

Consultation on the Impact of Covid-19

on the working lives of business, management and economics' academics in UK - 2020

James Walker, Chris Brewster, Rita Fontinha

International Business & Strategy, Henley Business School at the University of Reading, UK.
Contact: j.t.walker@henley.ac.uk

June 2020

Acknowledgements

This work is the preliminary outcome of an independent research project, led by James T. Walker at the Henley Business School at the University of Reading. We would like to gratefully acknowledge the assistance provided by Fabio Scaffidi-Argentina, Marco Munari, Fabio Lamperti, Dalila Ribaud, and Stefano Benigni on the data side. We are also grateful to our colleagues who provided us with detailed input in developing the survey instrument during the pilot phase. This research was only possible because of the time and support provided by our respondents. We are extremely grateful for their efforts. This work is independent of any other group. All statements and analysis are the responsibility of the authors alone.

Executive summary

The Covid-19 pandemic has placed significant stress on economically active individuals as they have suddenly and rapidly been expected to work remotely. We know little of the impacts of remote work on 1. academics' ability to effectively perform their research role, 2. Academics ability to perform their teaching role, and 3. academics' level of engagement and possibility to engage in work. Institutionally, whilst universities are 'open for business', evidence on their ability to effectively perform their core functions in an on-line environment is largely absent. Understanding the key factors impacting academics' work provides valuable lessons both during the lockdown and when a 'new normal' has been achieved. Understanding the factors that impede or promote the successful application of on-line delivery, as well as how to better facilitate academic research will enable the sector to be more resilient and productive.

In the longer term, it is clear that certain groups of faculty will be more affected than others, such as parents with young children, and those reliant on field research. This study provides evidence from a representative sample of academics during lockdown and in the period immediately thereafter to inform decision making in the Higher Education sector.

The initial findings from the report relating to each of the three themes of the survey are:

- With respect to **research**,
 - *on-line conferences* were considered a poor substitute for face-to-face events.
 - participants are concerned that the pandemic may be crowding out *research income and grant funding* to other important research projects by shifting research efforts away from other debates that researchers would like to contribute to, and reducing their willingness to throw their 'hat into the ring' and apply for non-Covid related grants.
 - *research methodology* is important. In particular, those employing quantitative methodologies are likely to be less affected than those using qualitative ones (such as ethnographic and archival research), which are clearly more problematic during lockdown, with potentially damaging effects on multidisciplinary research.
 - the amount of *time* that is being devoted to teaching, assessment and administration has risen, which may make protecting time for research problematic.

- With respect to **teaching**,
 - Respondents largely agreed that teaching online makes it *more difficult to understand whether the students engage in learning and understand what is being taught*.
 - Marking on-line was considered *more tiring* for faculty suggesting that it may undermine their welfare.
 - Both teaching and marking on-line was considered *more time consuming*, again increasing workload pressures.

- With respect to **work engagement and related determinants**,
 - time pressures are unevenly distributed, but have typically risen in teaching, assessment, and administration in relation to work, as well as due to increased demands at the home (office) particularly *parental pressures*.
 - academics exhibited the *same dedication to their work*, and suffered the *same tendency to work long hours*, that they did prior to the pandemic.
 - respondents have *struggled to maintain the levels of mental resilience and energy* they had prior to the crisis.

Introduction

The study examines a key sector of the UK economy, Higher Education (HE). HE generated £40.5 billion in 2018-19 (HESA, 2020) and is a major employer with significant links to other sectors. Although each sector operates in a specific context, studying HE has wider implications for the UK as whole. First, the sector has been largely able to continue operating in a digital context and, in this respect, it provides a large working sample of remote work. Second, there are implications for the wider education and training domain beyond HE, such as market research, primary and secondary education. Third, there are implications for other sectors where online research plays an important role, such as various manufacturing and service sectors.

This study is a multidisciplinary one based on a large-scale survey with academics in business, management and economics. Business schools have traditionally engaged extensively with post-experience students, and have been at the forefront of developing on-line delivery methods for decades. These schools are the focus of an existing substantive literature, and capture a broad set of disciplines from the humanities (e.g. business history) to more scientific domains (e.g. IT). As such, business, management and economics faculty are perhaps ‘canaries in the mine’ for academics in other contexts where such remote work practices are just being introduced.

This research is based on data collected through a questionnaire administered to all academics working in business schools and economics department.

The project involved one of the authors collating information on academic faculty at business schools in the UK capturing gender, rank, some key academic roles (such as Dean, and Head of Unit), and the department within each institution. The first collection was completed between October and December 2019 and included economics’ departments that had membership within the Conference of Heads of Departments of Economics (the representative body for economics departments of the Royal Economic Society). The data was developed prior to the running of the first phase of a separate ESRC funded survey ‘Assessing the Impact of REF on Academic Macroeconomics’ conducted prior to the pandemic (22nd January-18th February 2020). These data were expanded to include other departments in business schools with the second tranche being completed on the 15th April 2020, while the third was completed by 1st May 2020. By collating a complete set of data, we will be able to situate our respondents within the population of business and management scholars and academic economists in the UK.

Respondents’ names and contact details were double checked on the web to ensure they were as accurate as possible. The final population investigated consists of 13,048 university faculty

affiliated to over 100 UK Higher Education institutions. We received many ‘return to senders’ emails as people had left academia, retired or were on leave. In future analyses, we are planning to exclude all these ‘return to senders’ responses in the calculation of our response rate, as we are able to differentiate them from non-responses.

A large-scale survey of academics was run in two waves. The first was conducted over the period between the 15th April - 15th May 2020, with the second from the 4th May - 26th May 2020. The two-wave design reflected the data collection and cleaning of data that was completed on the 28th April 2020. In an attempt to capture whether the changing context of the pandemic influenced participants, the second wave was implemented the following week. The study therefore captures the three phases of response to the pandemic: the first phase was based on a policy of ‘herd immunity’; prior to the rapid shift to the second phase - a partial-lockdown that was announced on 23rd March 2020. By the end of the sample period, some tentative steps towards easing of the lockdown had occurred.

The survey:¹

The survey consisted of two parts.

■ PART I – How do measures related to Covid-19 influence your work activity?

This section includes questions concerning the effects of the pandemic on: 1. faculty research activity; 2. instructor’s experiences of on-line delivery and assessment and 3. individual’s work engagement.

We asked respondents to compare their current experience of research and teaching activities before the crisis. Asking individuals to access their memories, even quite recent ones regarding factual information, is an area where we appreciated a need for caution (Robins, Fraley & Krueger, 2009, p.91). We were aided in two regards. First, the rapid onset of the pandemic meant that the time period individuals were asked to compare was quite short. Although short-term memory recalls can still be prone to bias, we academics’ past experience of research and teaching events are likely to be a crucial part of their working lives, with a relatively public nature and with a set of tangible outcomes of these activities. Second, we were able to compare for a subsample of 232 individuals who had engaged in the early survey to check the consistency of individuals’ responses with respect

¹ If you would like to request a copy of the survey then please contact j.t.walker@henley.ac.uk. Also note FAQs provided for the survey are found at [FAQ](#).

to the time devoted to activities. The subsample results were consistent and since they cover workload models of business school and economics' departments these provide a further comparative baseline with which to ground the analysis.

This section of the survey had three substantive components:

1. *What are the effects of the pandemic on research activity?*

In examining researching 'from home' we capture a large set of potential factors that may have both positive impacts (e.g., 'more time to establish projects or do planning work', 'easier to catch interviewees', 'more time to write up potential articles') and negative impacts (e.g., 'inability to conduct field work', 'difficulties in collaboration with co-authors and colleagues'). A similar approach is taken in examining how journal rankings have affected academics working lives (Walker et al., 2019). We capture a rich set of factors such as research grants, time allocation and publication record.

2. *What are instructor's experiences of on-line delivery and assessment?*

On-line teaching and assessment has both advocates and critics, given its long lineage in business learning (e.g. Webster and Hackley, 1997). Adaptors see virtual delivery as 'the future' for HE, while those who are warier argue that on-line delivery is a poor substitute for face-to-face learning. We develop a set of rationales for teaching (e.g. 'it is a lot more time-consuming to prepare', 'it makes it difficult to measure whether the students understand what is being taught') and assessment (e.g. 'being more tiring', 'more time-consuming'). By their nature, business schools contain diverse sets of staff, some who have considerable experience of teaching and assessing on-line, but with a large contingent for whom teaching and assessment on-line was only experienced when necessitated by the pandemic. The data sources enable us to capture other potentially important elements associated with employment status, rank and experience in academia.

3. *What are the determinants of work engagement?*

We utilise an extensively validated 9-item-version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufelli, Bakker and Salanova, 2006). Informed by the literature, we collect data on a selection of factors that impact the ability to undertake work, and on factors affecting engagement with work. We consider parenthood and extent of support, perceptions of job security and employability, gender, contract type and academic status. The variables will potentially influence individuals' quality of working life, particularly mandatory remote work [e.g. Fontinha et al. (2018), (2019)].

■ *PART II - Personal and Career Background*

This section of the survey explores the impact of the work context on researchers' attitudes towards their responses to the pandemic. This section also investigates how individual academics allocate their time among their different activities (e.g. teaching delivery).

We also collected demographic information such as year when their PhD was awarded and institution where it was received, to analyse possible cohort and training effects. We also collect information on: the respondent's gender; the age of the participants (aggregated into age groupings that align to groups known to be affected differently by the crisis); nationality, and the period of time they have been living in the UK. Finally, to better understand how parenthood might shape attitudes to research assessment, we gathered information about the respondents' number of children and their age.

Data collection

The development of the survey itself commenced on 9th April 2020. The initial survey was piloted on two occasions with eight scholars in the pre-test phase. No major inconsistencies emerged in the pilot phase. The survey was administered exclusively online and was designed using an online tool. The online questionnaire was launched on 15th April 2020. Recipients were sent an email explaining the purpose of the study, inviting them to participate and including a link to the survey.

We were careful to explain that the research project was not subject to any editorial control by any external body. The survey was sent out in two batches in order to facilitate complete and accurate data capture. For the first batch three sets of reminders, issued in the names of the research team leaders, were sent to participants on the 22th April and the 29th April with the first batch of the survey being concluded on 8th May 2020. The second batch was run from 4th May, with reminders sent on the 11th and 18th and was completed on the 26th May 2020. We received a response from 2,660 participants. Given that the total population for the survey was 13,048, the response rate was over 20%. Of that response 2,287 provide usable responses (17%).

The survey includes scholars from all ranks. Table 1 examines the distribution of faculty captured in the survey frame and by survey itself. The bulk of the population, 83%, are captured by the standard academic ranks of Lecturer/ Assistant Professor, Associate Professor/ Reader/ Senior Lecturer and Professor/ Chair and reassuringly. There is a close mapping between the survey frame and the total numbers of survey participants in each category. There is also a close mapping between the

proportion of individuals who are based in Russell Group universities with the survey capturing a roughly 2% lower proportion. There are however some differences in gender with the participant group including a higher proportion of women than the sample frame.

Table 1. Completing the rank, gender and the type of institutional participation in the survey and the sampling frame drawn from (in brackets)

Lecturer / Assistant Professor	27.3 (27.9)
Associate Professor / Reader / Senior Lecturer	32.9 (32.1)
Professor / Chair	23.0 (22.7)
Research Fellow / Research Associate	5.9 (5.6)
Senior Research Fellow / Principal Researcher	0.8 (0.9)
Senior Teaching Fellow	1.9 (1.6)
Teaching Associate / Teaching Fellow	5.6 (6.1)
Other	2.6 (4.2)
Russell Group	24.7 (26.6)
Gender (women)	46.0 (40.11)
Survey (Sample) N	2,176 (13,048)

Notes: The sample includes 101 institutions. A number of small institutions were omitted as identifying their faculty provide difficult.

Covid-19 and Research

A core interest of the project was in examining how Covid-19 has impacted on individual academics through a variety of conduits. A summary of the distribution of these views is summarised in Table 2 which collapses a five-point scale into three categories for clarity. What is clear is that the pandemic induced lockdown had differential impacts for different individuals. For example, while a majority were not affected in their ability to access resources, a sizable minority were. Further, the proportion of individuals who disagreed that ‘collaboration with co-authors and colleagues in the UK more difficult’ at 43% was not dissimilar to those who held the opposite view.

It also was the case that there were a number of scholars who benefited from the pandemic from a research perspective in the sense that it provided them with more time to redraft their work (46%). The flip side to this finding, however, is that while some individuals benefited from the pandemic in terms of driving their output, others would be relatively less productive, particularly due to childcare and to other academic activities beyond research (teaching, marking and administrative tasks). Given that research output is an important promotion criterion for research active faculty, the

implication may well be that some individual’s future promotion prospects may be undermined relative to their peers.

The majority of respondents felt that the pandemic has shifted research efforts away from other important issues. Furthermore, the pandemics undermined confidence in applying for grants that are not focused on Covid-19 for about 40% of the participants. These findings likely reflect concerns that an extreme focus on Covid-19 will draw attention from, and crowd-out, funding that otherwise may be destined to examine some of the other longer run issues and ‘Grand Challenges’ that humanity faces, as well as other debates. That scholars may feel there is a low probability of success in applying for grants which could lead to a self-fulfilling prophesy where fewer non-Covid grants are applied for and, in the absence of research income to run larger scale projects, such potentially valuable projects may be moth balled. While this implication is not one that needs to apply exclusively to business and management related subjects, it is plausible that the effects may be sharpest in that area given the low success rates that business and management scholars currently achieve in their applications to research councils, relative to others fields. It is also the case in a funding environment where grant success is already low in general.

Table 2: Views on how Covid-19 has impacted on research

	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Sometimes	Agree/Strongly Agree
* Has not affected my ability to access resources such as literature or data	28.4	5.6	65.9
* Has made collaboration with co-authors and colleagues in the UK more difficult	41.8	20.1	38.1
* Has made collaboration with co-authors and colleagues outside the UK more difficult	48.6	23.2	28.2
* Has provided more time to redraft work	45.6	18.3	36.1
* Has shifted research efforts away from other debates that researchers would like to contribute to	23.3	36.6	40.1
* Has undermined my confidence in applying for grants that are not focused on Covid-19	25.2	35.0	39.8

The ‘nature’ of research work will be affected differently depending on the methods used. In general, while there is no problem in, for example, interrogating established databases, research methods such as ethnographic and archival research are clearly more problematic during a lockdown. This may have potentially damaging effects on multidisciplinary research. Thus, any tendency toward reinforcing a research mono-culture based around quantitative work is likely to be exacerbated, while multidisciplinary research is put on hold. Table 3 provides some evidence

relating to the issue. The first panel shows that over 53% of researchers typically do work that is conducted outside the office (such as field work, face-to-face interviews, accessing archival materials). The second panel asks the extent that those who do research are able to adapt to an on-line environment. Certainly, findings from the survey suggest that only about a quarter of individuals did not find their ‘ability to access resources’ was not affected. This was particularly important for those who needed to be *in situ* to do their work: over 10% of the sample.

Table 3: Views on how Covid-19 has impacted upon how research is conducted

	%
Does your research typically require work that is conducted outside the office (such as field work, face-to-face interviews, accessing archival materials)?	52.7
Of those who required to work outside the office:	
• have been able to conduct all work on-line (e.g. by scheduling meetings on-line).	25.3
• have been able to conduct some work on-line (e.g. by scheduling some meetings on-line).	63.2
• Have not been able to as their work requires them to be physically in the field.	11.4

We also examine the more practical and the most pressing initial issue for most scholars as the Covid-19 developed into a global pandemic - their ability to travel and to attend conferences. For over 90%, the Covid-19 affected their ability to attend conferences/ workshops abroad (either because they were cancelled or because they could not travel). Conference organisers appear to have been fast to respond, with around 50% of these events been replaced by on-line alternatives (such as virtual conferences). However, less than 15%, agreed that these on-line events were as effective as being physically present. While a potentially important issue for all scholars, it was noted by some participants that the lack of a physical venue with the opportunity to meet new people, to engage in face-to-face networking and to obtain comments on work was one that will disproportionately affect early career scholars.

The pandemic has dominated the media coverage. While the majority of scholars in business school’s work does not align to the direct health effects of the pandemic, the far-reaching implications of the lockdown on the economy and society lead to a demand for coverage and input from a range of expertise. This is reflected in about 10% of participants being involved in ‘opinion

pieces’ or media participation. Furthermore, a substantial proportion of research activity was also directed to Covid-19 with about one in five participants engaging in the topic.

Covid and teaching and assessment

Our findings on teaching and assessment show that only about 15% of scholars had been engaged in online delivery prior to the pandemic. Table 4 summarises, in the top panel, the view of participants to rationales relating to teaching and, in the lower one, to marking. It illustrates that 78% of respondents agreed that teaching online ‘Makes it difficult to understand whether the students understand what is being taught’. And this is not only down to the experience being a ‘novel’ one since even the majority of experienced online instructors also agreed.

The success of some colleagues, particularly those with on-line teaching experience does suggest that it is not impossible to provide a similar experience, and certainly many colleagues are doing their utmost to ensure that students are getting a high-quality experience. However, these findings may suggest that there are limits to the extent that online delivery can substitute for face-to-face delivery and that it is not the case, as some have argued (e.g. Redpath, 2012), that academics themselves simply lack willingness to engage in virtual delivery and that is what has slowed the shift to the virtual teaching world. It not imply that on-line delivery cannot be harnessed to enable the sector to be more resilient and productive. The findings suggest there is a middle ground to be found where blended learning provides benefits to a wider set of students than was the case prior to the pandemic when students were able to be taught once again *in situ*.

Table 4: Views on how Covid-19 has impacted on teaching and marking

	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Sometimes	Agree/Strongly Agree
Teaching			
* Enables me to plan my delivery more carefully and provide a better teaching experience	54.9	24.5	20.6
* Makes it difficult to understand whether the students understand what is being taught	11.4	10.6	78.0
* is a lot more time consuming to prepare	10.6	13.9	75.5
Marking			
* Is more time consuming than marking hard copy	38.7	22.2	39.1
* Is more tiring	28.7	20.1	51.1
* Enables me to provide better and more considered feedback	26.2	39.1	34.8

Unlike teaching, more than 70% of those sampled had previous experience of online assessment. However, the research found that there was an increased toll of online marking, with more individuals who agreed that it was ‘more tiring’ than those who disagreed. A similar proportion of participants agreed that marking on-line was more ‘time consuming’ as those that disagreed. And, on a positive note, a third of respondents thought that on-line marking enhanced the quality of their feedback.

Covid and work engagement

Perhaps the most complex questions of the survey looked to examine how the pandemic is effecting individuals’ engagement in their work. The complexity relates to the very different experiences that the study uncovers as driving engagement. Some issues are practical ones, such as child care (qualitative commentaries in particular highlighted issues here extensively as an element that reduced the capacity to work at the same levels), leading in some cases to an individual simply focusing on demand-driven teaching and assessment requirements. However, it was also the case that while childcare demands increased for the majority, 15% of those with children were able to reduce their child care requirements via input from other household members.

Time is certainly a factor since, as we have noted above, teaching demands have typically expanded. The pressures are likely to have been exacerbated since, as Table 5 illustrates, we also found that the amount of time associated with administrative tasks has expanded for the majority of faculty.

Table 5: Administrative workload since measures were taken in response to the Covid-19 Pandemic

Decrease/ Deceased significantly	Did not increase or decrease	Increased/ Increased significantly
8.1	31.4	60.5

Demands in terms of time and child care is one factor, but previous work has highlighted that engagement is also likely to be tied to job security, contract type and other factors, given the widely publicised economic issues besetting the economy and the sector (e.g. Fontinha et al. 2018, 2019). Table 6 highlights these issues. A significant proportion of the sample had fears for their position. While the negative impacts of low levels of perceived job security can be buffered by high

employability levels (Silla et al., 2009), that is not the case given the context of the pandemic. Many felt that finding another position would be difficult and the vast majority did not see an opportunity to ‘trade up’. About 25% of the participants in the study found the time to make often detailed accounts of their circumstances. While child care was top of the list of circumstances commented up, a large number of comments were focused on job insecurity.

Table 6: Job insecurity during the pandemic

	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree/Strongly Agree
I feel insecure about the future of my job	31.5	24.5	43.9
I feel that if I lose this job, I would easily find another job	46.7	29.1	22.8
I feel that if I lose this job, I would easily find a better job	56.3	33.7	8.6

As noted, we use the seven-point Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufelli, Bakker and Salanova, 2006). Engagement is captured by three concepts in that scale – dedication, vigour and absorption. Dedication reflects the degree of enthusiasm, pride and significance that individual feels about their work. Vigour captures the amount of energy and mental resilience that is maintained whilst working. Finally, absorption is characterised by the extent that an individual is able to remain ensconced in their work.

Table 7 summarises responses relating to the question. The first three columns of numbers summarise the seven-point scale into three categories, while the fourth provides the mean response of the sample to each question. Following the distribution of responses, mean levels of dedication and absorption remain high, but level of vigour was considerably lower. That academics have remained as dedicated to their work as they have and continue to work long hours is not something that will surprise many. Indeed, earlier work has illustrated HE teaching professionals record the second highest number of hours worked on average, behind physicians (Walker et al., 2010). It would seem plausible that mental resilience and energy would be difficult to maintain in the face of difficulties on the scale of a global pandemic, and the findings echo the qualitative comments of a number of survey participants. But while these engagement estimates appear reasonable, it is also the case that prior studies have found quite varying mean responses across different contexts.

In order to examine the extent that there has been a shift in a perfect work, we need to draw upon a

recent benchmark. We are in a position to do so since we conducted a survey in January and February 2020 of economists and econometricists mentioned earlier. While the survey focused on the rather different subject of how metrics influence work behaviours, it included an analogous survey question. In order to situate our baseline responses, we first compare the matched sub-sample of economists and econometricians from the Covid survey to the full sample in columns four and five. Comparing the resulting means for each category we can see that they are almost identical, suggesting, with respect to engagement at least, that economists and econometricians behave similarly, on average, to other disciplines in the business and management domain. When we compare the matched sample of economists before and during the pandemic, we find that that they remain as dedicated to their jobs as before and have the same tendency to long working hours, whether they are working remotely or not. What is most notable, however, is that they are markedly less able to sustain their energy levels. While it is worth being cautious with respect to these preliminary descriptive findings, they do warrant further investigation and investigation.

Table 7: Comparing engagement before and during Covid-19

	Never/Almost never/Rarely	Sometimes	Often/Very Often/Always	mean responses to a 7-point scale		
				Full sample	Economist & Econometricians (Covid-19 period)	Economist & Econometricians (pre-Covid 19)
Dedication	9.7	23.6	66.7	5.0	5.1	5.1
Vigour	28.6	34.7	36.9	4.1	4.1	4.8
Absorption	18.4	28.5	53.3	5.0	5.0	5.0

Implications

Within a short timeframe the Covid-19 pandemic has had a profound effect on the nature of working lives across the globe. Governments have responded by a total or partial lockdown to promote social distancing, and this has necessitated remote working. The HE sector is a major driver of education, research and innovation in the UK economy, which moved swiftly into an on-line mode. It therefore provides a rich case study with potential lessons for sectors where education, training and research have significant roles. We have examined the determinants of work engagement, research, teaching and assessment in the HE sector, using a survey of key actors to provide a rich evidence base for policy on flexible working.

At this early stage of the analysis, it is difficult to draw strong implications about the results of the survey. It is, however, clear that the Covid-19 pandemic has had a highly differential experience on academics. While many have been put under increased, and in many cases considerably increased, pressure, others have been able to maintain their work and for a minority of others, from a work perspective at least, a lower time pressure has presented the opportunity to engage in research. This time pressure needs to be put in context within the sector but it should also be acknowledged that academics traditionally have longer work hours, with earlier work showing that HE teaching professionals record the second highest number of hours worked on average, behind physicians (Walker et al. 2010).

The findings of the survey also have important direct implications for policy and practices. The following tentative and non-exhaustive list of suggestions flow from the survey findings.

- Probation and promotion committees should explicitly account for Covid-19 related circumstances.
- Grant bodies should ensure and communicate clearly that support for funding for projects that relate to topics beyond Covid-19 is maintained.
- Future research evaluations, such as the Research Excellence Framework, should also be conscious of the differential effects the pandemic has had on some individual's circumstances.
- Given the additional time pressures placed upon staff by remote work highlighted in the study, university managers need to be conscious of these in response to the pandemic by not making unreasonable demands of staff or setting unrealistic expectations to applicants in the upcoming academic year.
- Students should also be made aware of the pressures that their instructors face.
- Line managers and colleagues need to look for means to better enable their colleagues to be able to maintain engagement in their work.
- Renewed energy and more precise evaluative should be developed and employed, examining whether the modes of teaching, such as blended learning, can enable better student outcomes.

In future research, we will explore in greater detail:

1. What are the immediate effects of the pandemic on research activity?
2. What are instructor's experiences of on-line delivery and assessment?

3. What are the determinants of work engagement?

And in the future we will look to examine:

4. Whether publications by women, and the resultant impact upon their promotion prospects, will be reduced, as suggested by Minello (2020)?
5. Whether the lockdown will potentially damage effects on multidisciplinary research by reinforcing a research mono-culture based around quantitative work?
6. Whether the pandemics lead to the radical shift to online or blended learning that many commentators had predicted would accompany MOOCs in the early 2010s by has failed to occur (Reich and Ruipérez-Valiente, 2020)?
7. Whether the trend toward flexible employment might be accelerated by the crisis as copious commentary is suggesting; or will the change be subtler?

Methodologically, we will look to expand the project to engage of detailed in-depth interviews lead by Washkika Haak-Saheem to provide a more nuanced understanding of each of these research questions.

References

- Fontinha, R., Easton, S. and Van Laar, D. (2019). 'Overtime and quality of working life in academics and non-academics: the role of perceived work-life balance.' *International Journal of Stress Management*, 26(2), 173-183.
- Fontinha, R., Van Laar, D., and Easton, S. (2018). 'Quality of working life of academics and researchers in the UK: the roles of contract type, tenure and university ranking.' *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(4), 786-806.
- Higher Education Statistical Agency (2020). Consolidated statement of comprehensive income and expenditure 2015/16 to 2018/19. <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/finances/table-1>. Accessed 26/04/2020
- Minello, A. (2020). 'The pandemic and the female academic.' *Nature*, 17/04/2020.
- Office for National Statistics (2020). Coronavirus and homeworking in the UK labour market: 2019. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/articles/coronavirusandhomeworkingintheuklabourmarket/2019> Accessed 26/04/2020
- Redpath, L. (2012). 'Confronting the bias against on-line learning in management education.' *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(1), 125-140.
- Reich, J. and Ruipérez-Valiente, J. A. (2019), 'The MOOC Pivot.' *Science* 363(6423), 130-131
- Robins, R.W., Fraley, R.C. and Krueger, R.F. (2009). *Handbook of research methods in personality psychology*. Guildford Press: London.

- Schaufeli, W.B, Bakker A.B., and Salanova, M. (2006). 'The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire.' *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716.
- Silla, I., De Cuyper, N., Gracia, F.J., Peiró, J. M., and De Witte, H. (2009). Job insecurity and well-being: moderation by job insecurity. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10: 739-751.
- Walker, J.T., Vignoles, A. and Collins, M. (2010). 'Higher education academic salaries in the UK.' *Oxford Economic Papers*, 62 (1): 12-35.
- Walker, J.T., Fenton, E., Salter, A. and Salandra, R. (2019), 'What influences business academics' use of the Association of Business Schools' (ABS) list? Evidence from a survey of UK academics.' *British Journal of Management*, 30(3), 730-747.
- Webster, J., & Hackley, P. (1997). 'Teaching effectiveness in technology-mediated distance learning.' *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(6): 1282-1309.