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The Ivory Tower is crumbling fast. Privatisation and managerialism have radically altered the work culture of whole of the public sector including academia. Those who entered it to escape a commercial career have found themselves pursued and caught by the very thing they wanted to avoid. The commercialisation of academia is the context behind any realistic prognosis of landing stable careers for current doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers, and will encourage the growth of bivocationalism, as academics are increasingly fluctuating between their vocation and other careers.

The reader may be surprised by my shortage of material on “Thinking Christianly within your discipline” or on “How to refine a Christian world view”. This is not because it is unimportant - for it is also critical to be a scholar who applies Biblical truth to intellectual enquiry. It is simply because there are several qualified institutes and individuals who are already grappling with this issue, of which I would particularly recommend the Ravi Zacharias Trust. What is being relatively ignored, however, is the impact of managerialism and audit culture on Christians in higher education. I will argue that this has led to greater individualism and the breakdown of “collegialism” within a competitive market place, which is extremely “dog eat dog” and in which the acquisition of business skills is a matter of survival.

Managerialism was introduced to limit abuses of self-indulgence and lack of accountability, but its dysfunctional unintended consequences are sufficiently deep and broad to deserve selective resistance. Ironically, the resisting academics also have to simultaneously learn resilience and commercial skills in order to survive in the market place. But the Christian cannot “sell their soul” to the excesses of “careerism”, rather they need to maintain their sense of vocation. Ultimately, dependence has to be on God rather than REF (Research Excellence Framework) or TEF, (Teaching Excellence Framework)
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and our vocation has to be contingent on His providence. Also, research is ultimately a matter of truth not a commodity, and the paramount elements of virtue, the acquisition of knowledge (research) and its transmission (teaching) have to be restored as the core values in professional decisions. Although, it is naive to exclude costs from higher education, and we live in a harder age, and someone somewhere has to pay for what we do, the non-financial benefits of universities cannot be ignored in the calculations either.

This booklet is written based upon my current experience working amongst academics in the UK, and to a much lesser extent the USA and Italy. Whilst it has been written with early career academics primarily in mind, it has application to anyone (which is most of us working in insecure, even precarious, working environment). Through reading it my prayer is that it will help you to both survive and thrive in your own working environment and practically assist others in theirs.

I would like to thank the Christian Academic Network (C-A-N-), George Grimble and Chris Mabey for their help in the writing of this booklet. Especially Maurice Manktelow whose reformatting of the document saved this dyspraxic from hours of frustration.

Mark Surey
Before We Start

Something for aspiring academics

There once was a day when a successful upper middle class family would have five sons. One of each of them would become a lawyer, a doctor, an army officer and an academic. The simplest of them would merely make vicar! But all five were guaranteed solid careers with guaranteed income.

One of the most striking differences between academia and the law, the army or medicine, is that there is no restriction on the number of potential entrants. The Law Society and the BMA try to ensure, although they are not universally successful, that there are the right number of trained applicants for every job, by selecting, whilst allowing for attrition in the process, the right number of candidates for places offered in colleges. At Sandhurst those the Army most wants as officers, successfully compete for their limited number of places in their vocation also. Even ABM, the Church of England’s “HR department” recently took only 60% of those who feel called to the Anglican ministry successfully reach seminary, because that’s about the amount required to fill the parishes whilst staying within the Church’s budget. God even “calls” the right balance of high churchmen, liberals, conservatives and charismatics to fit the right theological profile too! Or, more realistically, ABM ensure that there are the right number of successful candidates to play in every position in the church, before they all go off to training camp.

However, academia is not organized like that. Even if we allow the basic level of past success to reach the starting line to be three grade “A” A Levels followed by a First and a PhD, obtaining these is no guarantee of coming even close. It may have been so in the past, when Higher Education was smaller but expanding, and public funding was less tight, but not in the current state of affairs. Depending on their discipline and the research orientation of their institution, every professor will supervise between 30 and 90 doctoral
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dissertations in their career. An average of 50 per head is realistic. Equally realistic is an estimate that half of these would want a career in academia, as both the necessary interest and aptitude to be a scholar is already demonstrated. But, be it due to retirement, or promotion, or a move to a more prestigious college, there is now only that academic to replace in a career which is no longer rapidly expanding. Hence, the average current prognosis of a successful doctoral candidate establishing the career they desire in academia is currently barely 4%. Or, imagine 25 people at the starting line, all beginning a PhD, all of whom have known nothing but success in education, for they are divided only by the thinnest and fuzziest graduations of intellectual and scholarly ability. Well, statistically only one will land anything approaching “tenure” and join the “club”. The other 24 will have to adjust to the failure to materialise up to a decade of dreams. One professor recently told me that some of his peers had estimated an average of 160 applicants per science and 450 per humanities vacancy at his university. This is the cruelty of having the stiffest competition for entry after rather than before the training. Of not having, God forbid, an artificial quota of the PhDs which are allowed to be attempted and completed, in order to match the demand within the academic employment market. This inherently makes academia more entrepreneurial than other traditional professions like law, medicine or accountancy have become. The risk of failure and the instability of guaranteed income and career progression are now inherent. Although contentment within either a junior post with a relatively secure funding stream, or, for the entrepreneurial, a lifestyle of criss-crossing between opportunities in academia and other careers, is also possible for many.

Nevertheless, if God has called us to this vocation, His providence should carry us through despite the odds. However, they are sobering. And there is a balance between developing the resilience to overcome the odds, and the
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obstinacy to keep up a vain hope once it becomes clear that an academic career is not opening up, no matter how much energy and prayer is being expended.

![Pie Chart]

Figure 1 – Pie Chart showing the typical proportions of researchers in the League of European Research Universities. Source: (Croffie & Donaldson 2016)

The League of European Research Universities recently calculated the percentage of postdoctoral staff and other researchers in the four phases leading to tenure as shown in Figure 1. The attrition is sobering, from 55% of posts at Phase 1 reducing to only 12% at Phase 3 and 8% at Phase 4, the generally expected levels at which the academic may be generally considered for anything like traditional “tenure” (Croffie & Donaldson 2016).

Those who have recently “succeeded” are generally those with publications. Or, to put it another way:

“The audit and accountability culture has swept through the public sector over the past 30 years, as neo-liberal market values have been increasingly
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applied by agencies appointed from the outside, in order to monitor activity and reward the “marginal increased productivity” of participants with extra funding. This is the basis of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) since renamed Research Excellence Framework (REF), which was introduced before the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) as research was perceived as more quantifiable than teaching. “Publish or perish”, and the requirement for “social impact” in the humanities and social sciences, have become normalized. This funding regime is inherently competition between universities rather than partnership and collaboration and as “reinforced individualistic careerist strategies as opposed to collegial and scholarly values” (Clarke & Knights 2015.2).

Figure 2 – Flow diagram of future posts of PhD researchers
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Even the sciences, which are better funded by government and corporate interest because of their functionalist rationale, are not immune from the pessimistic prognosis of career success, for the successful PhD candidate who dreams of something approaching “tenure” or even a professorial chair.

The Royal Society Report “Scientific Century: searching our future prosperity” (2010) concluded that although 47% of successful PhDs “want” to remain connected with academia, only 30% obtain research posts, as illustrated in Figure 2, of which because of the attrition in the four research phases only 3.5% become permanent research staff. Finally, only 0.45% will currently become professors. That is serious and sobering attrition. (Croffie & Donaldson 2016)

Nevertheless, the whole of economic life is more competitive than ever. The High Flyers report concluded that application numbers for graduate level jobs rose by 6% in 2014-15, 9% in 2013-14, 7% in 2012-3 and by a record 19% in 2011-12 (2015). So it is tough everywhere. But reaching the pinnacle in academia is particularly difficult because of the expanding numbers of PhDs and Level 1 researchers at the bottom who have no space further up the tube.

The author does not want to discourage those of you who God has called to a vocation in academia, but, on the other hand, he most certainly wants you to be alert to the pitfalls, risks and prognosis of a terminated career. He would want you to be realistic and always have a Plan B. And he wants you to expropriate Jesus’ wisdom through which The Lord can facilitate success, even against the odds.
The privatisation of higher education, combined with regular changing in government policies, have led to academia becoming part of the “precariat”, (that sector of the economy without a stable or guaranteed career progression). This state of affairs has become common in other aspects of the public sector as well as within the private sector. In a sense academia has primarily lost its traditional immunity and protection from the economic pressures of the world and is certainly no longer a vocation with a privileged gentlemanly status.

So

1. How does one survive and even thrive in such an environment?
2. Where are individuals given the essential faith and understanding necessary to live in today’s highly competitive environment?

The purpose of this booklet is to start to provide an answer to both of these questions.

Case study
In order to illustrate the precarious nature of modern academia I would like to use a friend of mine who is a junior Oxford don as a case study.

Observers in his church think that he is successful in his career and has “made it”. But his income is only £16k. (In general, the more prestigious a university is the meaner it is as an employer. This is supply and demand, the more attractive a college’s status the more it makes it a purchaser in a purchaser’s market). He can only afford to work there for three years and accumulate so much debt. After that he will be able to pragmatically seek the security, lack of stress, and job security of a “red brick” or American University. He has
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pragmatically, and in my view wisely in his case, opted for the city of gold over the dreaming spires.

He feels used:

“I feel I am a small cog in a machine which is the University of Oxford, which is using me unjustly for its own purposes. My salary and the conditions I work in show that the University doesn’t care much about its employees. It is a form of modern slavery which is only sustained by the old glory of the name “Oxford”. I feel that my mentor is very supportive, but hardly has time to deal with the needs I may have”.

But does not want to use people back:

“I try to show competitive colleagues that success is not everything. There is more to life than posts or honours. I make friends with people, not their posts and the advantages they confer. I never make money my measure of value. I do certain jobs and services for other reasons. I apply for funding as a means to an end. I feel I respect all my colleagues equally. I can see that many of them have a hierarchy of dealing with people on a scale. I talk to graduate students and emeriti professors alike. I never sacrifice teaching quality in order to publish. Appearances deceive, and I don’t want to engage in deception. Given that I am junior staff, I try to stand up for myself as much as I can without it seeming impertinent”.

All credit goes to God:

“I feel God’s hand in my life clearly shows how much he cares for me. He has taken me from a lowly place to a place I never dreamt of. Although one never comfortably deals with risk, I try to bare this in mind when I face one”
For me it is his humility, his ethical integrity and grace under pressure which mark him out as a Christian scholar, at least as much as whether he can cross all the “t’s” and do all the “i’s”, in a systematic Christian world view. Furthermore he would refuse on principle to fit his data to his world view, although there is much excellent scholarship by Christians who challenge the dominant paradigms of their disciplines.

Christian scholarship should be excellent in clarity and perceptiveness, and be coherent with Biblical truth. But this needs to be done without being contrived, and because people are not “brains on sticks”, without an ethical dimension rooted in social context it is defective.
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What is it?
The building of both personal and professional resilience is an essential element in the construction of any career within a competitive environment – especially an academic career. This is because it is regularly challenged, for example, every time when recovering from an unsuccessful job application or a request for funding is declined.

Resilience has been described as:

“the ability of a substance or object to spring back into shape; the capacity to recover quickly from difficulties; and an individual’s ability to properly adapt to stress and adversity”. (Croffie & Donaldson, 2016)

Resilience is an accumulated quality which is developed via recovering from adversity. It is largely a question of “how we fail”, of learning sufficiently from defeat to succeed next time. This constitutes a “realism” which sees failing by a shorter margin as the progress which will lead to achieving the goals tomorrow. Thereby personal history is changed rather than repeated with the lessons unlearnt.

A resilient attitude fosters the behaviour which leads to the development of skills and capability. Charlotte Croffiie states that “The measure of effective personal and professional resilience is an individual’s ability to properly adapt to stress (good and bad stress) and adversity in a fluid context/environment and respond appropriately”. (Croffie & Donaldson 2016)

Undoubtedly, resilience is becoming increasingly essential when functioning within the increasingly competitive academic environment. It is constantly
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tested as a function of having to change and adapt research goals, teaching requirements and funding criteria etc. in order to match the fluid “market”. Whether the entrepreneurial quality of contemporary academia is something imposed on us, or whether we would select it, there is no escape.

Within this environment “It is not the strongest or the most intelligent that survive but the most adaptable” (Charles Darwin). In other words, it is not necessarily those who are the best scholars who win interviews, but those who also bring to the table a much broader width of social skills and self-management.

As a seminary dean I was always concerned about selecting “all-rounders” who could add the practical ministry training of future pastors and missionaries to their scholarship: we never selected those who hadn’t both. As government funding declines within universities, and fees, trusts and industry, become the paymasters, academics able to move between academia and the private sector, and have the skills to operate in both, are increasingly at a premium and winning appointments.

Developing resilience

How do you, as a Christian academic, improve your personal and professional effectiveness when operating in such a competitive environment?

There is a wide corpus of generic material on developing resilience from “self-help” resources which are well worth our consideration and application. They are more a matter of common sense than scholarship, and are mundane rather than profound. But we should not be arrogant enough to overlook the simple and only focus on the sophisticated. According to the generals, business leaders and sports coaches of the world, more battles are lost by simple mistakes than won through brilliance!
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Here is a compendium of those that are core:

1. Know your goals and focus on how and when to logically achieve them
2. Build relationships and alliances with those “friends” who want us to succeed, even if we don’t always agree.
3. Develop the ability to self-regulate and to take control of your own internal world.
4. Adapt to rejection and/or failure, by learning from the shortcomings of your work so you can research and rewrite from a stronger position.
5. View your work strategically as an integrated whole, instead of as isolated fragments. That can help give pattern to both the whole corpus and the individual segments of your current work.
6. Become optimistic. Positive people are more resilient than pessimists. We can decide to be optimistic, without drifting into wishful thinking.
7. Be a learner and develop a new skill. Those engaged in improving their capacity can easier engage poor situations that need to be transformed, and deal more effectively with change,
8. Be an entrepreneur. It’s your career, and nobody else is going to chart your path. Take realistic risks.
9. Have a broader perspective that looks at the whole picture. Be more preoccupied with the future than the present and use the now to get there.
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10. Keep physically fit. A healthy regime of diet, exercise and sleep is essential to support a busy and stressful life.

11. Be modest without sacrificing assertiveness. This also implies a healthy but not excessive measure of self-esteem and self-sufficiency.

12. Have a sense of purpose behind what you do. Those with a sense of meaningfulness are more effective.

13. Remember your past successes and learn from them in order to confront current problems and issues.

14. Don’t sink under stress. What does not kill me makes me stronger. Use it to adapt and get stronger instead.

15. Those with a sense of humour cope better with stress, so cultivate rather than suppress it.

16. Those who are prepared to be patient handle stress and change better, and develop resilience through it.

17. Always be prepared to adapt to change. Move forward without forgetting the lessons of the past.

This list is not exhaustive but I hope I have covered all the key points. They are not easy to do but we should find them conceptually straightforward. They also imply that the capacity of an academic to network, have a positive attitude, adapt, self-manage, career plan and exercise can be as critical in establishing a stable academic path as their scholarship. And, that to maintain an intellectual peak, proper sleep and exercise, and Omega 3’s rather than fizzy drinks can be a mundane but critical factor!

Resilience and faith

Many of the “self-help” manuals also add that we should have “faith”. This does, however, beg the question of faith in what? There is no better
Resilience

destination for our “faith” than the Lord Himself. The Christian academic can be helped by a healthy level of self-esteem but ultimate trust must be in God. This is obvious, but the obvious is worth stating.

For me as a Christian, part of my internal locus of control is my view of myself from a Christian point of view, which is best informed by the Word and the Holy Spirit! An internal locus of control helps develop balanced self-esteem and sufficiency, clear personal goals and a strong sense of meaningfulness. Success in developing these qualities can be essentially used in order to help confront challenges. People with a sense of purpose tend not to be destroyed by stress, on the contrary, especially since what doesn’t kill you makes you stronger. Stress can be viewed as way to get resilient! Overcoming stress produces even more resilience in the lives of those helped by the attributes of tolerance, patience, humour, and optimism. The even tempered have a better record of both overcoming stress and developing resilience than the anxious do.

There is a definite role for prayer here! Make sure you are in communication with your creator. The cultivation of our relationship with our Loving Father inherently reduces stress and anxiety, since you can cast your care on a loving senior friend in a way you can’t on an ideology.

God usually needs to be in charge of our environment because the reason why we need to deal with stress and be resilient is that we certainly aren’t!

The resilient who can use stress constructively can also adapt better to change, by “rolling with the punches” and adjusting their responses. Ironically this flexibility in the long run facilitates an “action orientated approach”, whereby, it is the individual who is developing the skills to impose themselves on their environment, rather than have their environment impose itself on them.
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Resilience and Reality

Another model for the development of essential elements in Resilience has been developed by Robertson Cooper. Within this model, confidence, purposefulness, social support and adaptability are seen as essential elements of resilience. Resilient people tend to have a realistic confidence, in their capacity and self-worth when under stress. This is harnessed to clarity of purpose, and focused values and direction, essential in the overcoming of setbacks and blocks.

Although positive in disposition, the resilient person is also not delusional, and has a realistic assessment of the world around them. But they are also not taken in by the myth of self-contingency and can call on social support, when necessary in order to overcome adversity.

Above all, the resilient individual has to be adaptable. For flexibility, and adapting to changing situations which are beyond our control, are essential to maintaining resilience.

Resilient individuals can cope with change and their recovery from its impact tends to be quicker.

For reflection

1. How convinced am I that I have a vocational “call” into academia? Or, is it my own desire to hold on to a world that I have uniquely enjoyed and/or have been successful in, and a fear of the outside world
3. Do I like taking chances or am I risk averse? A career in industry may offer more security.
4. If a fail, can I improve and fail by smaller margins until I succeed?
**Skills**

**Some necessary skills**

**Marketing**

There is no area in academia in which the quality of resilience is more significant than the search for funding, particularly within the government departments, whose names are ever changing but are always aligning academia to business, and whose externally applied functionalist approach has arguably overturned the “Haldane Principle (1918)” which stated that research objectives and priorities should be determined by practitioners rather than politicians.

The triumph of functionalism in University funding is to the extent that David Willets, when Universities and Science minister targeted the eight areas of research to be favoured in government assisted development on the sole criteria of which of then stimulated economic growth. This happened despite the protest of the Royal Society that this could lead to low quality research and a drop in innovation. Furthermore, researchers from the London School of Economics uncovered evidence that governments apply pressure on academics to produce data which coheres with their political expediency (LSE GV314 Group). Also, academic workload being qualitative is more difficult to cost than it is in most professions and this ambiguity allows considerable subjectivity in interpretation of value.

Hence, academics now have to have the marketing skills to lobby politicians and their economic advisors for funding, as well as simultaneously protecting their autonomy by standing up for themselves. They also need to get the ear of private sources. For example, the same year, 2013, the Wellcome Trust announced grants of up to £4.5m to research with “public engagement”, but that all implies a reading by the applicant of how they want to be engaged! Knowing how they want the forms to be filled in is often an art in itself.
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Intelligence gathering
Applying for research funding is a long and laborious process, the form filling, working out of collaborator job descriptions and patents / ownership, and sufficiently accurate costing and budget making alone consumes hours. Proving value for money in terms of the economic efficiency of the project is also required. All of these tasks are made more complicated by the diverse nature of the cross-disciplinary teams who tend to be favoured as offering greater potential innovation and broader impact.

But there are helpful short cuts. Research UK has a website on the criteria of 42,000 successfully funded projects, referring to this data helps keep the applicant up to date on the perceived needs of spenders, which is useful if not time consuming intelligence. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation has a helpful record of advising potential projects from the funder point of view, these range from, not obscuring analysis and methodology by being too detailed over the background, to formatting issues, and to being realistic over timing.

In general, intelligence gathering, together from advice from seasoned colleagues, are essential in successfully negotiating the management skills which are as core to success within contemporary academia a scholarship.

Ethical issues
Funding applications also involve a broad range of ethical issues such as, copyright and patent, data and privacy, plagiarism and intellectual property, conflicts of interests of those with multiple roles, and unintended bias.

The sphere within which the Christian academic now has to exercise integrity has broadening out from the merely intellectual, focusing on rigorous and objective research and teaching, to include business ethics as a result of the
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similar broadening of the whole vacation. Many academics now have to adapt to thinking through business ethics from first principles, not because they are short of morals, but because they chose academia in order to be scholars not businessmen, only for commercial imperatives to have followed them into scholarship.

Impact statement writing

Similarly, many academics, especially in the arts and humanities, were brought up to consider themselves as members of a collegiate team studying a field which has intrinsic inalienable value, rather than individual self-employed businessmen studying something which requires public utility, and struggle with personal fundraising in general and particularly the concept of Impact Statements.

It is in the difficulty in writing of successful Impact Statements that the Christian academics I know have been at their greatest professional vulnerability.

I have heard it said that some impact statements exaggerate or even lie to get funding and a Christian obviously should not do that: but those who do that have a reputation which will catch up on them, and you can also gain a legitimate “edge” by entering into the world of your funder and writing your application through their eyes.

In her book “How to Finance your Research Project: A practical guide to costing research projects and obtaining funding”, Catherine Dawson has a short but useful section on this issue. She states that:

“Funding bodies will require an impact statement that clearly demonstrates the societal and economic benefits to be gained from your research. It should demonstrate how your research will benefit people, communities, industry or
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the environment. Your impact statement should describe the issue or problem, provide an action statement, describe the potential benefits and provide a list of researchers, collaborator and contributors along with their impact activities” (Dawson 2015:128).

Catherine Dawson argues that Impact Statement need to be precise, time table specific and orientated toward the audience. Who are we addressing?

As well as an Impact Statement, a Pathway to Impact attachment is generally required. This needs to address potential exploitation (commercial and non-commercial), the shaping of policy and practice, the application of intellectual assets and outputs and associated communication activities (e.g. workshops, publications, websites, media relations, public engagement activities (past, present and future), collaboration relationships, and roles and responsibilities).

Enjoyment
The one thing that I would like to add is my observation that those who see impact as a joy rather than a chore, are more relaxed, and write better Impact Statements. Why should learning not be fun?

Mary Beard, as well as being a serious scholar, must get so much fun making the joy and relevance of classics assessable to the multitudes rather than an obscure preserve, who can object? If anyone thinks that the classics should be an obscure preserve do they ethically deserve the tax payer to support their hobby?

It’s hard, I know, if paying your rent depends on the Impact Statement being robust enough to secure funding, but the pleasure of seeing your field from the eyes of, say a learning child, is not only a good experience, it also pragmatically helps construct Impact statements that succeed.
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The contemporary academic has to adapt to continually securing his/her funding in a continually more competitive environment, and both with broader economic and ethical demands, and within an attitude of “impact” which is alien to the mentality of a previous age. All this is a real test of resilience and must be mastered.

For reflection

1. How do I live with possible failure and defeat? 3 grade A A levels, a 1st and a P HD only get me to the starting line?
2. If I don’t try to gain an academic career I will always say “if only”. But when does bad time and energy flow after good, as I could be enjoying benefits, a higher salary and even more domestic stability in industry?
3. When does persistence stop and stubbornness begin?
4. Under what circumstances should an exit-strategy start? How long do I plan an alternative path whilst not weakening my resolve to succeed in academia?
Resistance

Careering

Nevertheless, resistance to “mammon” is required, because those with business skills and no business ethics will be a bad witness rather than an absent one!

In the task of preparing Christian academics for the future business skills and ethics are as critical as developing a Christian world view in scholarship. Otherwise, we risk the hypocrisy of producing a generation of Christian thinkers who have a new variation of the sacred-secular split, lauded by churches for the purity and depth of their thought, but despised by colleagues because of their behaviour. Witness is what you do, and how you treat people, more than what you say.

The concept of “Careering” – meaning both the planned, practical construction of a “career” in contemporary academia, and the sometimes erratic navigation required to get there, is investigated thoroughly by Clarke and Knights (Clarke & Knights, 2015). This term has connotations of sacrificing lives on the altars of financial advancement and job security as well as erratic movement across the road. Careering is in deliberate juxtaposition to the ethical construction of a vacation which benefits neighbours as well as the scholar. It is possible, but not always easy, to pursue an academic career without selling out, dabbling in dubious activities and conducting poor but expedient research. And, arguably, safer in the long run, as those who are caught careering have their credibility compromised.
**Resistance**

**Managerialism**

Although Clarke & Knight’s empirical study was restricted to business school there is no reason to not see it as pertinent to varying extents within other faculties. The authors perceive a rapid expansion of “careering” as a definite response to the context of audit, accountability and control brought in by “managerialism,” (control of academia by management rather than peer practitioners) and conclude that rather than effectively resisting this, and securing a more qualitative and less quantitative perception of their work, academics respond to their insecure work environment by opting to “chase the illusory sense of a secure self through “careering”, a frantic and frenetic individualistic strategy designed to moderate the pressures of excessive managerial competitive demands” (Clarke & Knights 2015:2).

It is not easy to resist managerialism. There is both considerable financial pressure applied and the periodic mobilisation of such laudatory terms as accountability, quality and transparency. The irony is that the “tick-box” approach, which generally fosters systematically rewards those academics who **willingly** truncate their work in such a way as to deliver maximum measureable output for the lowest risk and least effort, makes those who can manipulate the rules of the game end up as winners. And much which is published is not even read. A colleague of mine in the humanities recently estimated that it takes most scholars 3-6 months to compose a 25 page document, of which 80% are never cited, and 50% read only by peer reviewers and journal editor. But it can still score in REF! This is surely wasteful. Maybe academics would read and share knowledge more if it was not artificially rushed for premature publication ,and read by those with more time and less” publish or perish” pressure themselves.

One of the most common complaints I have heard over the past three years, is how much sub-standard research which struggles for peer review is funded
Resistance
because it “ticks the boxes” of funding agencies detached from the reality of the field of study, whilst qualitatively better research withers on the vine through lack of funding. The outcome of managerialism can easily become an unpredictable parody of its very intention, as correct assessment becomes invalidated by gamesmanship.

Another contradiction within this process is the research funding exercise reduces and truncates its value to a few finitely measurable criteria, but in such a way that it forces the individual academic to be willing to work unbounded hours and “walk the extra mile” to secure a measurable marginal advantage over the competition. Christian academics need to ensure that the legitimate building of careers does not drift into the state of affairs where both family life and the diversity of a holistic week are being sacrificed on the altar of careerism. Furthermore, the identity of the academic can become fractured by the lack of mutual loyalty between he/her and the institution because such a work culture fosters anomie and dislocation at work as relationships become fractured.

New perspective
This anomie and constant reinvention can arguably corrode character, or at least put it at risk, because individuals need a sense of belonging, coherent personal narratives and a sense of meaningful “craftsmanship” to happily succeed. These things can only be developed over time, whereas post-modern, flexible organisations and their leaders structure the world in such an individualistic way that they discourage the very character qualities which facilitate social cohesion. Such flexible organisations instead offer discontinuous reinvention, the devaluing of permanent “craftsmanship”, the flexible specialisation of production, and the concentration of power even if there is no permanent central location. For there is a lack of temporal attachment to places and things, tolerance of fragmentation and dislocation,
and a willingness to let go of, or even discard the past in the pursuit of a future shaped by vague targets and benefits rather than intrinsic satisfactions. Expediency and immediate problem solving substitute for a stable work identity with a premium of loyalty, commitment and other virtues. The outcome of this nexus can be anomie, less trust between colleagues, and the corrosion of institutional knowledge.

This situation also perfectly describes the present direction of academia. And do the overworked, fractured and narrow make the best enquirers and observers? No, for this is an arguably self-defeating state of affairs. For it is stronger competition between the mutually weakened. The narrowing of what counts in academic life can be so dysfunctional.

Any organisation which spurns people’s loyalty, trust and institutional knowledge pays a heavy price in terms of lack of commitment, especially in hard times when commitment is most needed. Furthermore any problems tend to be conveniently hidden rather than disclosed and dealt with, as employees seek the easiest life in a culture where they feel unrewarded. Meanwhile the transient and potentially expendable workforce live under a cloud of insecurity and purposelessness. A precariat living from pay check to pay check, and not even with the guarantee of that, cannot work to live rather than live to work. If the technology reduces people to commodities to be exchanged and consumed, there is the spiritual and moral problem of a wasted people in a wasted world. This is especially so if the majority cannot fully participate in society due to inequality of power and wealth. Furthermore, if they do not have the income to make regular purchases because their labour has become cheapened or disposed of, low income workers and the redundant are forced to cut spending, which risks recession for all. This is because a capitalism that produces an extensive precariat risks “over-production”, where goods and services are manufactured in cheap
**Resistance**

abundance but remain unsold due to there being insufficient consumers to generate sustainable sales of products.

How can a REF or TEF, or funding score, or even student satisfaction score, calculate the value of a Hall of Residence warden with their children living on campus, whilst integrating their students into one big family? It does not reflect the value of voluntary sacrifices which vocation fosters. You cannot score for that, and it is just one illustration of how a restricted managerial framework can become the enemy of holism in higher education. The self-management of neo-liberal “middle class professionalism” has displaced collegiateism, as young academics take their places in a hierarchy, which is meant to offer linear progression, but seldom does, due to the outcomes of competition and the game playing required to produce the performance criteria which delivers jobs. The concept of college has largely been displaced by the language of “qualispeak”.

Qualispeak says you need to publish four good articles by the deadline and, if you do that you are a good academic, who is rewarded by promotion. If the pattern repeats itself four or five times you have established a good career and eventually become a professor. For, what has recently mattered to the careerist has been 4* publications, that is how to become an achiever. That goal, especially if linked to leading a research group, are the magnets to funders, and it is a general rule these days that those whom spend minimal time on administration and teaching (30% if that) and maximum time reading over their researchers papers and fundraising who progress. Clarke & Knights have demonstrated through extensive interviews with respondents the problems that such a narrow perspective produces. One academic stated that the requirements of REF dominate promotion opportunities:
“[It] just changed everything! You’ve got your equivalent of Ronaldo, Drogba and Messi in the sector – but not as educators, as Researchers. You don’t ever see the great teachers in there…that’s where the divide exists…….Some of it comes from the university…some of it comes from your own desire to do well and improve yourself….to climb the greasy pole…….Every time I do a piece of field work, I’m looking at trying to get another publication out, (thinking) where will it take me when I leave here…There’s an almost Fordist element to publishing, and once the paper’s finished then you are thinking about the next paper…increasingly its beginning to feel like a production line”. (Clarke & Knights 2015:9)

This narrow perspective replaces a more well-rounded engagement. For example, I have spoken with many academics who feel that their “idealism” has been seriously eroded and undermined by the “tick box” culture, and that their focus has been tragically deflected away from the intrinsic value of their teaching and research and toward the imperative of staying on the “greasy poll”.

Academics are encouraged to specialise on 4* publishing alone because that is what engenders “careering”, and devalue criteria which do not currently score to secure funding or promotion. Even the very important, like undergraduate teaching, can be ignored for a season if it distracts energy from today’s contingent objective. I constantly hear complaints by those who have felt over the years that the depth and creativity of their teaching has been inordinately sacrificed on the altar of a few research publications, whose premature submission dates have often been determined by the calendar rather than scholarly factors. Intellectualism itself can be
compromised as academics are forced to be totally instrumental in the content, direction and timing of their research.

It is hoped that the introduction of TEF by the managers will dilute managerialism within academia via the diversification of criteria, for even David Willets the former Education Minister had seen the myopia of narrow research goals leading to some poor but box-ticking research. But this seems to be backfiring and merely providing academics with two clashing and time consuming “cup finals” called REF and TEF. All this adds further stress and “careering” to the profession! And although the “cup final” rules concerning REF are apparently being amended so that in order to allow for the development of junior staff, the faculty publication average per academic is scored rather than that of the individual, there must still be the pressure to reward those who have more publications for “pulling their weight”, as it will put less pressure on the rest of the faculty. Hence this change may practically make little difference.

Sally Hunt further comments that TEF will not reverse the recent casualisation of university employment because:

“If the absence of the academic is striking in TEF proposals, so too is the failure to appreciate how important the underlying employment model pursued by universities is in relation to quality. More than 100,000 teaching staff (more than half of the total) are in insecure employment. The lucky ones of one year contracts, tens of thousands more are on hourly paid contracts and 20,000 more on some form of zero-hours contract. This endemic casualisation, is, in the words of one lecturer I met last week “higher education’s dirty secret” (Hunt, 2016).
Resistance

Although the green paper introducing TEF suggests Universities mentor their staff professionally, the competition between colleges over “student satisfaction”, student retention and graduate employment, can work in opposition to this. For the calculations can lack objectivity (how do you calculate students’ satisfaction correctly?), and being open to false deductions (employment prospects rely on other factors such as connections and social class), Ultimately TEF is overly concerned with maximising profit - and may not even do that. For example, 14% of Overseas students are in the UK, the government sees this as a short-term cash cow - if the TEF score is high fees can be raised, but numbers will go down. This can be as disastrous for long term quality and growth as REF. We have in genesis another functionalist catastrophe with an ironic weakening of future growth.

Therefore, TEF instead of correcting the abuses of an academia dominated by REF scores, will probably end up as another example of managerialist excess, which needs to be critiqued and its abuses resisted.

For reflection

1. How do I chase funding in order to stay in academia without it becoming my measure of value? Is my work both where my heart and funding is?

2. To what extent does my work facilitate my career? Or, does my career determine my research to the extent that I let funders excessively influence both the parameters and interpretation of results?

3. Do I get more preoccupied with how things look than how things are?

4. Do I acquiesce to low level bullying in the workplace or can I ignore or even object to it?

5. Am I ultimately, self-employed, employed by the university or called by God? Who does my work bless? How would I want to be remembered?
Resistance

6. Does my relationship with God allow me to comfortably deal with risk because I am consciously dependent on Him?
Balance resilience and resistance

In the meanwhile, however, what do academics who support a broader perspective do? They have to be resilient enough to play the game whilst offering some resistance - and it is not easy, playing a game which is morally dubious to them. Sometimes there is friction between those who are more holistic and the exclusively career minded. Three separate postdoctoral researchers I have counselled have become very disturbed by how unconcerned their colleagues were with the quality of the education of their students, and mourn the myopia and selfishness of the contemporary careerism. Although the Clarke & Knights study concedes that the overwhelming majority of academics opposed the new managerialism, all were forced into participating, not only those who could be censored for collaboration. Furthermore, there was a counsel of despair as to how to put up anything approaching effective resistance. Clarke and Knights conclude:

“In sum, the majority of our respondents were merely descriptive of the performance demands of new managerialism, while considerably fewer problematised careering as displacing other valuable activities. Fewer still demonstrated a “certain transfiguration” of themselves as…subjects of action and subjects of true knowledge.” (Clarke & Knights 2015:14)

Ultimately most academics, like most people in a fallen environment, will conform in order to circumvent the moral dilemma of acting ethically. They are worn down and passively comply even if they are not in agreement. The rewards of a safe life, publishing what is expected and not “rocking the boat” can be seductive as well as coercive.

Clarke and Knights observations are, for what it is worth, totally coherent with my own experience of visiting academics and offering them professional and pastoral support under the auspices of being a Christian Academic
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Network Travelling Secretary. The examples which can be cited from their research study are often nearly identical to my own testimony, and if I had taped the meetings I have had with academics over coffee over these past three years, the transcripts would form an unerringly comparative corpus. As well as providing me with a valuable reference in an under worked field, which makes their study probably the single source that this work is most reliant on, they have also created a number of marginal decisions as to when to include their examples to back up my own case or when to simply use my own people’s testimony!

Probably the saddest point of agreement between Clarke and Knights Study and my own experience is the universal sense, within the academic community, that the current state of affairs is unsatisfactory but cannot be effectively resisted without the threat of isolation or “martyrdom” for those who rebel against the managerialist position. But is this pessimistic outlook totally correct?

**Parrhesia**

As a basis for resistance to managerialism Clarke and Knights suggest the development of the concept of “parrhesia”- a commitment to tell the truth, despite risks to ourselves (even to our very lives). This, if pursued, has the cost of potentially disrupted relations, with reduced professional support and isolation, as we relate to others in a more embodied and engaged ethical manner. This process would particularly require academics to make themselves vulnerable within a competitive environment, through the admission and exposing of weakness, as well as the capacity to openly question the rules, conventions, customs and habits of managerialism. (2015:17)

Clarke & Knights conclude that against the background of the proliferation and intensification of audit, accountability and capability in universities,
Balance

academics are forced to adapt careerist strategies to survive, which are sometimes legitimized by meritocratic principles or hyper individualism but, nevertheless, still leave an atmosphere of unease. This unease does, however, sow the seeds for the motivation to challenge the status quo when necessary, and forms the basis for *parrhesia*. 
Do we actively resist?

We need to look beyond the materialistic world of modern capitalism and look back to spiritual communities which have been living and working together over the centuries and concerned with qualities such as virtue, altruism, loyalty, commitment and justice.

Religious traditions often facilitate and nurture attachments to people, communities, places and things.

Julian Rivers argues that “expressions of concern about the changing culture of the modern university are not uncommon”. He would like to respond, however, by advocating a return to an “ecclesial vision of scholarly community” within which universities have four concerns, a teaching community, a charismatic community, a sacramental community and a moral community. Within this framework, people must feel that they are “collaborators in a common search for truth, rather than purchasers of a marketable commodity”. Diversity of talent can be celebrated, with a broad range of extra-curricular and voluntary activities, and the ethos is not individualistic or materialistic. Within the latter context there is an element of Danielic exile for those scholars, at least Christian ones, who desire a broader vision (Rivers, 2014). The introduction of TEF assessment provided an opportunity to correct the functionalist quality of higher education but instead it seems set to reinforce it.

Collegial leadership

There was a time when academic institutions were colleges, they had collegial structure and such was the model of its academic leadership. “Collegiality” is a form of academic leadership based on a team of specialists complementing each other’s skills and knowledge, with a presidential figure, or principal, or master, who is there to oversee them, rather than command their fields.
**Do we actively resist?**

Collegial leadership is inclusive and consultative; it is based on the notion of all being open to learning from each other in an atmosphere of discussion. It is not a surprising model for good scholarship to flow from. This would be true whether the objective of good scholarship is seen as the accumulation of wisdom, or knowledge, or even, more recently, the building of persons who will be productive within the economy. Collegial leadership is not confined to academia, but it has traditional roots in colleges.

The functionalism of contemporary managerialism, with its centralised controls and audited reporting and micro-management cannot fail to be the antithesis of this. It is about hierarchically imposed quantitative standards, externally defined goals, and a market based approach, which has at its heart the world of constant restructuring and reinvention, normative redundancy, and an emphasis on incisive action rather than reflection at its core. These are not what traditional scholarship is about. Managerialism’s search for simple solutions within a metric paradigm often clashes with the complexity of the real university, especially when two goals clash. For example, UK universities have been effectively privatised, and made dependent on high student fees rather than government grants for finance, at the very time where extra border controls make it difficult for students to get visas. The result, universities are forced to be dependent on a declining pool of income, which forces them to even further displace qualitative with inappropriate quantitative targets, in order to balance the books. The belt tightening and lack of numbers inevitably leads to the closing of courses or the replacement of experienced with lower paid staff, hence the reputation suffers and the future prospect of recruitment radically declines into a vicious circle which actually contradicts the metricised rationale.

This is not the only contradiction of a managerialist approach. The top-down authority puts weight and pressure on those at the bottom of the pile but arguably leaves the decision makers with the most power comparatively
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unaccountable. Furthermore, metric measurements with little consultation can lead to arbitrary and unintended consequences and be greatly resented. The factional agendas of a team now playing against each other for a larger slice of the complete pie can lead to inertia and obstruction, as opposed to the entrepreneurial spirit which managerialism was supposed to promote, this can ironically shrink the size of the pie which all are scrambling for a larger piece of. For example, it can actually lead to the missing of publication, as the managers miss the nuances of the specialists and their fields, and force them to “back the wrong horses” in the name of short term financial prudence. The constant reinvention of a managed college can lead to the erosion of its “folk knowledge” as the absence of those either made redundant, demoted or marginalized by the detached managers end up being those who know the hidden subtleties of the colleges’ de facto world, and wheels have to be reinvented at an ironically greater economic cost of that of keeping them actively hired. Furthermore, the insecurity of staff can cause an anomie, within which the “minions” feel controlled and without any ownership or loyalty to their institution. This is potentially toxic in terms of HR, and leads to a reluctance by academic staff “to walk the extra mile”, in a way that they would have automatically done, even if it would not have been a contractual obligation, under a more vocationally orientated regime. In plain language, more is done if the person’s heart is in it.

Collegialism - a better way

In other words, collegialism is a better way to run colleges than managerialism in many ways. Even measurable criteria, such as evaluation and work load allocation are arguably best done within this framework as the person who leads as the insider knows what is really going on and “what it really takes”. Academic leadership cannot thrive in the absence of community. The complimentary work of specialists is compromised without fellowship which produces followers not subordinates. This is also why even
Do we actively resist?

though the internet has broadened collaboration beyond those in physical proximity, it is still no substitute for phone, or phone for face-to-face, because of the nuances and feedback that can be missed. Community matters in academia, and those in a dysfunctional department who are not totally compliant can either be put on temporary contracts or effectively ignored until they leave, as notions of inclusive “teamwork” owe more to rhetoric than reality

Academia is also about the discovery and application of new ideas, and such innovation and intellectual flexibility is not aided by torpid organisations. Torpidity does not embrace creativity and it also has a tendency to want to promote a conformity of practice which can tend to want to “clone” its staff and make any myopia worse. It is actually hard to be a more junior manager within this type of management structure, as when distant managers impose on creative people it can only lead to the subordination of those with low morale by those further down the chain with limited budget and low clout, as they themselves are accountable to someone further up the hierarchy.

Collegialism - long term advantages

Collegialism has the long-term advantages, in terms of the form of academic management, even in terms of measurable criteria and adaption to legitimate new targets. A consultative approach simply involves more skills and experience in more people, which helps the organism evolve and be transformed when it has to. It assists in the navigation of the future more than the demand of managerialism for obedience to a narrow range of objectives and the convenience of a few selective “right” answers. In other word collegiate leadership is more effective in terms of the ultimate aims of the university than functionalist micro-management. There are unintended consequences for teaching, research, morale and engagement when the positional authority of managerialism is applied in a way which is not coherent with consultative collegialism. Strategic mistakes occur when
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colleagues are not properly listened to, especially in universities which are a band of mutually symbiotic specialists not a group of identical units. What is required is a more supportive community environment not a redundancy culture of multi-careerism which erodes and destroys the “folk knowledge” of the university. My limited experience of university management is that external managers have a tendency to either believe in the last person they spoke to or be convinced by whoever’s needs are their own needs, and end up effectively misreading the situation. On the other hand, decisions that seem to cut waste may take only a year or two to implement, but the building up of the ecology of the university is a longer task requiring some level of stability within the personnel who operate it. This requires academic leadership rather than management, and the collegiate system has the clear edge.

For most universities leadership now comes from a dominant executive board which expects compliance from a “senate body” which will then impose on committees below. In parallel with this we have seen the rise of dominant charismatic leading academics, whose power to raise funds for themselves and many others is a mixed blessing, as it can lead to conformity, and even low level bullying, as well as financial security for the subordinate. Under the older system, committees framed proposed policy and submitted it to the senate for approval. The reversal of which has eroded both democracy and collegialism in universities as most practitioners are bye-passed.

Collegialism - more coherent with Biblical ethics

The displacement of collegiate leadership with managerialism also came during the end of a time when universities were expanding in both scope and student numbers. University life had also moved from being the preserve of the privileged within elitist private institutions, to being the common life of the educated multitudes, and this was done at the tax payer’s expense. Therefore, it was natural to expect some “value for money”, and not allow
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academics to be self-indulgently following their private tastes outside the social context and what is publicly useful. What has happened, however, is that the managerialist solution to the abuses of academia has caused further problems rather than be a panacea. It would be much better if we could return to a collegiate government, within which academics really showed servant leadership and held each other properly accountable for the stewardship of their use of time to conduct research for the common good as opposed to any selfish private agenda. As well as being the most effective and efficient way of running higher education institutions, collegiate leadership is also more coherent with Biblical ethics because of its emphasis on servanthood and professional discipleship. Both in terms of intrinsic ethics and pragmatic practice we need to return more to academic leadership rather than externally imposed management.

When I did my doctoral studies in the late 80’s I was the Baptist chaplain at both the University and the Polytechnic in the same city. At the time I would have advised any Sixth Former to become an undergraduate at the University rather the Polytechnic of that city. Why? Because of the extra prestige of the University and its higher academic standards? Actually not. Some of that was real, but most of it mythical and course dependent. No, the main reason was that the Polytechnic was run by its bureaucrats whereas, at that time at least, the University was controlled by its professors. Because of that, if you had a problem with your course, your exams, or just general welfare; the difference was between a detached polytechnic bureaucrat exercising procedure and a sympathetic practitioner. As a Chaplain I noticed that pastorally I could always get an empathetic hearing from his or her tutor if representing a sick University student, whereas the Polytechnic would be inflexible. I don’t believe that this dichotomy between ex-Polytechnics managed by managers and Universities being collegiate has survived, nor that it was as universally apt as in this local situation, but it did lead me to actively oppose the imposition of managerialism in the local National Health Service.
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Practitioners simply know best, and I would rather trust the consultant or matron to run things, even if like professors they could get “high and mighty”. And part of my pastoral advice to an early career academic today would be to see whether the institution you are applying to work at is on the collegiate spectrum and not functional managerial as a serious criteria concerning the jobs you go for, for you will be happier, less stressed and better supported at the former.

For reflection

1. Do I react to hierarchy by pandering to superiors and showing a lack of respect to subordinates? Do I sacrifice teaching quality on the altar of publishing deadlines?
2. Do I find it difficult to be vulnerable and admit mistakes to colleagues?
3. Can I see weakness in others without adopting a fault finding mentality?
4. Do I feel there is a lack of loyalty between the university and I and how does that make me feel? Have I a trusted mentor for when I need one?
5. Do I make colleagues react to me s a Christian purely on the basis of my world view or are they aware of some virtue behind it?
6. Do I really support both colleagues and students in my community?
7. Do I stand up to the belittling or plagiarism of junior staff at work?
**Jesus centred approach**

**Jesus Centred Approach**

It is my conviction that the selective resistance of the Christian scholar to managerialism in Universities and Colleges is an essential way we can be “salt and light”. By doing so, as salt we add value and act as disinfectant, and as a source of light, we can help facilitate both revelation and life itself. Standing up for values of collegialism and community are an essential part of this project. But there is more.

Mabey et al believe that Christian applications to spirituality at work (SAW) and spiritual leadership theory (SLT) should be particularly pertinent to “dealing with the ego and closing the gap between what we say and what we do. The more we understand about the dynamics of human nature, the more we know about the profundity of Jesus’s teachings” (Mabey, Conroy, Blakeley, & de Marco, 2016). They advocate a Jesus Centred approach to leadership which primarily asks what the Jesus of History would do and say and have us do and say in a specific local situation.

This is because Jesus-centred leadership (JCL) can specifically address the way that so-called spiritual approaches within SAW and SLT can be misappropriated for selfish instrumental purposes, and operate as another counterfeit form of managerialism rather than producing an authentic alternative. This phenomenon was comprehensively documented in Tourish’s “The Dark Side of Transformative Leadership” (Tourish, 2013), which critically established the extent to which SAW and SLT systems could become self-serving for the operative. It can hence be just as monocultural and instrumental in its outcome. In fact, there is little which is more manipulative, than the high minded being colonized by the self-serving, because dissent to it can be framed as traitorous rather than noble. Followers are ultimately expected to conform to a “spiritual ideology” which is just as convenient for the operative as the managerialism it replaces. Jesus,
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himself, was constantly taking on the Pharisaic systematises, those who advocated the contemporary, SAW and SLT, for producing high minded coherent theory which did not help the practice of everyday life.

Mabey et al then “propose a number of ways in which Jesus centred ethical leadership can be practiced. Each is radical and each implies risk: both the personal risk of inner renewal arising from repentance as a doorway to personal integrity, as well as the risk of opposing unethical practices and by promoting the excellence of core practices in the workplace” (Mabey, Conroy, Blakeley, & de Marco, 2016).

JCL is a more nuanced approach, which follows the example of an individual rather than adopts of system of thought which can become corrupted by the harsh realities of academic business life. This gives it more potential to develop personal integrity in order to counteract the “dark side of leadership” (Mabey, Conroy, Blakeley, & de Marco, 2016). By moving from an historical system of theory like SAW or SLT, to down to earth personal examples, JCL is more transparent and less open to abuse. In Matthew 5 and 6, the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus counteracts “the world’s obsession with material success” with “love for the neighbour and solidarity with the oppressed……by placing humility, integrity, kindness, forgiveness, peace and love, as core values, at the centre of the Christian life”. This praxis is active rather than a form of solace, and is aimed at the powerful as well as the powerless. And the Kingdom of God is primarily for the poor who can enter it with considerable more ease. This is not an “ideological apologia” which provides conformity and compliance. Furthermore, Jesus is prepared to deal in his parables and case studies with how “gritty, bewildering, torturous and ambiguous” life can be. Arguably, following Jesus helps address these hard edge issues rather than providing a “spiritually attired” parody of the modernist managerialism, which is no less instrumental and seeks to make more money which is its ultimate measure of value. If the maximization of
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profit is the objective, who cares if Milton Freidman, a new age guru or a prosperity preacher is your model? There is no self sacrifice in self help, therefore it is void of ethical potency. Morality must drive economic activity not the other way around. Jesus arguably sees “his teaching a reliance on wisdom rather than wealth, a compassion for others as against selfish ambition”. (Mabey, Conroy, Blakeley, & de Marco, 2016)

One aspect of Jesus’ teaching which Mabey et al are particularly interested in is the emphasis on personal transformation as a prerequisite for ethical behaviour; the immoral cannot expect to inculcate morality, no matter how clear their code. This provides a praxis for avoid the manipulation of the expectation to adapt everything they possess, body and soul, in order to favour the organisation. This does not happen to anything near the same extent when people are privately moral before implementing public morality (Mabey, Conroy, Blakeley, & de Marco, 2016). Jesus does not teach us to be “spiritual individuals: he teaches us to be spiritual individuals, who are rooted in Christ’s teaching, will embody love, integrity and service, in all we do without having to advertise our spiritual credentials”. (Mabey, Conroy, Blakeley, & de Marco, 2016)

One of the most important elements which the teaching of Jesus applies to spiritual leadership is “Dealing with the Ego”, which concerns “lower levels of moral development when the individual seeks self-gratification, vigorously promotes its self- interest and generally lacks empathy, self- control, humility or self-sacrifice”. This requires metanoia, often translated as repentance, but this can miss the transformative nuance of a deep transformation from inside out. It is rooted in the relationship with God Himself (Matthew 19v25-26). The Holy Spirit is the plausibility structure which germinates the growth of personal integrity, honesty and other qualities this transformation entails. It does not come from an act of the human will but by rootedness in Gods Spirit (John 6v63).
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Similarly, advocates of JCL see the “Reducing of the Credibility Gap” between the hopes and track record of both SAW and SLT as being possible through Jesus’s concept of servant leadership as opposed to the image of the especially enlightened one who must be followed for the benefit of all. If servanthood is it is as core to the “virtue-led” as it is in JCL it protects from self-aggrandisement.

Six practical implications of Jesus Centred leadership

Mabey et al argue for six practical implications from how Jesus centred leadership can transform the ethical leadership of organizations.

1. Firstly, it should lead to “Questioning Dubious Practice Rather Than Staying Silent”. This mode of servant leadership should lead to the active listening to consent rather than the primacy of transmitting insight one way to conformist followers.

2. It should also facilitate “The Embracing of Work as Calling Rather than a Job”. This is because JCL works at grassroots by seeing the job more as part of a whole way of life rather than as an instrument to obtain isolated objectives.

3. It should have such as strong element of vocation that there is no longer a split between the public and the private sphere. As well as preaching the word Jesus modelled this redemptive work to his followers during his ministry by feeding the hungry, welcoming the stranger, clothing the poor, tending the sick, and releasing captives; He stated that healing relationships, reconciling enemies, and bringing peace to that troubled earth was part of their community mandate.

4. This brings theological thinking into the workplace and breaks the sacred-secular divide at the level of managerial
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operation. This is because “Jesus instructs his followers to not only enjoy the benefits of work but to use them for the growth and development of themselves and those around them”, to triumph worship and service at work over drudgery.

5 Furthermore, JCL involves “Maintaining Ethical Purpose Rather than Bowing to Market Pressure”. This is because loyalty and rule governed action is not as prone to be corrupted in a vocational workplace where there is an attitude of “what you do is what you are, and what you win people with you win people to”. A JCL enterprise is less likely to capitulate to dubious marginal profiteering with this communitarian concern at the core.

6 Finally, JCL necessitates “Being Transformed Internally Rather than Regulated Externally”.

There is a real tendency for firms to respond to amendments in regulative regimes by merely shifting the short term instrumental objectives to the ticking of other boxes, as gamesmanship is the natural response to changes in the rules of the game. But JCL must, of necessity, put core values such as fairness, compassion and commitment above the interim accounts. (Matthew 23v24). This, again, will only ever happen if the “individual repents and allows the inner transformation of the Holy Spirit. All this would appear to put JCL practitioners at a political and competitive disadvantage, if there is not a God who nourishes it! (Mabey, Conroy, Blakeley, & de Marco, 2016). This demonstrates just how much more JCL eschews a narrow functionalist instrumentalism than SLT or SAW does. Mabey et al conclude that “By reflecting on the person of Jesus, we see how his teachings and example speak incisively—and sometimes uncomfortably—across the centuries to the heart of ethical leadership and business ethics. Perhaps, surprisingly, they call for radical non-conformity, as he wants to risk the inner renewal
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arising from its experience as a doorway to personal integrity, often demonstrated by a willingness to be self-sacrificial. Then, a further stage of risk taking in the workplace, not in order to protect or increase personal or organizational capital, status or power, but to counter malpractice, to embrace work as a vacation, to think theologically, to ensure ethical purpose and to protect the excellence of core practice” (Mabey, Conroy, Blakeley, & de Marco, 2016)

**Wisdom**

The pre-existence of Jesus is one of the most neglected fields of Christology and is uniquely precious to me. It states in Proverbs 8: 22-36, that wisdom is God’s master craftsman or chief architect in the creation of the universe. That it was bought forth “before His deeds of old. That wisdom was appointed before eternity, from before the world began”. This wisdom “set the boundaries in place, and delighted in its work as it marked out the foundations”. Wisdom was face to face with God before there was any creation and the creation of everything was done through wisdom and by wisdom.

This co-existence of wisdom alongside God in eternity raises an interesting theological question which is as simple as it is profound. If wisdom exists before time and space is it part of the creator rather than creation? Does wisdom therefore relate to the Father of the universe as His ontological equal? Within Judaism there has been an obvious historical emphasis on an indivisible monotheism, but even here there has been philosophical speculation about wisdom as being emanations from God, which may be embodied in the form of the Messiah. The concept of the Messiah as a philosopher king who through receiving God’s Shekinah presence becomes the personification of wisdom is a core Messianic theme, and probably the closest rabbinical thought has got to conceding the possibility of a divine Messiah.
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The New Testament has, however, gone much further than this. Paul and John both consciously made Jesus the embodiment of divine, pre-existent, Messianic wisdom. In Colossians Jesus is the *eikon*, the exact copy, of the invisible God. The *protokos*, in the sense of being a distinct prototype of humanity, since He was seated in heaven before the creation of Adam. For “by Him all things were created, things in heaven and earth, visible and invisible, or powers, or rulers, or authorities, all things were created by Him and for Him. He is before all things and in Him all things hold together. And he is the head of the Church body, he is the beginning, and the firstborn from among the dead, so that in everything He may have supremacy. For God was pleased to have all the fullness dwell in Him”. (Col 1v13-18). This theme of Jesus as having the grandeur of divinity, does however turn towards Jesus’s character as also being the embodiment of humility as He reconciles a fallen creation to Himself by “making peace through his blood, shed on the cross” (Col 1v20). In Philippians, Paul continues this theme, stressing that the modesty of Christian disciples should model that of Jesus, who although he was in very nature God, or, alternatively, having the same *morphe* of the Father, which in colloquial English would mean having the same substance or stuff” (Philippians 2v6), did not grasp his equality (or regard it as an act of illicit robbery), but instead emptied Himself, taking the form of an unknown servant and dying on the cross. (vs 6-8). Furthermore, it is Jesus’s own humility, ultimately demonstrated on the cross, which leads to His greatest triumph, when his Father exalts Him to the highest place, and gave Him the name that is above all Names, that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, in heaven, and earth, and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (vs 9-11). If we emulate Jesus humility, we are to shine like stars. In our celebrity culture we often want everyone and everything to resolve around us, something which, when all do the same, leads to strange orbits and planetary collisions. But we all
Jesus centred approach

have orderly orbits around Jesus, who both created and redeemed the cosmos, and who stands in the middle as the measure of all things.

John also writes of Jesus as the man from beyond the beginning in both his theological prologues. In John’s gospel we have “in the beginning was the Logos- a Greek word nuanced with active wisdom!

And that this wisdom was both alongside God the Father and just like him (John 1v1). Furthermore, through the Logos all things were made, and nothing was made without it. The Logos alone creates life, and is the creative light which establishes that life. He is energy. (vs 6-9) Finally the Word took flesh and dwelt among us- Jesus the Messiah is the embodiment of Wisdom. (v14) In 1 John 1v1, the apostle further adds that “That which is from the beginning (an allusion to genesis) which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked at, and which our hands have touched, we proclaim concerning the Word of Life”. Jesus, pre-existent wisdom, has responded to sinners breaking his universe, by humbly coming to earth to fix it at the expense of His own death, and He can be heard, seen, gazed at and even touch- for he offers intimacy as well as greatness.

For many years, the pre-existence of Jesus as Wisdom, and his embodiment as Messiah has been an inspiration to me. It has also had a pragmatic relevance in both witnessing to my fellow Jews as well as Muslims, for it has offered a more direct and tangible expression to them of how Jesus can be divine, than the doctrine of the Trinity, something which, although true and precious, even Christians struggle to comprehend. The Lord, however, does like to shine new light through old windows, and since focusing on ministry within the academy over the past three years, a whole new application of this theme has emerged.
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It should be a particular source of encouragement, comfort and inspiration for the Christian academic, in particular, to be consciously aware of the fact that everything that we study, research and teach was created by, through and for, the Jesus that we are in personal relationship with. Please sit back, relax and think of it - Christian academics are investigating the world which the person they walk with made at the creation of time and space. What a joy and privilege to look at the building in the company of the architect!

**Practical implications**

What are the practical implications of that being true?

*Delighting in our discipline:*

First of all, it should allow us to more easily keep academia in perspective. Academics are in the business of knowledge: research is its acquisition and teaching is its conveyance. We should surely delight in our discipline but beware of making it an idol.

**Application**

Knowledge is not the be all and end all. What did Solomon ask for to his credit - Wisdom? The correct use and application of knowledge is a major aspect of wisdom, and it can make all the difference between knowledge blessing as benefit, or it being irrelevant, or in the wrong hands harmful. We should worship our creator not his creation, likewise, we value understanding wisdom before comprehending the world that he creates. In order to do this, it can only help if we keep prayer close to our research and teaching rather than see it in a detached and separate compartment. This is something I feel strongly about from experience.

**Prayer life**

I concede that if ministers are batsmen and academics bowlers I have always been a batsman who can bowl rather than a bowler who can bat. My
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“academic career” consists of teaching undergraduates and being a dean, and I have never researched beyond one short postdoctoral project. But although I have not written nearly as often as most in academia, I can confidently say that every thesis and publication consists of blood, sweat, tears and a one or two essential bursts of creative, original thought. And an active prayer life with Jesus must give us an edge in delighting Him by discovering and expressing them! Prayer can turn study into worship.

Character
It is important to have the character as well as the insight that comes from Jesus. Academic life is becoming increasingly more competitive and funding becomes tighter, and we will increasingly be faced with collaborating with colleagues one day and fighting for the same pot of gold, in the knowledge that the loser may have their career “culled” or “curtailed” the next. How do we approach this in God’s grace? Did Daniel adopt the career methodology of Babylon? In his days it was not so much publish or perish as prophesy or perish! Did Daniel and his team respond to the brutality of court life by being even more cut-throat than his competitors, no, at times he even demonstrated the Wisdom of Jesus by endeavouring to bless his opposition. We can so easily have our character tainted by the harsh professional climate of the contemporary world, and Universities are not immune from this, but we are called to be salt and light instead.

Street-wise - not nasty
Christian academics increasingly need to know how to be street-wise and not nasty, to be as wise as serpents and harmless as doves. How did Daniel pull this off? His relationship with the Lord was so intimate, his life so dependent on the Almighty, and his prayer life so close to his discipline, that he survived and thrived through that divine inspiration which active spirituality can ignite in a field of knowledge. As some departments become more ideologically antagonistic toward the gospel we need to raise up young academics like
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Daniel! These are those who trust in God, and can outrun their colleagues who try to trust self and rely on trying to impress others rather than have the Wisdom of Jesus impress them.

This will require a certain level of social skills and emotional intelligence, which can be essential compliments, as the future of Christians in universities may rely as much as them having to read situations and people as it does articles and data. In order to discover how to secure funding and get published, as well as witness to the perceived inconvenient truth of the gospel without losing friends and not influencing people, Christians will need to rely on the Wisdom of Jesus to guide their insight and decision making on all kinds of levels, as did Daniel in the University of Babylon! Because the academic career in every subject, discipline and college is variable, there is no panacea to be found. Mentors should be found to guide early career academics through the landscape, and training in how to be a self-employed businessman seriously sought, since we still don’t know how far the privatisation of British Universities will go, and we need to think as entrepreneurs and not count so much on institutional loyalty in a mobile and financially insecure world. But ultimately, there is no substitute for what Jesus reveals to the individual about their own life and subject when they are in prayer! The professional challenges of the vocation Christian academics have loved and embraced, coupled with its mobility and financial insecurity could make many of our people anxious. Nevertheless, it is not wise to pay interest on tomorrow troubles. Jesus implores us to cast our anxiety on Him and he will give us a light yoke and carry our burden (Matt 11v28). This is simple but not easy for us!
Evangelism and how we shape our disciplines for Christ

Two final implications of being face to face with Jesus, the Wisdom who created our universe is how it can impact both our evangelism and how we shape our disciplines for Christ.

Thirteen people I have had the joy and privilege of seeing find Jesus over the past four years have been academics. What their conversion stories have in common was that something pertinent was revealed to them, either “prophetically” about their personal life or within the discipline which is their vocation. Although they all had Christian friends who could elegantly and thoroughly construct a Christian world view, and frequently did, all of them had a tendency to switch-off from Christian apologetics as the transmission of “inconvenient truth which could be delayed for consideration until later” until something was revealed which really mattered. The Christians in their colleges were effectively talking apologetics amongst themselves until the profoundly personal challenged the spiritual allegiance of those outside their circle.

I would like to be clear at this point about not being anti-apologetics, Christians always need to think clearly and in depth and I would hate to be misread as advocating the abandonment of giving reason for our hope. I am saying that apologetics are necessary but usually not sufficient. For it is only when the personally pertinent is brought to bear that they have effect and are energised. Sometimes this game changing breakthrough is in the life of the individual, as their Christian friend’s relationship with Jesus the embodiment of wisdom, brings something critically life changing into the equation. This insight often relates to the field of study of the person and/or their Christian colleague.
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If Jesus is the embodiment of all wisdom and we are face to face with him in our daily walk it should help us find the original, creative, and yet academically grounded within our disciplines. Why not?

Please forgive any simplification from a non-specialist, but I am told that Faraday discovered electro-magnetic fields, because unlike his contemporaries who were looking for mechanics, he could contemplate a parallel with the Holy Spirit who can act at a distance. Let that be an inspiration for us all!

I hope in grounded vision rather than fantasy, of a generation of Christian Daniels whose distinctly Christian work can get publications and funding, and witness, but they not be regarded by their professors as awkward, because they have insight in critical and beneficial fields of their discipline. They are seen as connected to the heart of their discipline rather than perceived as leading a distracting theological assault on it.

Andrew Basden, my colleague within C-A-N-, has written an excellent booklet called “Shaping Our Disciplines for Christ”. This presentation starts with laying a foundation of Intuitive awareness within the discipline, discusses perspectives and missing pieces within the discipline, which sets up a dialogue on how uniquely Christian thought can creatively contribute to those perspectives in order to make a more whole picture, and finishes with guidance as to who could either collaborate with or be particularly blessed by this process. In conjunction with deep prayer to Jesus the embodiment of wisdom, this rigorous approach will yield the quality of insight which could challenge a colleague, lead to a quality publication, help find a grant, give us a secure voice in our department, or just bless people by pushing good knowledge forward.

For reflection
1. How visible am I as a disciple of Jesus within my department? If on trial as a Christian would there be enough evidence to convict me?

2. Jesus is the embodiment of wisdom and the chief engineer of the universe. How conscious am I of this and does it excite me?

3. Do I keep my research life adjacent to my prayer closet. If not, why not?

4. Jesus wants to reveal the secrets of his handiwork to me. Do I feel this joy and do I give Him credit for what I find?

5. Does my relationship with Jesus inspire my work. Or is it incidental?

6. What can my discipline inform me about the qualities of Jesus and how He works?

7. Does my academic career know boundaries? Or, is it in danger of becoming my idol

8. Do I put my family /significant-others under excessive demands for the sake of my career? And if they miss out on anything how do I provide for them in alternative ways?

9. Is my church/work life balanced?

10. Does my pastor either put me on a pedestal or feel threatened by my analytical skills? How can I help rectify this?

11. Can I enjoy home if my workplace is transitory?
Final story

I would like to share one final story from John 8. Jesus has been claiming to both forgive sin and fulfil the law and He is brought a woman who is caught in adultery. Should the guilty die? The man is suspiciously missing, (maybe on a legal technicality by claiming he thought he was taking a concubine).

Maybe it is all a hostile set up by Jesus’s enemies ask whether they should stone her or not. The implied trap, is if we release her, your soft on crime and don’t fulfil the law; but if we stone her you can’t forgive sin! Jesus bends and starts to write. Maybe a bible verse, or possibly her name and crime as required at a place of execution in the Roman Empire. He then stops and says that he without sin can cast the first stone, no-one can, so they evaporate from the most experienced downwards, until, Jesus, the only one who could convict, acquits the solitary woman. Jesus actually escapes the trap by going out of the box; he never tries to answer or argue with the question he is asked, but, instead, goes well beyond it for the creative and inspired insight which answers the dilemma.

I pray that we expropriate such wisdom from Jesus the embodiment of Wisdom itself
Summation

It is my conviction that only the revelation of the wisdom of Jesus can fully prepare the contemporary young Christian academic to navigate the current maze of academic life.

I believe we also need to recognize how managerialism, initially introduced to deal with abuses of indulgence and pride within our vacation has had serious unintended consequences. By promoting quantity over quality it has encouraged a “tick box culture”, which values quantitative and short term targets, which downplays values such as creativity, innovation and quality. It also threatens the collegial style of leadership and reduces vocation to “careerism”. Academia has become more individualistic, competitive and even brutal under its regime. And Christian academics have to adapt to being under its rule, rather than deny the fact and imagine the past. Our emerging scholars need to develop both the qualities of resistance and the skills of a self-employed businessman in order to survive there. Nevertheless, the dysfunctional tendencies of managerialism make selective resistance a required Christian response.

We should encourage the rebuilding of collegiality, and the broader virtues as we apply the wit and wisdom of Jesus to our working lives. This way of crossing the secular-sacred divide is at least as pertinent as the construction of a Christian world view, but it is the “elephant ion the room” that is seldom discussed. Managerialism, as an issue, is ignored by most seasoned Christian academics, either because they were established under the old regime and don’t personally feel the changes, or because of a desire to not “rock the boat”, either because it suits them to, or more likely, they can’t see a way out of the current situation and “grin and bear” it. Nevertheless, the impact of managerialism on academia is live and urgent issue which requires a
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specifically Christian response. In this “dog eat dog” would what would Jesus stand for? The case of the woman caught in adultery shows how He would stand for the weak and compromised rather than abandon them. He also loved all, rather than decided to personalise or hate His enemies. The dean or vice-chancellor looks like an obsessive of prestige projects to some early career academics I know. But put yourself in his shoes, if that is what it takes for adequate central funding to be secured would you not do it too?

I think that humility rather than pride is a necessary quality in resisting self-aggrandisement; you have to be able to demonstrate the opposite. This humility in a culture of self-marketing has obvious risks. But in our working life we need to be distinctly Christian in our behaviour, exhibiting the fruits of the Holy Spirit behind enemy lines when not expedient (Galatians 5v13-20).

A friend of mine has a picture on his office wall, of an Anabaptist saving the pursuer who wanted to arrest and burn him, from drowning in a frozen lake, to remind him to love opponents and enemies. Our behaviour in this situation needs to also be this counter-cultural. This is a risk that requires courage, for its always costly to pursue the intrinsically valuable over short term outcome in a myopic culture. But it is sub-Christian to let our research, teaching, or treatment of others, be tainted by a lack of virtue.

So if we are called to the academy, we must trust the Lord with the consequences of our selective resistance.

I think that the key to selective resistance is to promote virtue, and to emphasize the acquisition and transmission of knowledge and the development of working skills, as objectives of university life. In this project the integrity of our lives is even more critical than the coherence of our thinking.
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However, in the meantime, it would also be foolish to not learn the resilience and business skills that boost the prognosis of success. Providence does not reward folly.

Academia has become so much a business that those who successfully function within it have to be business like, as well as resilient, and they also need to act ethically in competitive situations. Business skills and ethics are becoming as important as scholarship in contemporary academia, both are necessary to sustain a career or vocation.

To rank scholarship as the sole cardinal criteria is to ask a car to run with an engine and no wheels-managerialism has ensured that the vehicle does not move without both scholarship and business skills. However, to stop “careering” an ethical dimension needs to be added to point the car in the proper direction.

In order to navigate the necessity of being business-like without being seduced by business as an idol it is essential that the Christian academic have both a well-rounded world view and a deep relationship with Jesus who is our fount of wisdom. That daily encounter with Jesus can lift a person out of the drudge of functionalism, and keep academia focused on that which gives purpose and meaning. This relationship with Jesus can retain the attractiveness of academia for the Christian as both a worth whilst vocation and a wholesome way of providing for both them and their family. Encountering the wisdom of Jesus helps us both understand His creation and apply that knowledge constructively, and it grants us an exciting vocation, as we experience the transformation of the Holy Spirit in such a way as to overcome the tick-box mentality around us.

For reflection

1. Do I shape my discipline for Christ or does my discipline shape me?
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2. Am I the academic and I the Christian two unrecognizable people? Do they ignore each other or are they at peace?

3. How integrated is my Christian world view with the practice of my discipline? Do they ignore each other or are they at peace?

4. Can I challenge secular paradigms within my subject without needless belligerence? Do I know how to?

5. Have I an active and well-formed Christian world view? If neglected what fences need to be repaired or built?

6. Have I a valid Christian critique of my whole subject?
Some questions

These are some questions which I have asked postdocs over the past three years and they have formed the background for this booklet. They are posed throughout the document but you may want to review them corporately at the end.

Jesus and Academia

1. How visible am I as a disciple of Jesus within my department? If on trial as a Christian would there be enough evidence to convict me?
2. Jesus is the embodiment of wisdom and the chief engineer of the universe. How conscious am I of this and does it excite me?
3. Do I keep my research life adjacent to my prayer closet. If not, why not?
4. Jesus wants to reveal the secrets of his handiwork to me. Do I feel this joy and do I give Him credit for what I find?
5. Does my relationship with Jesus inspire my work. Or is it incidental?
6. What can my discipline inform me about the qualities of Jesus and how He works?

The Basis of Contemporary Academia- Competition

1. How do I live with possible failure and defeat? 3 grade A A levels, a 1st and a P HD only get me to the starting line?
2. If I don’t try to gain an academic career I will always say “if only”. But when does bad time and energy flow after good, as I could be enjoying benefits, a higher salary and even more domestic stability in industry?
3. When does persistence stop and stubbornness begin?
4. Under what circumstances should an exit-strategy start? How long do I plan an alternative path whilst not weakening my resolve to succeed in academia?
Some questions

5. How do I ethically compete with someone for the same funding one minute and co-operate with them in research the next?
6. Despite the competitiveness of academia am I still comfortable in my work environment? What can I do to build healthier relationships with colleagues?

The Praxis of Contemporary Academia: Instrumentalism

1. How do I chase funding in order to stay in academia without it becoming my measure of value? Is my work both where my heart and funding is?
2. To what extent does my work facilitate my career? Or, does my career determine my research to the extent that I let funders excessively influence both the parameters and interpretation of results?
3. Do I react to hierarchy by pandering to superiors and showing a lack of respect to subordinates? Do I sacrifice teaching quality on the altar of publishing deadlines?
4. Do I find it difficult to be vulnerable and admit mistakes to colleagues?
5. Can I see weakness in others without adopting a fault finding mentality?
6. Do I feel there is a lack of loyalty between the university and I and how does that make me feel? Have I a trusted mentor for when I need one?
7. Do I get more preoccupied with how things look than how things are?
8. Do I acquiesce to low level bullying in the workplace or can I ignore or even object to it?
9. Do I make colleagues react to me s a Christian purely on the basis of my world view or are they aware of some virtue behind it?
10. Am I ultimately, self-employed, employed by the university or called by God? Who does my work bless? How would I want to be remembered?
Some questions

11. Does my relationship with God allow me to comfortably deal with risk because I am consciously dependent on Him?
12. Do I really support both colleagues and students in my community?
13. Do I stand up to the belittling or plagiarism of junior staff at work?

The Broader Perspective: Academia and Life

1. Does my academic career know boundaries? Or, is it in danger of becoming my idol?
2. Do I put my family/significant others under excessive demands for the sake of my career? And if they miss out on anything how do I provide for them in alternative ways?
3. Is my church/work life balanced?
4. Does my pastor either put me on a pedestal or feel threatened by my analytical skills?
5. How can I help rectify this?
6. Can I enjoy home if my workplace is transitory?

The Gospel and Academia

1. Do I shape my discipline for Christ or does my discipline shape me?
2. Am I the academic and I the Christian two unrecognizable people? Do they ignore each other or are they at peace?
3. How integrated is my Christian worldview with the practice of my discipline? Do they ignore each other or are they at peace?
4. Can I challenge secular paradigms within my subject without needless belligerence? Do I know how to?
5. Have I an active and well-formed Christian worldview? If neglected what fences need to be repaired or built?
6. Have I a valid Christian critique of my whole subject?
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