



PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND ITS INFLUENCE ON ACADEMICS' EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIPS AND CAREERS. LINCOLN UNIVERSITY SINCE 1990



Rupert Tipples and Branka Krivokapic-Skoko,

*Department of Farm and Horticultural
Management
Lincoln University*

Abstract

With the increasing financial pressures being experienced by New Zealand universities, greater attention is being placed on the performance of academic staff. The primary aim of this paper is to explore the role of performance management in the management of universities; and its influence on academics' employment relationships and careers. The paper reviews the overt contractual changes which have occurred in the period 1990-1996, and contrasts them with the covert changes to academics' related psychological contracts. A mixture of methods including participatory action research and participant observation of management policies and processes over the period is used based around a survey of academic colleagues. Conclusions are drawn about the outcomes of changes in management policy and practice and suggestions are made for improving university-academic employment relations and academic careers.

"We trained hard - but it seemed that, every time we were beginning to form up into teams, we would be reorganised. I was to learn later in life that we tend to meet any new situation by reorganising, and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency and demoralisation."
Gaius Petronius, 66 A.D.

The new 'managerialism' underlying the State Sector reforms of the 1980s "... lies in the assumption that there is 'something called 'management' which is a generic, purely instrumental activity, embodying a set of principles that can be applied to the public business as well as the private business'" (Painter quoted by Boston *et al.*, 1996, 25)

The types of reforms which have been applied to tertiary education are:

1. The development of a strategic planning approach with an emphasis on performance management.
2. A stress on performance through the use of incentives whether for individuals or institutions.
3. An extensive use of explicit contracts specifying the nature of performance required, coupled with more exacting monitoring and reporting systems.
4. The separation of commercial and non-commercial activities, and of the roles of funder, purchaser and provider.
5. The maximum decentralisation of management decision making, especially in the management of human resources.
6. The implementation of financial management systems based on accrual accounting and appropriation systems, and being 'fiscally responsible'. (Boston *et al.*, 1996, 5-6)

For the Universities these changes were implemented through the Education Amendment Act 1990. However, that was underpinned by the more generic changes in the State Sector brought about by the State Owned Enterprises Act 1986, the State Sector Act 1988, the Public Finance Act 1989 and the later Fiscal Responsibility Act 1994. The State Sector Act 1988 brought academics under a similar employment relations system to the private sector, the Labour Relations Act 1987, and then subsequently to the Employment Contracts Act 1991.

New management policies

The new management policies introduced at Lincoln University follow these six types of reform very closely. Each one listed below is followed by a number in parentheses indicating into which of Boston *et al.*'s categories of new State Sector Reform policies each fits.

1. Preparation of a University Corporate Plan, an annual Operational Plan and new financial processes [1, 4, 6].
2. Introduction of the Lincoln University Management Manual in 1990 as the sole means of promulgating definitive administrative/management processes [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6].
3. In 1990 a Professional Development and Appraisal (PD & A) policy was introduced. The Vice Chancellor had a very positive view of such a Management by Objectives (MbO) system after experience of one with O.E.C.D. It was introduced in an atmosphere favouring greater accountability in universities, while there were also concerns about the future role of the proposed Education Review Office. It has become a key management practice for all HODs [1, 2, 3, 5].

4. A Total Quality Management programme for the University called Lincoln Quality Improvement (LQI) was introduced in 1992 (1, 2, 5).
5. The University's Departmental Review policy was brought about in 1989 to monitor and assess departmental performance; and to ensure that teaching and research activities meet international standards (1, 2).
6. Introduction of a 'Performance Ethos'. This was not announced explicitly but has appeared gradually until coming to prominence in the 1995 Promotion Round. It is closely related to the PD & A policy, to student evaluations of lecturers, and to success in the Promotions exercise [1, 2, 5].
7. In the 1996-9 Corporate Plan a 'Human Resources Strategy' was introduced. Personnel matters were first referred to as Human Resource concerns in 1990 when parts of the Management Manual, which had been issued under a Staffing title, were reissued under a "correct" Human Resources title!

This study set out to investigate how actual conditions were changing in practice at Lincoln University. It begins by exploring the employment relationships of New Zealand academics and reviews the impact of changes in management policies and practices following the State Sector reforms.

The psychological contract

One essential problem following the reforms seemed to be that the expectations of the University of its academic staff had changed substantially, but that the message had not got clearly over to them that this was the case. This fitted in well with a theoretical idea, that of individual's psychological contracts with their employer. Rousseau has defined a psychological contract as:

individual beliefs, shaped by the organization, regarding terms of an exchange agreement between individuals and their organization ... A key feature of the psychological contract is that the individual voluntarily assents to make and accept certain promises as he or she understands them. It is what the individual believes he or she has agreed to, not what the person intends, that makes the contract (Rousseau, 1995, 9-10).

Herriot, Manning and Kidd (in press) suggest that a psychological contract:

... refers to the perceptions of their mutual obligations to each other held by the two parties to the employment relationship, the organisation and the employee. Such perceptions may be the result of formal contracts, or they may be implied by the expectations which each holds of the other and which are communicated in a multitude of subtle and not so subtle ways.

This definition implies that the understanding of the mutual obligations may not be clear because the two parties have different perceptions. The employment relationship can be described as being like a continuum with two extremes - the

overt features covered by the formal legal contract at one end, and the covert features of the more ethereal world of expectations and perceptions of obligations, the psychological contract, at the other. A psychological contract is different to the economic concept, implicit contract, in that the latter implies employee risk averseness which the former does not (Pearce, 1981).

Methods

A number of different approaches have been used to try and explore the psychological contracts of academics at Lincoln University, largely following Rousseau and her colleagues (Rousseau, 1990; Robinson, Kraatz and Rousseau, 1994; and Robinson and Rousseau, 1994). There has also been an attempt to try and triangulate the findings in order not to depend on any one set of impressions or opinions. The data generated have been drawn from the following sources:

1. A postal survey of academic colleagues' opinions about their changing relationships with Lincoln University. The survey was sent to 238 colleagues in December 1995 and 147 replies were received (61.8 percent). The survey took place against a background of sustained organisational change since autonomy and full university status had been achieved in 1990.
2. An interview survey with 12/15 (80 percent) Heads of Academic Departments.
3. Personal observation and participation in a number of the political and management processes associated with the reforms whether as an Association of University Staff (AUS) officeholder, or as a junior manager of an academic department.
4. Documentary evidence.
5. Interviews with other key actors.

Explicit changes in employment policies

While all these largely management driven changes were proceeding, student numbers were rising and staff productivity was increasing, yet academic employment contracts remained unchanged - unless a member of staff was given an automatic increment or promoted. Academic staff received \$1,000 as their first pay increase for five years at the beginning of 1996. In return the University demanded that Senior Lecturers, who were then described as the career grade, be placed on a range of rates. It did, however, increase the top level of the range. Those who were at the bar on the old scale, and some had been there for several years, then had to apply to advance to the new bar. Further adjustments in mid 1996 were based on what was perceived as the individual's all round performance against the university's promotion criteria. A staff member performing adequately was expected to proceed through the new range to the bar in six years. In the 1996 Promotions Round performance again was the critical variable. Although the University was under considerable financial pressure in 1996, and budgeting for further cuts in government income in 1997, the Promotions Round was not financially constrained because it had been budgeted. The Acting Vice Chancellor emphasised that there was to be recognition of good performance, which

meant in practice to have a good research and publications record, together with acceptable teaching evaluations from students, and a recommendation from one's Head of Department supported by the Academic Division Director.

A further salary increase for academic staff of \$1150 has been negotiated to come into effect from 1 January 1997, with a further increase in the level of the Senior Lecturer salary bar, but university staff had to go on strike to get that. A further across the board salary increase had not been budgeted and was consequently opposed. That represents an average increase of only 1.6 percent per annum since 1990. Since salary negotiations had become the responsibility of each Vice Chancellor in 1990, academic salaries had slipped by 14.4 percent in the period to 1995 (NZVCC). In contrast the Lincoln University Vice Chancellor's employment package was boosted by performance bonuses in 1993, 1994 and 1995 by the maximum of \$10,000 per annum¹.

Academic psychological contracts at Lincoln

In contrast to the overt changes in the legal part of the employment relationship, the covert behavioural parts were explored through the postal survey of academic colleagues. To assess the state of the psychological contracts of Lincoln academics a series of questions in the staff survey explored the staff members' beliefs and expectations about their relationship with Lincoln University. Respondents were asked how well overall Lincoln University had fulfilled the promised obligations that they had promised the respondent. The mean response to a rating scale from 'Very well fulfilled' (5) to 'Very poorly fulfilled' (1) was 3.43 (s.d.=0.99) suggesting that Lincoln academics were fairly satisfied with the extent to which the university had met what were perceived as its promised obligations. However, to check this point further individuals were asked whether Lincoln University had ever failed to meet any of the obligations promised to the individual. Twenty seven percent (39) claimed to have had a promised obligation unmet whereas 73 percent had had all their obligations met. Of those unmet several breaches were common and might be interpreted as violations of the psychological contract (see Table 1).

To illustrate the unmet obligations quotes are presented of individuals' responses. However, it must be noted that some

of these breached obligations might have occurred where promises were made and unmet by different levels of university management:

001 "My postgraduate work has been severely restricted by administration. Problem not yet finalised after 14 months." Female, 30, L, 4 years at LU².

012 "Offered University flat at interview - offer withdrawn when I wrote accepting job offer and accepting University flat offer." Male, 52, SL at bar, 9 years at LU.

047 "Yes - the lifestyle commonly associated with a university position as compensation for the low pay. Lack of research leadership and supervision of further study. Very poor management - failure to address important issues specifically raised with them. Management at the top level a disaster." Male, 38, L over bar, 5 years at LU.

072 "Collegiality atmosphere - interdisciplinary work declined to virtually nil because of competitive atmosphere engendered between departments - less opportunity to participate in university decision making." Male, 53, SL above bar, 26 years at LU.

106 "I was led to believe I would get a Lecturer's position, but was not even considered, on two separate occasions." Female, 53, ST, 24 years at LU.

134 "Conflict between agreements expressed verbally by the Vice Chancellor and the actions followed by other administrative officers." Male, 60, P, 16 years at LU.

142 "University life used to have significant perks like a growing library, recreation facilities, parking, sabbaticals, in addition to a generous time for research. These were implied expectations/obligations when I joined; they are increasingly diminishing to the point of vanishing altogether in some cases." Male, 58, SL at bar, 23 years at LU.

An approach similar to Rousseau's (1990) was also used to

Table 1. Types of unmet obligations by Lincoln University (n=36).

Types of unmet obligations	Number of times cited	%
Matters relating to promotion	11	26
Matters relating to research, resourcing, availability of postgraduate supervision etc.	7	17
Accommodation, office space promises	3	7
Job satisfaction/lifestyle	4	10
Management weaknesses - failure to provide contracts, confidentiality, honesty, conflicting advice	8	19
Level of pay	3	7
Other unmet promises	6	14
Total	42	100

differentiate between what staff believed were their obligations to Lincoln University and Lincoln University's obligations to them. Staff indicated that they believed that the University owed them Job Satisfaction above five other factors named in a question which asked them to indicate the extent to which they believed that the University owed them six different things (Table 2). These were to be expressed on a five point scale from 1. "Not at all" to 5. "Very highly". In return academic staff believed that they owed the University "Loyalty" above all else, and "Working outside ordinary office hours" (Table 3).

Changing beliefs about the employment relationship

Respondents were also asked about how they believed their employment relationship with Lincoln University had changed over the previous ten years and how they believed it would change over the next ten years. Fifty seven percent of respondents believed that the employment relationship between them and Lincoln University had changed over the last ten years, and 74 percent believed that it would change significantly over the next ten years. In both cases respondents were asked to indicate how they believed those changes had effected them or would do so. Their responses were coded into summary response categories, but there was considerable overlapping between categories.

Administrative issues were the major concern and almost always carried negative connotations. Not only had the amount of administration increased substantially but much or the associated work was seen as being unproductive,

formalistic and bureaucratic. Also, it was tending to push research into personal time such as evenings. Some of that growth in administration may be attributed no doubt to the increasing size of the University. However, a second theme was also apparent with the increase of auditing type arrangements derived more directly from the State Sector Reforms, and the development of a 'them/us' antagonistic culture rather than the supportive collegial one which had existed before. A sense of pride and individual responsibility among academic staff had been destroyed. Moreover, there was also a thread concerning administrative incompetence running through the results as well. Rather than being supportive, the administration had developed an exclusive management style which was perceived as being a law unto itself.

Table 4 presents an overall summary of the responses. Complete quotations of responses as to how staff believed their employment relationship with Lincoln University had changed are provided to outline the complexity of the beliefs felt by staff. Again each selected quotation is identified by a survey number and brief descriptive statistics of the respondent.

012 "There has been a change from Administration being here as a service to help academic staff teach and perform research to the Admin being a manager of a commodity. Systems once introduced to 'assist' staff are now used to 'evaluate' staff."

Male, 52, SL over bar, 9 years at LU.

058 "I have become increasingly discouraged - I seem to work harder, yet get no further."

Table 2. Academic staff's beliefs about what Lincoln University owed them.

	Factor	Mean score	Standard deviation
1	Job satisfaction (2,3,4,5,6)*	4.04	1.09
2	Career development (1,4,5,6)*	3.75	1.17
3	More pay (1,5,6)*	3.66	1.25
4	Long term job security (1,2,6)*	3.40	1.19
5	Promotion (1,2,3,6)*	3.19	1.36
6	Support with personal problems (1,2,3,4,5)*	2.56	1.24

* Indicates the pairs of means which were statistically different at the $p < 0.05$ probability level.

Table 3. Academic staff's beliefs about what they owed Lincoln University

	Factor	Mean score	Standard deviation
1	Loyalty (3,4,5,6)*	3.71	1.16
2	Work outside ordinary office hours (3,4,5,6)*	3.64	1.15
3	Volunteering to do non-required jobs (1,2,5,6)*	3.12	1.11
4	Giving advanced notice of leaving (1,2,5,6)*	2.94	1.35
5	Being willing to accept transfers within the University (1,2,3,4)*	2.54	1.14
6	Spending a minimum period of time in the employment of the University (1,2,3,4)*	2.51	1.31

* Indicates the pairs of means which were statistically different at the $p < 0.05$ probability level

Female, 33, L under bar, 3 years at LU.

061 "More bureaucratic/less sensitive to students/more money driven/less sensitive to staff."

Male, 49, SL at bar, 8 years at LU.

064 "Less faculty democracy/more autocracy from Registrar/less focus on students/more focus on administration."

Female, 37, L below bar, 7 years at LU.

094 "Loss of former group identity - us/them situation now - loss of former goodwill/willingness to go the extra mile by academic staff. - Evaporation of career structure/expectation that there may be a place for me until retirement - Feeling that my personal professionalism is not valued by the University."

Male, 49, SL at bar, 9 years at LU.

104 "Much higher expectations now - greater teaching loads, higher research productivity, more admin expected in order to achieve promotion - or even meet the day to day requirements. Academics are now lackeys of registry. We had greater influence on the running of the university in the past. We are more answerable to HOD, higher management and registry - less our own boss. Less academic freedom today."

Female, 46, L at bar, 10 years at LU.

109 "Now too much resource is spent in unproductive activity (accountability, admin.) and too little time in teaching, research."

Male, 44, L at bar, 15 years at LU.

119 "My workload (teaching and administration) has doubled since the university gained autonomy in 1990/91.

There has been a significant increase in 'accountability', and hence a monitoring of individual performance. This is a trend I dislike. As a strongly conscientious individual, I am quite capable of personal responsibility."

Male, 47, Reader, 9 years at LU.

144 "People are so busy now - nobody cares except to look after their own affairs."

Male, 50, SL at bar, 28 years at LU.

Future changes

Academic staff were asked also whether they believed the employment relationship between them and Lincoln University would change over the next ten years. These responses too have been categorised and the summarised data is given in Table 5. First, as a general observation, it must be noted that most respondents expected things to get worse before they get better. Then it must be noted that many do not expect to still be at Lincoln University for the whole ten years, whether because of retirement, resignation or redundancy. Many of the themes of the previous section reappear - the evils of excessive administration, accountability and auditing.

As before some examples of academics' beliefs about future changes in their employment relationship with the University are given:

001 "I don't plan to work here much longer. For me, more than 5 years will not be healthy - for my career, nor for the students I teach."

Male, 30, Lecturer, 4 years at LU.

013 "I believe it will continue to decline as long as registry

Table 4. Beliefs about changes in academics' employment relationships with Lincoln University over the last ten years. (n = 70)

Belief categories given for changes in employment relationships	Number of times belief cited	%
Greater demands on staff for more work/quality/hours with decreased resources/rewards	21	18
Pride in job/professionalism of staff replaced with auditing/evaluations/monitoring; added performance criteria; academics becoming accountants	11	9
Administrative problems, more of it, less sensitivity to staff/students, more layers, them/us, more adversarial -less a team, hard nosed, education becoming a commodity, formalisation	36	31
Poor management, University losing direction, communicating poorly, losing staff trust	5	4
Loss of research time/internal funding; loss of academic freedom	8	7
More pressure/stress, loss of lifestyle	7	6
Promotion related issues	7	6
Pay related issues	5	4
Other beliefs	17	15
Total number of beliefs expressed	117	100

are in 'box ticking' mode."

Male, 30, Senior Consultant, 7 years at LU.

060 "More managerial bullshit from people who haven't got the faintest idea what a university is for."

Male, 33, L, 1 year at LU.

090 "I cannot maintain the expectations of the University and still produce innovative ideas for research, teaching etc."

Male, 57, SL at bar, 15 years at LU.

104 "More of the above changes. Even less control of our destiny - less influence in the running of the university. Each year we become even smaller cogs in an ever bigger machine. Management are less concerned with our personal wellbeing and development now than ever before."

Female, 46, L at SL bar, 10 years at LU.

109 "Hopefully we will see a reversal of management style in the establishment."

Male, 44, L at SL bar, 15 years at LU.

112 "I believe we will become more like employees of a large company rather than a university. We will lose any autonomy we have and our roles and our subjects (i.e. content, time of offering - summer) will be dictated to us."

Female, 30, L at bar, 1 whole year at LU.

119 "1. There will be increased pressure to 'corporatize' the university, converting it into a dollar-driven institution. This is quite inconsistent with the traditional (and admirable) role of a university as an independent and 'free thinking' institution. Our society is in grave danger of entering 'headless chicken' mode. Universities must preserve their role as guidance systems. 2. Accountability will continue to grow, replacing mutual trust with a 'them-and-us' ethos."

Male, 47, Reader, 9 years at LU.

Conclusions

Since the Employment Contracts Act 1991 employment relations in New Zealand have had much more of a contractual focus, but most of that focus has been on the legal aspects of the employment relationship. In this study a broader view of the employment relationships at Lincoln University has been developed focusing on the behavioural aspects of the relationship through individual academics' psychological contracts. Those contracts were found to have been changed by changing circumstances, by the policy of central government, and by managerial actions. Before drawing this paper to a conclusion and making some recommendations it is important to say that some of the reforms have had very positive effects. Not all have been bad. Rather it is the new managerialist culture which has most distressed academic staff. Many of the management changes introduced by the University have been received somewhat sceptically. For example, LQI has used Quality Teams and Quality Analysis methods to solve what have been regarded as insignificant problems by academics, while ignoring major issues, at the expense of a considerable input of staff time. Another time consuming process has been the University's Departmental Review Policy which has had only limited positive outcomes. It was the subject of some adverse comment in the initial New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Report (pp.25-26). Student evaluations have also been abused in the eyes of academic staff. They were developed originally for improving teaching, but more recently they have become summative, with a role in the promotions processes, rather than having a formative role. It is now proposed that they should be made compulsory rather than voluntary.

If Lincoln University is still serious about its TQM policy (LQI) it will have embraced the *kaizen* (continuous improvement) idea, and will learn from what its most valuable assets believe has been happening to them. At present Lincoln academics are only 'fairly satisfied' with the University meeting its promised obligations. The performance of the

Table 5. Beliefs about changes in the employment relationships at Lincoln University over the next ten years. (n = 99)

Belief categories for future changes in employment relationships	Number of times cited	%
Not working at Lincoln University any longer	16	15
Different forms of changes to contractual status	17	16
More extreme administration/controls, loss of academic freedom, auditing/accountability	19	17
More performance/output orientation/pay with less rewards/resources available	15	14
More outside earnings required	3	2
More business/management orientation; economics driven	4	4
More mismanagement, distress, further self-reporting of fictitious success, mistrust	4	4
Other beliefs/individual reasons	30	28
Total beliefs expressed	108	100

University in keeping its promises, and thus psychological contracts, is lamentable. If a TQM approach suggests a performance standard or perfection is desirable, then no promises should have been unmet, let alone in the case of over a quarter of respondents.

The most important obligation that academic staff believe Lincoln University owes them is 'Job Satisfaction', but current levels appear to be somewhat deficient. 'Career Development' was the second most important obligation owed by the University, then 'Pay'. There was some concern with 'Promotion' prospects. They may become problematic if there are more contractual/short term employment arrangements in the future.

The overriding concern in terms of changed employment relationships at Lincoln University was the dominance of administrative issues, particularly the growth in administration which was perceived as unproductive, formalistic and bureaucratic. Furthermore, the increased auditing emphasis was profoundly disliked, as were its damaging effects on trust and collegiality. The former collegial atmosphere had been replaced by a competitive them/us approach. Additionally, there was a perception of administrative incompetence glossed over by a new managerial exclusivity.

Recommendations

If current psychological contracts at Lincoln are in such a poor state what can be done to improve them? First, attention needs to be paid to avoiding broken promises. Some of these may appear quite trivial, but they can loom large for the individual. An organisational culture favouring transparent honesty may have a role here. Secondly, attention needs to be paid to giving out clear, consistent messages about the institution, its processes and personnel. Different levels of management in the University need to establish clearer consistent psychological contracts with staff. Management training for academic managers, which has already begun, may help achieve both. However, once off courses will not sustain such a cultural change which needs to become a part of all managers and a Mission of the University.

The regular Professional Development and Appraisal sessions held at least annually between academic staff and their Head of Department offer the best opportunity for a regular renegotiation of academic psychological contracts. However, they need to be supported by appropriate recognition in the University's Promotion processes. In the past that has not always been the case, although it appeared to be more the case in 1996. Those performing according to the University's criteria, with the support of their Head of Department and Academic Division Director, received the most acknowledgement. With the increasing of the minimum salary levels for Senior Lecturers at the Bar in 1995 and 1996, those who had reached the career grade and then 'coasted' have been placed under greater scrutiny, and below acceptable performance has become a real concern. In the past the University had failed to address such problems adequately through the processes available. Whether it will be able to

in future cases remains to be seen. It may be significant that in 1996 a number of long serving staff took advantage of the quite generous budget made available for early retirement and put themselves beyond the reach possible of disciplinary measures.

Is there any incentive to pursue an academic career in the future? At present academic lifestyles are not sufficiently attractive or remunerative to attract many New Zealanders, and postgraduate fees may put off some. Over 53 percent of academic positions were filled from overseas according to the Vice Chancellors' Committee (NZVCC, 1995). Bosses often underestimate what their subordinates aspire to in terms of promotion with both being in the dark about what they think the other wants, although they believe that they know (Herriot, 1992, 75-7). In this study academic staff still retain a strong career and promotion orientation, even if their employers do not realise it. The nature of their skills and knowledge mean that they cannot be picked up and put down quickly. They will not sit comfortably in any employment environment which does not favour relatively long term relationships where such investments as taking a Ph.D are not appropriately valued. Any university has to bear that in mind in its future planning.

In terms of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction the University needs to be concerned about what is preventing its academic staff from getting the job satisfaction they value so highly. If teaching and research are the critical areas of focus why have they been allowed to become so bogged down in administration and auditing type activities? Can the latter be reduced in a way which would facilitate better and more scholarship, teaching and research?

Future research

This paper has focused on achieving a better understanding of the real world of academics' employment relationships, through studying their psychological contracts. The study is only the first stage of what is intended to be an ongoing one as psychological contracts develop over time.

As a case study of a single New Zealand university the results are limited. Would they be replicated at others? Have other universities managed their affairs with more concern for their staff?

Worldwide empirical research on psychological contracts is also quite limited. More New Zealand data about employer and employee mutual beliefs, expectations and obligations about their employment relations would be very useful and instructive alongside the studies of overt employment contracts such as those carried out by Raymond Harbridge.

Notes

1. Information from AUS Update following a written Parliamentary question from Trevor Mallard MP, Labour's associate spokesperson on education to the Minister of State Services on 9 August 1995. It was replied to on 17 August 1995.

2. Each quotation is followed by the gender, age, academic rank and period employed by Lincoln University, of the respondent. The academic ranks used were P=Professor, R=Reader, SL=Senior Lecturer, L=Lecturer and ST=Senior Tutor. The bars referred to are salary bars requiring substantive promotions to cross them.

References

Boston, J. Martin, J. Pallot, J. and Walsh, P. 1996 *Public Management - The New Zealand Model* Auckland: Oxford University Press

Herriot, P. 1992 *The Career Management Challenge - Balancing individual and organisational needs* London: Sage Publications

Herriot, P., Manning, W. and Kidd, J. 1997 The content of the psychological contract. submitted to *British Journal of Management* (in press).

Johnson, E. 1994 Total quality management and performance appraisal: To be or not to be? In Boxall, P. *The challenge of human resource management* Auckland: Longman Paul, 268-292.

Lonsdale, A. 1996 Performance management: the fourth generation. *Campus Review* 2-8 October, 6, 38, 8

N.Z.V.C.C. 1995 *Statistical Collection* 30 June. Wellington

New Zealand Universities' Academic Audit Unit 1995 *Lincoln University Audit Report - September 1995 (Trial Audit)* Wellington

Pearce, D.W. (ed) 1981 *The Dictionary of Modern Economics* London: Macmillan Reference Books

Robinson, S. Kraatz, M. and Rousseau, D. 1994 Changing obligations and the psychological contract: A longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Journal* 37, 1, 137-152

Robinson, S. and Rousseau, D. 1994 Violating the psychological contract: not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 15, 3, 245-259

Rousseau, D. 1990 New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 5, 389-400

Rousseau, D. 1995 *Psychological Contracts in Organizations - Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Tipples, R. 1994 Contracting: The Heart of Employment

Labour, Employment and Work in New Zealand 1996

Relations. In *Employment Relations Theory and Practice: Current Research*. Churchill, Victoria: International Employment Relations Association

Authors

Rupert Tipples is a Senior Lecturer in Management and Branka Krivokapic-Skoko is a Ph.D student, working on ethnic entrepreneurship and New Zealand agriculture, based in the Department of Farm and Horticultural Management, P O Box 84, Lincoln University, Canterbury. E-mail: tipplesr@lincoln.ac.nz]