

© OECD, 2003.

© Software: 1987-1996, Acrobat is a trademark of ADOBE.

All rights reserved. OECD grants you the right to use one copy of this Program for your personal use only. Unauthorised reproduction, lending, hiring, transmission or distribution of any data or software is prohibited. You must treat the Program and associated materials and any elements thereof like any other copyrighted material.

All requests should be made to:

Head of Publications Service,  
OECD Publications Service,  
2, rue André-Pascal,  
75775 Paris Cedex 16, France.

© OCDE, 2003.

© Logiciel, 1987-1996, Acrobat, marque déposée d'ADOBE.

Tous droits du producteur et du propriétaire de ce produit sont réservés. L'OCDE autorise la reproduction d'un seul exemplaire de ce programme pour usage personnel et non commercial uniquement. Sauf autorisation, la duplication, la location, le prêt, l'utilisation de ce produit pour exécution publique sont interdits. Ce programme, les données y afférentes et d'autres éléments doivent donc être traités comme toute autre documentation sur laquelle s'exerce la protection par le droit d'auteur.

Les demandes sont à adresser au :

Chef du Service des Publications,  
Service des Publications de l'OCDE,  
2, rue André-Pascal,  
75775 Paris Cedex 16, France.

# **Encouraging Lecturers to Engage with New Technologies in Learning and Teaching in a Vocational University: The Role of Recognition and Reward**

by

Janet Hanson

Bournemouth University, United Kingdom

*Bournemouth University faces the same challenges as many other universities. These arise from the sector-wide agendas, such as widening participation, regional partnerships and international collaboration, in addition to increasing research activity and managing with reduced funding. A key priority within Bournemouth's Learning and Teaching Strategy is to use learning technologies to address these challenges. Several incentives are being used to encourage lecturers to adopt online learning. These have as their common focus the need to value teaching activity on an equal footing with research. The strategies used include funding for learning and teaching projects, a Learning and Teaching Fellowship Scheme, the creation of a Centre for Academic Practice to focus on pedagogic research, payment for membership of the Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, and a staff development programme for Programme Leaders. These initiatives are possible because the University has taken a strategic approach to using government funds for learning and teaching and human resources development (HRD) policies. However, putting in place such incentives is only worthwhile if they work, and research suggests that successful and widespread implementation of online learning depends on a number of factors (Johnston and McCormack, 1996; Steel and Hudson, 2001; Somekh, 1998; Spotts, 1999). This article presents findings from research in progress by the author which is investigating factors affecting the adoption of online learning by lecturers at Bournemouth and their motivation to change their teaching methods. The methodology used is action research and the article ends by briefly illustrating some of the issues faced by the researcher conducting research in her own organisation.*

## **The challenges facing higher education**

### **Introduction**

The context for extending the use of learning technologies in universities is often discussed with reference to a number of external, shaping forces.

The first of these is the broad political drive by governments to harness higher education to the needs of the economy. Through widening access to higher education and by promoting the concept of lifelong learning, more people are being attracted into higher education who would not traditionally have considered going to university. This changing concept of seeing a degree as a route to a job has led to many changes to the curriculum, including the incorporation of vocational and transferable skills (Coaldrake and Stedman, 1999).

The resulting increase in student numbers and growth in the diversity of the student population are encouraging universities to consider new patterns of curriculum design and more flexible strategies for learning and teaching. These are aimed at increasing access to learning from locations other than the traditional campus, for example, from home and from the work-place, and at times that are convenient to the individual student. This greater diversity of student background is also resulting in the need to make changes to student support and guidance structures and processes. Students enter university with less well-developed study habits, needing a wider range of study and language support.

However, as the number of students entering higher education has risen, so have the costs, while, in the United Kingdom, the corresponding per capita funding from government has fallen consistently for two decades. Universities are forced to seek more efficient ways to deliver education and to generate income from a wider range of sources, for example, from enterprise activities in collaboration with business. The higher fees contributed by international students, either on campus or in their home location, have become an important source of income, but this, together with home students contributing more to their fees, is resulting in a growing emphasis on customer orientation in universities. Students are one group among a rising number of stakeholders demanding greater accountability from universities (Coaldrake and Stedman, 1999; Watson, 2000).

Many universities are looking towards an increased use of learning technologies to address these challenges, and Bournemouth is no exception.

### ***The development of Bournemouth University***

The specific ways in which these challenges are being addressed by Bournemouth University are a reflection of its history and educational philosophy. Bournemouth University is a vocational university on the South coast of England. It aims to be “a pre-eminent vocational university well founded in terms of educational equality and student appeal”; (Bournemouth University, 2002, p. 4). It currently has around 8 000 full time students and 4 000 part time students and about 1 000 full time staff. Approximately half are lecturers within seven schools that reflect vocational areas rather than traditional academic disciplines. The other half constitutes management and support staff. One of the largest Support Services is Academic Services, in which the author is located.

The University was originally an institute of higher education, administered until 1988 by a Local Education Authority. Following incorporation it obtained polytechnic status in 1990, and was awarded its charter as a university in 1992. During this time the organisation underwent a period of rapid growth and change, experiencing a highly centralised approach to its management. For the last seven years, however, following the appointment of a new Vice-Chancellor in 1995, there has been a gradual shift towards a more open and collaborative style of management. The lengthy process of seeking staff views on the development of strategic plans is a reflection of this changed approach.

Since 1995 a process of financial devolution has also been taking place, as budgetary control of resources has transferred from the centre to each School. Schools are credited with income from which they pay their staffing and other direct costs, and contribute to the University’s overhead, including the Support Service costs. This has placed an increased responsibility on Schools and Support Services to provide a sound rationale for their activities and financial allocations.

### **Meeting the challenges at Bournemouth**

Bournemouth University is addressing these sector-wide challenges in a distinctive way with reference to its mission. Its strategic targets, to be achieved by 2006/7, are ambitious. They include developing more flexible approaches to learning and teaching in all programmes to enhance accessibility and widen participation, achieving excellence in research in five designated areas and significantly increasing income generated through enterprise activities. The role of learning technologies in helping to secure the achievement of these targets is evident in a number of ways.

In response to the widening participation agenda, Bournemouth is committed to developing higher education through partnerships with local further education colleges. The innovative way in which this is being undertaken has been recognised through substantial funding from the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) for a project to develop a common learning infrastructure across the partnership. This will present many opportunities to widen access to higher education through a virtual learning environment, but the curriculum will have to be sufficiently flexible to enable students to access it, especially for lifelong learning students. This has many implications for the delivery of teaching and the development and support of student learning.

The need to attract increased funding through diversifying income streams is resulting in all lecturers being encouraged and enabled to engage in income-generating research or consultancy. However, in order for them to have the time and space to do this, ways have to be found to re-structure learning and teaching activities, and the use of learning technologies is being promoted as one way of achieving this greater flexibility.

### ***Strategic factors affecting the adoption of learning technologies***

#### ***Senior management support and funding***

Since the increased use of learning technologies is a key priority for senior managers at Bournemouth, attention is being paid to ways in which lecturers may be encouraged and supported to use them. It is recognised that change strategies for encouraging greater use of technology should take into account issues related not only to organisational structure (Bates, 1997) but also to the individual preferences and motivations of those affected by the changes (Moore, 1991; Collis, Peters and Pals, 2000). The complex influence of the decentralised nature of academic culture should also be taken into account (Bottomley *et al.*, 1999; Coaldrake and Stedman, 1999; Taylor, 1999)

Two key enabling factors at the institutional level are the vision and support of the senior management, both at the executive level and within faculties, and having appropriate deliberative structures, again both at university level and faculty level, where issues relating to online learning may be discussed and policies agreed. These are in place at Bournemouth. A Learning and Teaching Development Committee has been constituted as sub-committee of Senate and is chaired by the Pro- Vice-Chancellor Academic. Within each of the seven Schools, a senior academic has been appointed to a role designated as Head of Learning and Teaching and these individuals act as “champions” of online learning. Another key factor contributing to the development of any initiative is the allocation of sufficient funds. For the past three years, Bournemouth has allocated around GBP 100 000 each year to fund innovative learning and teaching projects. This Learning and Teaching Development

Initiative Fund, with a maximum of up to GBP 15 000 allocated for each project, has supported 10-12 projects each year. Each project must be approved by the relevant School and show clear links to the School's Learning and Teaching Plan and the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy.

Further development and promotion of the use of learning technologies at Bournemouth has also been facilitated by the way in which the Funding Council has targeted funding for different initiatives. Two funding streams in particular which have been used to support, reward and recognise engagement with learning technologies are the Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund (TQEF) for learning and teaching strategies and the Rewarding and Developing Staff in Higher Education funds for human resources strategies (HEFCE, 1999 and 2002). Strategic use of funds from these two streams has enabled processes to be established which demonstrate the extent to which the University values teaching innovation, including the use of learning technologies.

### **Support from staff and educational development services**

In addition to senior management support and funding, another factor enabling innovation to become embedded with the university is an appropriate support structure that can respond quickly to need (Bates, 1997). The location of this educational development support can be provided either through a central unit that services the whole university, through devolved support units established in faculties, or through a combination of both. It has been recognised that the organisational culture of universities leads to very decentralised institutions, yet the very nature of technological innovation demands a whole institution approach to its implementation. This has the potential to cause tension between the faculties and the central units established to implement the change, if not carefully managed (McMurray, 2001).

At Bournemouth, a central facility within Academic Services, the Learning Design Studio, was established to provide pedagogic and technical support for online learning developments. The initial approach taken to encouraging lecturers to use learning technologies was to view the various elements of online learning as a set of building blocks from which they could select elements to use, depending on their pedagogical need. These elements included the development of subject web sites, computer conferencing and computer-assisted assessment. Initially, the impact of this approach was limited, involving mainly the technology enthusiasts, but with the additional appointment of learning technologists within the Schools to provide support closer to hand, more lecturers have become involved. A further strategy to engage larger numbers of lecturers is the in-house development of an easy-to-use managed learning environment (MLE), known as BUBBLE, which will link the School's online learning environments with central administrative systems such as student records.

## **Factors encouraging lecturers' adoption of online learning**

### **Individual motivations**

In addition to having strategic initiatives in place, supportive professional development processes and technology which is easy to use (Somekh, 1998), the successful and widespread implementation of online learning in a university, as with any technological innovation in an organisation, still depends on the motivation of individuals. It helps to understand the motivation of your audiences and the ways in which the motivation of the innovators may differ from that of the mainstream majority (Johnston and McCormack, 1996; Steel and Hudson, 2001; Spotts, 1999; Collis et al., 2000).

It has been suggested that changing academic practice is always a complex process, especially at a time when perceptions of academic work are changing (Martin, 1999; Coaldrake and Stedman, 1999; Taylor, 1999). In order to promote change at the individual level, appropriate staff development for new teaching methods should be in place (Bates, 1997; Cox et al., 1999). Since academics are being encouraged to learn to use the technology and develop appropriate pedagogical approaches, in the face of uncertainty or scepticism about its value to student learning and its impact on the academic workload, development opportunities should concentrate on changing conceptions of learning and learners, and then demonstrate how technology may be used to promote learning. (Taylor, Lopez and Quadrelli, 1996, p. xiii). But even if an appropriate staff development programme is in place, academics need to see that putting effort into changing their teaching practice is valued and that the effort is rewarded.

## **Seeking to understand the context at Bournemouth**

The development of online learning at Bournemouth has been underpinned by gaining a greater understanding of the motivation of lecturers to use learning technologies. Lecturers' views were gathered through a series of meetings. One focus group style meeting with eight lecturers was held to discuss conceptions of online learning and to seek their views on what the University should be doing to promote its use. Some were experienced users of learning technologies, others had little or no experience and they represented a range of different disciplines. Further views about the nature of online learning at Bournemouth and the perceptions of lecturers were gathered at the demonstrations of the pilot version of the MLE to senior staff in the academic Schools.

Concurrently with these meetings which specifically focused on online learning, another two focus group meetings were held with nine Programme Leaders, which provided more information about lecturers' perceptions of the challenges they faced. Programme Leaders are lecturers who are appointed to

take responsibility for the academic development of the programme and for leadership of the team of lecturers who contribute to the teaching of the programme. The specific pressures on them, particularly as a result of changing quality assurance methods, are growing to such an extent that it can be difficult to find staff willing to undertake this important academic leadership role. The primary purpose of the meetings was to seek views from them on ways in which they might be supported in undertaking their role but interesting insights were gained into their perception of how leadership of teaching and learning appeared to be less valued by the University than leadership of research or enterprise.

The following sections present an overview of the findings from these investigations and a summary of the ways in which these are being used strategically to put relevant recognition and reward mechanisms in place.

## **Identifying lecturers' views about learning technologies**

### ***Approaches to the use of online learning***

When the eight lecturers in the focus group were asked what the term "online learning" meant to them, they gave a range of examples, which revealed initially that they conceived of it predominantly as a tool for knowledge acquisition. One suggested that "learning on the web is no different to learning from a book". However, as the discussion continued, they began to suggest that they also perceived it to be an important tool for developing students' skills, both cognitive and transferable. More examples were given which related to the ways in which students could develop communication and collaborative skills, as well as enhance their IT skills.

Two lecturers had used computer conferencing with their students. Initially, both had used it as a means of providing their lecture notes to students, but one admitted that although all her notes were on the web, she was "not quite sure that this was an advantage". This was because "all I am doing is replicating what I am telling them, and it is taking me double the time to put them on the web". The second agreed with her and reported that she had decided not to make her lecture notes available next year but to use the conferencing tool as a vehicle for discussion and debate, not as a "depository". Another lecturer described how her students had set up their own web site and shared resources through it. Online learning was viewed as one among many tools for teaching. It was referred to several times by the lecturers as "complementary", and "a tool". The primary task for the lecturers was seen to be identifying the learning outcomes that had to be achieved and then making use of different teaching strategies to help students achieve those outcomes. One summarised this view when he suggested that "It (online learning) is a

parallel and not a replacement mechanism and it doesn't suit all subjects, lecturers, learning outcomes or students".

They also suggested that online learning could benefit certain groups of students. Apart from recognising that online learning can support distance learning generally, it was acknowledged that it can also provide access to resources for students who find it difficult to get to the campus, for example, mature and part-time students, and that it could also be used to support students on workplacement. There was also some recognition that other individual preferences might be met. Online learning was seen both as providing an opportunity for those who found it difficult to voice their opinions in seminars, but also possibly as a limitation for those who were good at face to face debate.

However, the lecturers were concerned that students, who came to university for the social experience, would start to question the value of a programme at Bournemouth if they came to a campus university and found much of the learning undertaken online. The concept of the student as paying customer of the university was also evident, one lecturer reported that "I have noticed over the past three to four years an increase in students demanding one to one relationships. If they don't get it in the seminars, they will go and stand outside your door until they do get it".

## **Encouraging the use of online learning**

The lecturers were then asked what factors encouraged or hindered greater use of online learning at Bournemouth. The ones they identified included the need to see the University's overall strategy for online learning, having the time and resources to engage with it and feeling supported in their attempts to use it. These were similar to those identified in other studies (Bottomley *et al.*, 1999; Collis and Moonen, 2001).

The strategic direction for online learning at Bournemouth was questioned several times during the interview. There was a suggestion that the strategy was neither clearly articulated, nor was there an obvious rationale for its use. Furthermore, some existing online developments were criticised because they appeared to have been introduced without thought for how they should be used.

### **Support for developing online learning**

None of the lecturers suggested that online learning should not be part of the University strategy at all, but there was a strong feeling among them that its use should be regarded as complementary to face to face teaching. The choice of when and how to use it should be left to the individual lecturer. They did recognise that perhaps they did not know enough about how it might be used most effectively and that it was difficult to find out what was going on in

the rest of the university. There was strong agreement from the group with the lecturer who said that she had never been in such an isolating job.

They recognised that there was a need for more support to help them use online learning. A specific kind of support was referred to, in which technical expertise was combined with the ability to design curriculum support materials. The term “consultant” was used, implying someone to whom you could hand over your subject content and who would not only turn it into an online resource but also give you guidance on the best way of using online learning to achieve your goals. This was linked to the idea of recognising that lecturers should be valued as specialists in teaching and was contrasted with the recognition given to those undertaking research. One lecturer described this rather vividly, “That’s important in terms of how you feel valued. There is a tendency, certainly in my School, if you are not doing research you are looked on as if you are something on the bottom of someone else’s shoe, but actually, there are people doing research who really shouldn’t teach”.

### ***Ease of use of the technologies***

There were relatively few concerns expressed about actually using the technology itself. The more technically knowledgeable innovators expressed concern about narrow bandwidth and the need to accommodate a range of web browsers, which prevented easy access to online resources by students from off-campus in the short term. The scale of facilities currently on-campus was also recognised as a limiting factor. One lecturer recognised that just putting lots of material on the web was resulting in students printing it out, but he could see that his ideal of being directly online with students in a classroom required more terminals in more seminar rooms than available at present. The cost of continually updating IT equipment was also recognised as a constraint. The need for students to be able to upload their own web-sites to show-case their work was considered critical in several Schools.

### ***Pedagogy of online learning***

As the discussion above indicates, given the commonality of conceptions of learning and teaching afforded by the vocational nature of the disciplines taught at Bournemouth, there appeared to be few subject areas where online learning was regarded as totally inappropriate. Lecturers would seem to support its use, providing it complemented more traditional approaches in a balanced approach. It was recognised that it could contribute to knowledge acquisition and concept formation and that it could facilitate collaboration among students, as suggested by Coomey and Stephenson, (2001).

The principle negative pedagogic factor attached to online learning appeared to be that it could lead to the reduction in face to face contact between lecturers and students, which might be detrimental to the

development of students' vocational skills and might alienate students looking for the campus experience.

An even clearer expression of the underpinning value of a constructivist approach to learning was expressed during the meetings to demonstrate the new MLE which was criticised for appearing to present a very transmission focused model of teaching. Lecturers asked "Is it just an electronic notice-board" and "Where does the learning come into it?" or "How can interaction in the learning and teaching process be made more evident?" and commented that "It looks very content driven". In the light of this, they sought reassurance from the MLE developers that they would consider how to design in opportunities for interaction to take place, and include spaces for collaborative activity and where students could display their best work on their own web-sites.

### **Programme Leaders' views**

A programme at Bournemouth comprises a number of units of study arranged by academic level leading to a University award, for example, a bachelors or masters degree. The role of Programme Leaders is an important one and it has become increasingly challenging as they are expected to encourage their team to incorporate changes to teaching, assessment or student support processes, including developing more online learning. However, it has become increasingly difficult to motivate lecturers to take up the role, so meetings were held with them to determine more specifically their perceptions of the role, both its positive and negative aspects, and then ask them to identify how the University could begin to address these issues.

The discussion in both groups revealed concerns about their relationships with three different groups whom they identified as the major stakeholders of their Programme. These were the students, academic colleagues and other staff within the University, either administrative colleagues within their own School, or others referred to as "management" or "the organisation".

One of their main concerns was knowing how to provide appropriate support for the needs of an increasingly diverse range of students, whom they described as appearing to be more dependent than in the past, and also more demanding.

A critical factor identified when dealing with academic colleagues was the fact that they often had to engage in a lot of persuasion and negotiation to achieve desired changes to teaching or assessment strategies. It was sometimes difficult to achieve what they wanted because they were not usually the line manager of any of their Programme team members, so could not influence an individual's behaviour through the appraisal process. They

relied on working with those whom they identified as “team-players” and tended to side-line those who were not.

They recognised that the administrative burden of the role was eased considerably by maintaining a close relationship with their Programme Administrator, but were often uncertain about where the boundaries lay between their role and that of the administrators.

Despite their concerns, most enjoyed being academic leaders and having the opportunity to “put their stamp” on the Programme. The role was regarded as a very visible one, and provided intrinsic rewards, “being known as a good leader is enormously satisfying”. However, it became clear, that due to the devolved nature of the University, monetary or other incentives for taking on the role varied across the seven Schools.

The perception of greatest relevance to this study was the one that the role was not as highly valued by the University as other roles involving leadership in research or enterprise. In common with the lecturers interviewed about online learning, Programme Leaders also suggested that the University should be investing in incentives to make involvement in learning and teaching innovation and leadership more rewarding. This would encourage the perception that the University regarded this activity as being on an equal footing with involvement in research and enterprise.

## Using the findings

### ***Informing the development of an appropriate learning and teaching strategy and its implementation***

The analysis of this data provided some useful insights for further action. The starting point was to update the University’s Learning and Teaching Strategy to incorporate more appropriate terminology which reflected the importance of collaborative learning and to shorten it to just four key priorities that could be explained more readily to academic staff. Emphasis was placed on the need to extend flexible learning opportunities, of which online learning was identified as one component but was not synonymous. The need for greater flexibility in learning and teaching as a way of securing greater efficiency in teaching delivery was also emphasised, but it was not suggested that online learning alone would achieve this, but that it could be achieved through a broader approach to curriculum re-design.

The findings also had implications for the implementation of the strategy to promote the further use of online learning through the development of the in-house MLE project. The development of the various components of the MLE was re-scheduled. Greater priority was given to developing a conferencing facility rather than concentrating solely on document publishing, in order to

facilitate the creation of a learning environment that facilitated participation and collaboration, as well as knowledge acquisition.

***Informing the development of appropriate recognition and reward mechanisms to increase the status of teaching***

A range of mechanisms has been established at Bournemouth to demonstrate that teaching is valued equally with research and enterprise activities. These include creating Learning and Teaching Fellowships, paying for membership of the Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (ILTHE), establishing a Centre for Academic Practice to promote pedagogical research, planning a development programme for Programme Leaders and continuing to fund learning and teaching projects which are linked to the University's strategic targets.

Many UK universities were prompted to address the issue of recognising and rewarding lecturers for the effort of engaging with the agenda for learning and teaching as a result of HEFCE's Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund (TQEF) (HEFCE, 1999). One of the more common ways of doing this has been to establish a teaching award scheme similar to those popular in the United States (Gibbs, 2002). This is one of several strategies developed at Bournemouth, but instead of using the TQEF, funds from the HEFCE Rewarding and Developing Staff in Higher Education initiative (HEFCE, 2002) were used to establish six annual Learning and Teaching Fellowships. This demonstrates a synergy between Bournemouth's strategies for learning and teaching and human resources development that is unusual, according to Gibbs. He suggests that "An analysis of the (mainly emerging) HRD strategies submitted by institutions to HEFCE in 2001 did not reveal significant evidence of reward mechanisms for excellent teaching even when such mechanisms were already contained in institutions' existing learning and teaching strategies. At present HRD strategies appear to be operating in parallel, rather than in synergy, with teaching improvement strategies". (Gibbs, 2002, p. 1). The criteria for Bournemouth's annual Learning and Teaching Fellowships are drawn from the United Kingdom's National Teaching Fellowships Scheme and one of the aims is to encourage lecturers to apply for the internal award to build up their confidence in applying for the National Scheme.

Further recognition of the value attached to professional development for learning and teaching is demonstrated through the University's support for those achieving membership of the United Kingdom's Institute for Learning and Teaching. Again, TQEF is used to fund the first year's subscription of everyone who gains membership.

The purpose of the Centre for Academic Practice is to encourage the development of research into learning and teaching activities and to

provide a focus for promoting and co-ordinating pedagogic research across the University. Its main aim is to develop a wider and more inclusive research culture across the University as a whole, including encouraging research activity by staff in support services as well as in the academic Schools. Collaborative research between lecturers and support staff is encouraged, for example, to investigate students' experiences of online learning, or between staff at the University and those in its Partner Colleges to investigate the factors affecting the delivery of Higher Education in a Further Education environment. Activities include workshops on writing for publication and research methodologies and seminars to discuss research in progress.

Senior staff in management positions at Bournemouth have had the opportunity of taking part in a management development programme which has been funded from the HR Strategy funds, but for the first time in 2003 a leadership programme for Programme Leaders will be offered, with the content and approach designed according to their feedback.

### ***The value of action research as a method of inquiry***

Action research was adopted for the inquiry because the starting point for the research was grounded in a real-world issue, it was attempting to identify the factors influencing the adoption of online learning in a vocational university. If the findings were going to be useful in improving practice, they had to be derived from a collaborative approach involving the author not as neutral observer but as participant in the research. Action research takes its strength and value in researching professional practice because theory is generated from practice (Coghlan and Brannick, 2001; Ellis and Kiely, 2000; Greenwood and Levin, 1998). It is also a cyclical process of planning, acting and evaluating. This paper considers findings from the first cycle of the research activity.

The tensions arising from undertaking research in my own organisation were similar to those identified by Coghlan and Brannick (2001). All the way through the study it was often difficult to define the research question separately from the management task of revising the learning and teaching strategy. This led to the strong possibility that that bias influenced the findings. In the data collection, lecturers may well have told me what they thought I wanted to hear, and in the analysis, I may not have been sufficiently objective. There was also the tension between the need to present findings in the public domain while respecting the confidentiality of those involved. The process of undertaking the research did lead to greater insight into relationships with colleagues and an understanding of the differing perceptions about the nature of work in a vocational university from the view-point of academic staff and support

staff. This insight has led the development of work in the second cycle of the research to investigate further the nature of the academic culture and the climate for change at Bournemouth.

The author:

Professor Janet Hanson  
Associate Head of Academic Services  
Bournemouth University  
Talbot Campus, Fern Barrow  
Poole, Dorset BH12 5BB, United Kingdom  
E-mail: [jhanson@bournemouth.ac.uk](mailto:jhanson@bournemouth.ac.uk)

## References

- BATES, A.W., (1997), "Restructuring the university for technological change", Paper presented to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 18-20 June, London. Available at: <http://bates.cstudies.ubc.ca/>
- BOTTOMLEY, J., C. SPRATT and M. RICE (1999), "Strategies for effecting strategic change in teaching practices: Case studies at Deakin University", *Interactive Learning Environments*, Vol. 7, No. 2-3, pp. 227-247.
- BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY (2002), *Strategic Plan 2002-2006*.
- COALDRAKE, P. and L. STEDMAN (1999), *Academic work in the Twenty-first Century: Changing roles and policies*, Higher Education Division, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Canberra. [www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/occpaper/99H/academic.pdf](http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/occpaper/99H/academic.pdf).
- COGLAN, D. and T. BRANNICK (2001), *Doing action research in your own organisation*, Sage, London.
- COLLIS, B. and J. MOONEN (2001), *Flexible learning in a digital world: experiences and expectations*, Kogan Page, London.
- COLLIS, B., O. PETERS and N. PALS (2000), "Influences on the educational use of the WWW, Email and videoconferencing", *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 108-119.
- COOMEY and J. STEPHENSON (2000), "Online learning: it is all about dialogue, involvement, support and control – according to the research", in Stephenson, J. (ed.) *Teaching and learning online: pedagogies for new technologies*, Kogan Page, London, pp. 38-52.
- COX, M., C. PRESTON and K. COX (1999), *What motivates teachers to use ICT?* British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Sussex at Brighton, September 2-5 1999.
- ELLIS, J. H.H M. and J.A. KIELY (2000), "Action inquiry strategies: taking stock and moving forward", *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 83-94.
- GIBBS, G. and T. HABESHAU (2002), *Recognising and rewarding excellent teaching TQEF* National Co-ordination Team, Milton Keynes.

- GREENWOOD, D. J. and M. LEVIN (1998), *Introduction to action research: social research for social change*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, California.
- HEFCE (1999), *Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund*, Circular 99/48. Higher Education Funding Council, Bristol.
- HEFCE (2002), *Rewarding and developing staff in Higher Education*, Circular 02/14. Higher Education Funding Council, Bristol.
- JOHNSTON, S. and C. McCORMACK (1996), "Integrating information technology into university teaching: identifying the needs and providing the support", *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 36-42.
- MARTIN, E. (1999), *Changing academic work: developing the learning university*, SRHE and Open University Press, Buckingham.
- MCMURRAY, D.W. (2001), "The importance of 'goodness of fit' between organisational culture and climate in the management of change: a case study in the development of online learning", *Association for Learning Technology Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 73-83.
- MOORE, G.A. (1991), *Crossing the chasm*, Harper Business, New York.
- SOMEKH, B. (1998), "Supporting information and communication technology innovations in higher education", *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education*, Vol. 7, No. 9, pp. 11-31.
- SPOTTS, T.H. (1999), "Discrimination factors in faculty use of instructional technology in learning and teaching: the perceptions and experiences of teaching staff", *Educational Technology and Society*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 92-99.
- STEEL, J. and A. HUDSON (2001), "Educational technology in learning and teaching: the perceptions and experiences of teaching staff", *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 103-111.
- TAYLOR, P. (1999), *Making sense of academic life: academics, universities and change*. SRHE and Open University Press, Buckingham.
- TAYLOR, P.G., L. LOPEZ and C. QUADRELLI (1996), *Flexibility, technology and academics' perspectives: Tantalising tales and muddy maps*, Higher Education Division, Evaluation and Investigation Program, Department of Employment, Education and Youth Affairs: Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- WATSON, D. (2000), *Managing strategy*, Open University Press, Buckingham.

# Information for authors

Contributions to the IMHE Journal should be submitted in either English or French and all articles are received on the understanding that they have not appeared in print elsewhere.

## Selection procedure and criteria

Articles are selected for publication by the Editor of the Journal and submitted to independent referees for review.

The Journal is primarily devoted to the needs of those involved with the administration and study of institutional management and policy in higher education. Articles should be concerned, therefore, with issues bearing on the practical working and policy direction of higher education. Contributions should, however, go beyond mere description of what is, or prescription of what ought to be, although both descriptive and prescriptive accounts are acceptable if they offer generalisations of use in contexts beyond those being described. Whilst articles devoted to the development of theory for its own sake will normally find a place in other and more academically based journals, theoretical treatments of direct use to practitioners will be considered.

Other criteria include clarity of expression and thought. *Titles of articles should be as brief as possible.*

## Presentation

\*\* Electronic submission is preferred. **Three copies** of each article should be sent if the article is submitted on paper only.

*Length:* should not exceed 15 pages (single spaced) including figures and references.

*The first page:* before the text itself should appear centred on the page in this order the title of the article and the name(s), affiliation(s) and country/countries of the author(s).

*Abstract:* the main text should be preceded by an abstract of 100 to 200 words summarising the article.

*Quotations:* long quotations should be single-spaced and each line should be indented 7 spaces.

*Footnotes:* authors should avoid using footnotes and incorporate any explanatory material in the text itself. If notes cannot be avoided, they should be endnotes typed at the end of the article.

*Tables and illustrations:* tabular material should bear a centred heading "Table". Presentations of non-tabular material should bear a centred heading "Figure". The source should always be cited.

*References in the text:* Jones and Little (1986) or Jones *et al.* (1988) in the case of three or more authors. However, the names of all authors should appear in the list of references at the end of the article.

*References at the end of the article:* references should be listed in alphabetical order under the heading "References". Examples of the reference style used in the Journal are:

- For periodicals: DUKE, C. (2000), "Beyond 'Delaying': Process, Structure and Boundaries", *Higher Education Management*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 7-22.
- For books: DE WIT, H. and J. KNIGHT (eds.) (1999), *Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education*, OECD, Paris.

## The covering letter

This should give full addresses and telephone numbers and, in the case of multi-authored papers, indicate the author to whom all correspondence should be sent.

## Complimentary copies

Each author will receive two complimentary copies of the Journal issue in which his article appears, in the original language.

# Table of Contents

<b>Internal Versus External Labour Markets</b> <i>Christine Musselin</i> .....	9
<b>An Integrated Approach to Academic Reinforcement Systems</b> <i>Mireille Mathieu</i> .....	25
<b>Motivating Knowledge Workers: Lessons to and from the Corporate Sector</b> <i>Ruth Dunkin</i> .....	41
<b>Changing Identity in an Ambiguous Environment A Work in Progress Report</b> <i>Chris Duke</i> .....	51
<b>Motivating Individuals: Incentives, Staff Reactions, and Institutional Effects</b> <i>Larry L. Leslie</i> .....	69
<b>University Roles and Career Paths: Trends, Scenarios and Motivational Challenges</b> <i>George Gordon</i> .....	89
<b>Australian Academics and Prospective Academics: Adjustment to a More Commercial Environment</b> <i>Grant Harman</i> .....	105
<b>Fear and Loathing in University Staffing: The Case of Australian Academic and General Staff</b> <i>Ian Dobson and Maree Conway</i> .....	123
<b>Encouraging Lecturers to Engage with New Technologies in Learning and Teaching in a Vocational University: The Role of Recognition and Reward</b> <i>Janet Hanson</i> .....	135
<b>Motivating the Professoriate: Why Sticks and Carrots are only for Donkeys</b> <i>Luanna H. Meyer and Ian M. Evans</i> .....	151
<b>Degree System in Mainland China: Development and Implications</b> <i>Luo Siming</i> .....	169