pedagogy and the 'customerisation' of teaching and learning." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* no. 42:15-34. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9752.2008.00600.x.
- Mather, Kim, Les Worrall, and Roger Seifert. 2007. "Reforming further education: the changing labour process for college lecturers." *Personnel Review* no. 36 (1):109-127. doi: doi:10.1108/00483480710716740.

- Medcalf, Richard. 2014. "Research and scholarship in a 'HE in FE' environment." *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education* no. 15:11-19. doi: 10.1016/j.jhiste.2014.03.001.
- Oppenheim, A.N. 2001. *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement*. New ed. London: Continuum.
- Parry, Gareth. 2013. "Colleges and the Governance of Higher Education." *Higher Education Quarterly* no. 67 (4):315-339. doi: 10.1111/hequ.12024.
- Parry, Gareth., Penny. Blackie, Anne. Thompson, Susan. Hayday, Maggie. Greenwood, and Lynn. Parker (2009) *Supporting higher education in further education colleges - Policy, practice and prospects*, Higher Education Funding Council for England, Bristol,
- Parry, Gareth., and Anne Thompson (2002) *Closer By Degrees - The Past, Present and Future of Higher Education in Further Education Colleges*, LSDA, R1164/04/02/2200.
- QAA (2008) *Learning from Academic Review of Higher Education in Further Education Colleges in England 2005-07 - Sharing Good Practice*, Gloucester, QAA 213 12/07.
- Ritzer, George. 2002. "Enchanting McUniversity: Toward a Spectacularly Irrational University Quotidian." In *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*, edited by Dennis. Hayes and Robin. Wynyard, 19-32. London: Bergin and Garvey.
- Ritzer, George. 2011. *The McDonaldization of Society* 6. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Robson, Colin. 2002. *Real World Research*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Simmons, Jonathan., and John. Lea (2013) *Capturing an HE ethos in college higher education practice*, Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, Gloucester, QAA 576 12/13.
- Simmons, Robin. 2008. "Gender, Work and Identity: A Case Study from the English Further Education Sector." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* no. 13 (3):267-279.
- Simmons, Robin. 2010. "Globalisation, neo-liberalism and vocational learning: the case of English further education colleges." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* no. 15 (4):363-376.
- Smith, Rob. 2015. "College re-culturing, marketisation and knowledge: the meaning of incorporation." *Journal of Education Administration and History* no. 47 (1):18-39. doi: 10.1080/00220620.2015.974145.
- Taylor, Peter. 2008. "Being an Academic Today." In *Changing Identities in Higher Education - Voicing Perspectives*, edited by Ronald. Barnett and Roberto. Di Napoli, 27-39. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Tummons, Jonathan., Kevin. Orr, and Liz. Atkins. 2013. *Teaching higher education courses in further education colleges*. London: Sage Publications.

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* no. 26 (3):273-286. doi: 10.1080/03098770220149620a.