

MAKING EU STAFF WELCOME
IN A HOSTILE POLICY
ENVIRONMENT: HUMAN
RESOURCE STRATEGIES IN UK
HIGHER EDUCATION

Luthra, Renee R
UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary | 2 |
| Motivation and Research Question..... | 2 |
| Methodology..... | 2 |
| Findings and Conclusions | 3 |
| Policy Recommendations and Dissemination Plans | 3 |
| Acknowledgements | 4 |
| Context | 5 |
| <i>Employer Response</i> | 5 |
| <i>Employee Response</i> | 6 |
| Methodology | 8 |
| <i>Higher Education Institutions</i> | 8 |
| <i>Data Collection and Analysis</i> | 8 |
| Selected Findings | 9 |
| <i>Staff Interviews</i> | 9 |
| <i>Interviews with Management</i> | 11 |
| Concluding Comments | 15 |
| Policy Recommendations | 16 |
| Dissemination Plans | 17 |
| <i>Completed Outputs</i> | 17 |
| References and Footnotes | 17 |

Executive Summary

Motivation and Research Question

Brexit is the political issue of the moment in the UK. Yet while there is a multitude of writing about the attitudes and perceptions that brought the Referendum vote to pass (Goodwin and Milazzo, 2017; Hobolt, 2016; Mckenzie, 2017), we are only just now able to see the consequences of the vote for UK residents. On the one hand, there has been a great deal of media attention about the reactions of EU nationals to the vote and their general dissatisfaction with the way the government has responded. On the other hand, a large grey literature is emerging which documents the risks posed by Brexit to a range of UK industries, in particular challenges faced by employers who rely on EU labourⁱ. While the terms of the UK's exit from the EU remain uncertain at the time of writing, there has not yet been any empirical analysis linking the two: how do employers who rely on EU labour react to an uncertain policy environment that is hostile to migration, and how does this response match the response and concerns of EU employees?

The goal of this project was to address this question, by systematically examining the concerns and expectations of EU staff alongside the concerns and action plans of senior management at three institutions in a sector highly reliant on EU labour: higher education. As a sector that is still adjusting to privatisation, UK higher education provides a particularly interesting case for understanding how restrictionist, conservative migration policies, which challenge commercial interests, are handled by local institutions which vary in the degree to which they are constrained by those interests.

Methodology

For this study I interviewed 31 EU academic and professional staff, alongside 6 members of senior management, to examine responses, expectations, and plans in response to the Referendum vote. My goal was to examine variation in response between academic and professional employees, as variation in response by management at institutions of differing levels of prestige and internationalization. Sociologists have long known that national policies are mediated, implemented, and resisted by local level actors (Lipsky, 1971; Pressman and Wildavsky, 1984), with the result that there is tremendous variation in the lived experiences of policy across institutions and geographic locations. (Jørgensen, 2012; Marrow, 2009). The response to the Referendum vote is precisely one such arena that, while under the

jurisdiction of national governance, can be differentially experienced within and across specific institutions.

Findings and Conclusions

Similar to this existing research on the response of local administrators, my interviews reveal the impact of perceptions of professional and institutional mission, as well as economic demands, on the concerns and response plans reported by university management and the experiences of EU employees.

Among EU employees, perceptions of the commercialization of the sector as a whole and their overall experience of the staff-management relationship (Nixon, 1996) strongly shaped their perception of their employers' Brexit response. EU academics from countries with more traditional, state funded, autonomously managed higher education systems expected more, and were more dissatisfied, with the Brexit response of management at their Universities than EU employees from countries with weaker higher education sectors or working in professional services.

Differences in the response to Brexit among University management can be understood as a response to economic imperatives as well as symbolic concerns. The highest prestige University was, contrary to expectation, more concerned than the less prestigious institutions with the potential ramifications of Brexit for staff recruitment and retention and most proactive in internal and external efforts to mitigate those risks. This greater concern could be understood within the logic that higher prestige, more research active Universities have more fully adopted a neo-liberal employment model, which relies on ready access to the EU to fulfil short term labour contracts on discrete grant projects.

Policy Recommendations and Dissemination Plans

I conclude this report with policy recommendations and academic and non-academic dissemination plans.

Acknowledgements

My first thanks go to the late Thomas Hippler, who was a prominent researcher in international management and who had the original idea for this project. Thomas was co-investigator on this award but was sadly diagnosed with an aggressive brain tumour before we went into field. His ideas are present throughout the work and I am grateful for the time we were able to spend together.

I would like to thank the Society for Research into Higher Education for supporting this research. This support allowed me to combine my interests in higher education and migration policy and to shed light on the ways that employers can support EU employees in this time of tremendous uncertainty. My results were surprising to me, especially the importance of the commercialization of higher education in the lives of EU academic and professional staff as well as the variation I found in response across different universities. I hope that my research will help higher education institutions to continue to support, retain, and recruit the best and the brightest academics whatever their nationalities.

I also extend my thanks to the following individuals for providing helpful comments on my interview guide and on earlier drafts of my work:

Tina Haux, University of Kent

Katy Wheeler, University of Essex

Laurie James-Hawkins, University of Essex

Erin Hamilton, University of California at Davis

Kate Choi, University of Western Ontario

I am very thankful for their time, insights and recommendations at both the development stages of the project and on written drafts.

Finally, I want to thank my interviewees for their generosity with their time in participating in this project. Learning more about the professional and personal lives of university employees in many different roles was the most enjoyable part of the work.

Context

While not an immigration policy in itself, the decision to leave the European Union created tremendous uncertainty about the future rights of EU nationals living in the UK: the basic right to continued residence alongside rights to work, pensions, NHS health care, social benefits, and importantly the rights of dependent children and spouses. This national level uncertain environment however is not passively received by local level institutions, leading to the research question motivating this paper; namely, how do employers that rely on immigrant labour react to an uncertain national environment that is hostile to migration, and how does this response match the response and concerns of EU employees?

Employer Response

Foundational research on the implementation of national policies at different levels and across different actors demonstrates substantial variation in how policy is experienced (Lipsky, 1971; Pressman and Wildavsky, 1984). While the literature on local response to migration policy has focused on bureaucrats and service providers, *employers* can also resist a restrictive migration policy context. Like the street-level bureaucrats, employers have to balance economic and symbolic concerns which may conflict with hostile migration policy. Employers benefit when they can choose from a large –international or even global - applicant pool, when employees can be recruited quickly and cheaply, and when bureaucratic procedures are kept minimal. On the other hand, employers in the UK are key monitoring agents of migration policy (Nisbet, 2018): visas are sponsored by individual employers, who bear the burden of proving their employees legal right to work and are tasked with monitoring visa compliance, for instance with an obligation to track and report extended absencesⁱⁱ. It is therefore in their interest to assume as much of a “light touch” approach to compliance as possible to ease international recruitment.

The degree to which different universities will be impacted by migration related challenges posed by the decision to leave the EU is related to reliance on EU funding and EU staff recruitment – and the two are intertwined. EU research income is concentrated: the top 10 institutions accounted for nearly half (47%) of the research income from EU government bodies in 2014-2015 – for all of these institutions, EU finding comprised more than 20% of their research incomeⁱⁱⁱ. Thus some universities, particularly the most research intensive and high prestige, are more vulnerable to departure from the EU than those who rely more on teaching for funding. Reliance on EU funding is also mirrored by reliance on flexible academic labour to fulfil grant projects; access to the wider hiring pool of the EU is important in meeting demands for short-term, highly specialized labour. Universities which more

closely approximate the neo-liberal model – more dependent on highly competitive funding sources and with strong demand for flexible and contingent labour – should be more threatened by the Brexit vote than those who are primarily funded by domestic student fees and who can attract academics for stable teaching and research posts.

Most UK higher education institutions are committed to an ethos, or at the very least a marketing brand, that is cosmopolitan and open to diversity; with a young, international, and highly educated customer base (students). Hostile migration policy runs counter to this ethos, threatening a brand of openness and inclusion that is central to marketing to students and recruiting and retaining international staff. Employers can shape the way an uncertain policy context is experienced by the level of care provided to students and employees. This care can be material, for instance providing legal advice and services, and bearing the financial burden of initial and settlement visas for the employee and their family. Support can also be symbolic, through positive internal messaging about the contribution of immigrant workers, and through the enforcement of a workplace culture that is cosmopolitan and welcoming to foreign nationals (Thatcher and Patel 2012). The degree to which internationalism and specifically European identity is part of the University ethos and brand should be related to the level of response and certainly the symbolic messaging in support of EU staff and students by University management.

Employee Response

EU immigrants in the UK had the right to live and work in the UK since the signing of the Maastricht treaty in 1992. A high proportion of the EU staff working in universities had already been living in the UK for decades when the Referendum occurred, essentially transforming them from quasi-internal to international migrants overnight. All interviewees reported a feeling of shock at the decision, with a widespread expectation among staff as well as management that many EU staff might leave. Despite being highly skilled workers in increasingly commercialized institutions within a free movement bloc, however, there is substantial variation in the degree to which staff might be expected to conform to the neo-liberal ideal of a fluid worker – and thus be more difficult to recruit or retain following the vote.

We expect that academic staff, rather than professional staff, will pose a greater challenge for employers to recruit and retain. Academics are highly mobile workers (Bauder, 2015), and the working lives of academic staff are likely to be compromised more by leaving the EU than the lives of professional staff: the completion of academic work is more reliant on access to EU funding, EU partnerships and mobility opportunities, and the ability to recruit high

quality students and staff for research projects (Royal Society 2017^{iv}). Even among academics, we would expect heterogeneity by country of origin and level of seniority. Stemming from countries with a wide range of workers rights and university management styles, the expectations of management response to Brexit should vary among EU academics of different origins. Academic staff that experience greater disconnect between self-concept and their understanding of the university mission with the actual management of privatising universities (Clegg, 2008; Gioia and Thomas, 1996; Nixon, 1996) may be more difficult to recruit and retain. Moreover those from countries with more attractive higher education systems, or those whose seniority and prestige affords greater options abroad, may be similarly more difficult to recruit and retain.

To return to the initial research question, we expect that higher education management will vary in response to hostile migration policy, with those institutions most reliant on EU staff in fixed term contracts most responsive. We further anticipate that that lower levels of engagement will better “match” expectations of non-academic employees, and among academic employee from more marketised higher education systems.

Methodology

Higher Education Institutions

The research involved interviews with management and EU academic and non-academic staff at three research active universities in England. All three Universities have higher than average proportions of EU academic and professional staff, comprising between 24-27% of academics and 5%-10% of professional staff. The first research site, Mid Prestige University (MPU), is a university built during the 1960s, with a less selective, highly socioeconomically and ethnically diverse student body, including a substantial proportion of international students. The second research site, High Prestige University (HPU), is a Russell group member with a student body which is highly selected on academic achievement and substantially less socioeconomically diverse, although nearly half of its student population are international students (including EU nationals). The third research site is a 1960s university with a moderately selective student body and average proportion of international students. This university (MPUE) sets itself apart from the other two in its strong orientation towards the rest of Europe including several campuses on the continent.

EU nationals are overrepresented among mid- and early career academics, in accordance with national trends, and EU nationals comprise a higher proportion of those on research only contracts, approximately 30% at all three institutions. Research only contracts may be long or short-term, but are strongly tied to specific grants and are much less likely to be permanent than traditional teaching and research lectureships: 48% of HPU research only staff are on fixed term contracts, and 82% and 83% of MPU and MPUE, respectively. It is also very important to note that the structure of academic staff differs strongly between HPU and the mid prestige universities: 68% of HPU academics are on research only contracts, in contrast with 10% at MPU and 14% at MPUE.

Data Collection and Analysis

A semi-structured interview guide was developed in autumn 2017 and used to obtain ethical approval for the study on 9 November 2017. The interview guide was piloted in December 2017 and amended. Thirty-seven semi-structured interviews were conducted between February and October 2018. At all three universities, the Vice-Chancellor's office was the first point of contact. For both MPU and MPUE an interview with the Vice-Chancellor was granted, and the office scheduled interviews with senior human resource officers (e.g. Head of HR, Head of Resourcing, and Head of Immigration and Compliance). For HPU the vice chancellor declined to be interviewed but helped arrange interviews with senior management. At MPU and MPUE the human resource department sent an invitation email to professional

staff via an existing EU national email list. MPUE also sent the invitation email to academic staff. Response was very high from this channel and potential interviewees were chosen to ensure coverage in terms of seniority of role, country of origin, and gender. All interviews at HPU and academic interviews at MPU were obtained via initial contacts held in several departments at both universities with referrals from initial interviewees resulting in further interviews. Of the 37 interviews obtained, 12 identified as men and 25 as women, 18 were academic staff, 13 professional staff, and six senior management (two at each university).

All interviews were professionally transcribed and analysed using Nvivo version 11. Interviews with staff and management are initially analysed separately and coded for initial themes emerging from staff and management interviews. As anticipated themes around academic mission were stronger among academic staff, in particular conflict with management emerging from the 2018 higher education strike. After this initial thematic coding interactions for staff and management response, interactions between the two by institution were also examined.

Selected Findings

Staff Interviews

Both professional and academic staff were asked about perception of opportunities and challenges arising from the Referendum vote, as well their expectations and satisfaction with both the government and their University in their response to the vote. Expectations and satisfaction with the Universities as employers coalesced around two main themes: symbolic support, including internal facing social support within the institution and external facing lobbying efforts and public statements, and practical assistance with visas and migration related issues. Expectations and satisfaction levels varied by staff role and national origin: academic staff generally had higher expectations and were less satisfied with management response than professional staff, and EU nationals from higher education systems that were perceived as more autonomous and less commercialized also had higher expectations and lower satisfaction. In other words, the level of expectation and satisfaction was both a function of what staff members saw as their professional mission and relationship to the university, and their perception of the mission of the University and its obligation to employees.

Symbolic Support

The importance of a cosmopolitan and welcoming environment in the higher education sector was a common theme across the interviews. Despite a nearly universal feeling of unwelcome

and threat in general following the vote, interviewees also reported that their local friendship groups and university working environment created a “bubble” where their daily lives remained unaffected by hostility. As stated by Iva, a mid-career Latvian professional staff member at MPU:

“I have never felt... an outsider in the UK...I think it is a lot to do with the University because it's a bit like a bubble...”

There was a general consensus that the University in general was a pro-Remain environment, yet employees differed in their expectations of external statements of support, for instance public statements against Brexit by university senior management or a more active role campaigning during the run up to the Referendum. Academics held higher expectations than professional staff in general, yet among the academic staff those who perceived the university’s mission to be a leader in public debates were especially disappointed in the measured public stance taken by all three of the Universities in this study. This was aligned with country of origin, most frequently espoused by EU nationals from countries such as Germany, Belgium and France with strong publicly funded higher education systems that follow a more traditional *Lehrstuhl* or chair professor model which grants greater autonomy to senior academics. These interviewees held a view of themselves as independent scholars and public intellectuals, rather than employees (several objected outright when I used the term) and believed the university had neglected its public function of officially weighing in on Brexit both before and after the Referendum vote. This neglect was also perceived as an affront to EU employees. For instance, Pia, a Belgian lecturer at MPUE, states

“So concerning to Brexit is a lack of spine. They are just spineless. It’s like any political statement, they are spineless. And I mean this also huge, a huge difference with the universities here [in Belgium], because they are run by Professors and they are truly independent institutions.”

In contrast, some academics and most professional staff members were more comfortable, or at least more resigned, to their role as employees and their universities’ need to maintain a neutral public response to Brexit. In particular they believed that the University could not risk alienating other staff members might have voted to leave. For instance, Maria, a mid-career professional staff member at MPU:

“I know that they can’t take sides in this argument either, because I bet they were worried there were a number of people in the University who voted Brexit... so I guess the University can't make a political stand.”

Practical Support

The second theme that emerged when discussing expectations and satisfaction with the University as employer was the issue of practical support. Both academic and non-academic staff mentioned a variety of potential measures that the university could take, from providing general immigration related information, to offering interest free loans for staff and their families to naturalize or even paying visa or naturalization fees altogether. Yet as with symbolic support, academics generally had higher expectations of practical support and greater dissatisfaction than professional staff. Among academics, those who were dissatisfied with the higher education sector as a whole also viewed the lack of practical support as part of a larger trend towards the commercialization of higher education and the adoption of neo-liberal employment for academics. A common thread was the experience of feeling expendable, and linking a lack of concern for employees as individuals to a shrewd assessment of university response, as stated by Bernd, a mid-career German academic at MPU:

“[The university] is not a social enterprise, it’s a business and wherever they see that they can save money and still get the same output I have no doubt in my mind that senior management will do that... if I become too expensive or too difficult over the next 10 or 15 years, then we just cut the ties and just say well we don’t need you anymore....”

While many academics shared disappointment that their University was not going to arrange for individual legal advice or cover visa or naturalization costs, this was much less of an issue among professional staff. Moreover there was again variation by origin and expectations of the University as employer. As stated by Antonio, a professor at MPUE from Italy:

“People from countries if they expect something back, maybe they are expecting more. If you interview Italians or Spaniards and so on, we don’t get anything at home anyway, so we don’t expect it, we are just grateful when we get something, that’s where we are coming from.”

Interviews with Management

Interviews with management revealed how their response to the Referendum vote was shaped by economics and institutional (brand) identity. Management at all three institutions expressed concern about the potential impact of Brexit on research funding and international

collaboration, on legal compliance and administrative burden, and on their international reputation and its knock-on effects on staff and student recruitment. But when asked what the biggest challenge from the Referendum vote was, Ruth, the Head of HR at HPU was clear:

“The uncertainty around EU funding is the biggest issue for us ...I think it’s 20 percent of our research income...”

The reliance on grant income, and also on short term academic recruitment from the EU to fulfil funded research, strongly shaped the response taken by HPU. In contrast, the VC of MPUE was most concerned about administrative burden:

“In effect, what we've done is kind of move it into the compliance agenda. So we kind of look at, 'OK, we've got to do this. How can we do it in as light touch way as possible, while still complying?’”

The HR recruitment manager at MPU was similarly most concerned with compliance; for the VC of MPU, with the high presence of international students, efforts have been directed at securing the MPU’s reputation as an international university for collaboration and recruitment.

These differentiated responses can be understood from the logic of the unique pressures facing each university. Retaining stable EU academic and professional staff on permanent contracts were not seen to be an issue. Human resource representatives at all three institutions reported that they had not seen a significant increase in staff leaving due to Brexit, nor had they observed a sharp drop in the number of EU nationals applying for academic positions. For instance, the VC of MPU stated

“...on staffing we have seen in general no major impact on our ability to recruit non-UK EU staff or indeed international staff.”

This perception aligned with employee interviews, where staff on permanent contracts, many mid-career with mortgages and children in school, reported feeling unable or unwilling to move. The tightness of the academic labour market, and the general positive working environment of the university in comparison to other potential employers of professional staff, meant that established staff members were unlikely to leave.

Compliance

All three universities expressed concern about the potential administrative burden and compliance demands posed by the UK’s exit from the EU. The existing visa categories for non-EU foreign nationals, Tier 2 for skilled professionals and Tier 4 for students, are

notoriously cumbersome and expensive for both employers and potential employees. As described above visa sponsors are also required to check and validate right to work documents and monitor place of residence and attendance. So it is unsurprising that concern about increases in required administrative support and compliance costs were a major component of scenario planning for Brexit. For instance, the head of visas and immigration compliance at HPU:

“So, we’re just having to wait for [the new migration policy] to come out, but obviously we haven’t got any inkling. Will EU Nationals just fall into the current migration system? We hope not. That would be horrendous, that would be the worst thing that could possibly happen...”

International Reputation

A second theme that emerged from interviews with management at all three Universities was concern about international reputation. This was even true of management at HPU: when asked whether HPU might better be able to weather response to Brexit than less prestigious institutions, the head of HR disagreed

“It isn’t that cut and dried ... there has always been a sense that people will want to come to HPU... [But] that isn’t always sufficient to overcome the practical difficulties...that can be a significant disincentive.”

While the Head of HR at MPUE was less concerned, she also expressed the importance of reputation:

“...we’ll certainly do everything we can to ensure that our recruitment offering makes it clear that we will ease the transition for all overseas workers...we’ve had biographies on our website from our overseas staff, including EEA, and EEA post Brexit...where we are still seen as a welcoming place for people to come.”

However it was the VC of MPU that took this position most personally:

“I am travelling six or seven weeks a year now and very specifically to counteract any impression that Brexit means that we are becoming inwardly focused...”

Whereas the HR director of recruitment at MPU did not mention any specific activities towards EU or international engagement at all, the VC as head of the university was very aware of the need for opportunity for international collaboration and student recruitment and

the emphasis on developing the reputation of the university was recurrent throughout the interview.

MPU sets itself apart from the other two universities in its heavier reliance on international student recruitment: approximately 20% of those studying undergraduate first degrees at MPU are international, in contrast to 15% at MPUE and 12% at HPU^v. The international composition of the student body is a major marketing point for this university, MPU is also aggressively expanding its international outreach, including transnational education provision. At the same time the university lacks the name recognition of HPU and thus is more vulnerable to challenges to its international branding in the wake of Brexit. A Brexit strategy that is strongly aimed at securing international reputation, rather than directed to EU recruitment and retention, is therefore logical.

Funding dependency and high responsiveness

The elite university most reliant on international funding was much more actively politically and practically in responding to recruitment and retention challenges arising from the Referendum vote. Both MPU and MPUE were primarily passive in political terms: both mentioned membership in sector wide bodies such as UCEA and Universities UK as their way of influencing government, but had not sought to influence migration policy directly. The HR recruitment director at MPU further described that she had fed into a Migration Advisory Committee call for evidence, but none of the management or employee interviews at MPU or MPUE mentioned direct lobbying from the institution itself. In contrast, HPU was engaged as an institution, with a very proactive role, as demonstrated by the Head of HR's explanation of response to Brexit:

“The immigration system will be the biggest challenge, clearly...and one of the key things we've determined is *that we must, as an institution, seek to influence from the sector.* (italics added)”

HPU currently maintains four working groups devoted to Brexit consequences, has hosted ministers of parliament in both formal and informal capacity, and advocates directly to government as its immigration and compliance director sits on several national level committees.

The more active role taken by HPU in lobbying for migration policy specifically can be understood by their much greater reliance on fixed term EU staff. Over half of HPU's academics [80% of EU academics] are on research only contracts, in contrast to less than one

in eight at MPU and MPUE, and are therefore less likely to be buffered by the more steady income source of student fees. This high proportion of research to teaching staff makes HPU more reliant on grant income, and thus research infrastructure (funding, visas for academics and research related staff) is much higher on their agenda; in particular in the physical and medical sciences. Whereas research income at MPU was approximately £30 million in 2016-17, and MPUE £20 million, research income for HPU was over £400 million.

Access to short-term, flexible and highly specialized labour is an important part of the necessary research infrastructure for volatile and short-term grant funded projects. This need is clearly articulated by the head of compliance at HPU:

“...there are certain roles where everything is time bound and it’s money bound... if they wait three months, they fall behind on their research, their research becomes not viable, the whole project falls apart and that’s where we’ve become so tied to the EU in that sense, that if they need somebody from France ...it’s done, it’s easy, they’re there...”

Much of the employment at HPU mirrors the just-in-time, highly fluid labour contracts found in the most deregulated sectors, resulting in a correspondingly greater reliance on flexible EU staff.

Concluding Comments

This project has shown how employers and EU employees have responded to the uncertain political environment following Brexit, demonstrating variation in response among employees within and employers across institutions. EU staff reported appreciation for the supportive and cosmopolitan environment of the University, and were aware of practical actions taken by management to provide access to migration information tailored to their concerns. Clearly universities are employers who are particularly well suited to address concerns arising from Brexit, given their highly international workforce and student base and extensive experience as visa sponsors. However as most of the actions – such as supportive statements from VCs and immigration advice – are fairly low cost, they are actions that could be implemented by most institutions that employ EU staff.

Despite this general positive picture of the University creating a “bubble” for employees which protected them from displays of public xenophobia and provided support in a changing migration policy climate, there was substantial variation in the expectations and satisfaction

of EU staff. Employees who were unsatisfied with university management's response were more likely to see the University as a public voice in policy debate, to see themselves as independent academics rather than employees, and to hold the perception of the university as a community of scholars. Not surprisingly, this perception was held more strongly by EU academics rather than professional staff and particularly by EU academics from countries with less commercialised higher education sectors. Dissatisfaction with higher education in general, exacerbated by the industrial action in Spring 2018, particularly coloured staff perceptions of university response during the fieldwork period.

However even among those who were most dissatisfied, very few EU employees had concrete plans to leave their institution or the UK. Despite perceptions of academics as a fluid and internationally mobile labour force, most of the academics were on permanent contracts, with partners, children, and homes in the UK. Those on fixed term contracts were more mobile but at both MPU and MPUE these comprised a very small proportion of EU staff; only HPU had the more flexible EU labour force which is most at risk due to Brexit. This relative immobility came through from interviews with both staff and management, and was borne out in the stable numbers of academics applying for jobs at all three institutions as well as the numbers of those leaving during the period of fieldwork.

At the level of university management, the institution with the greatest need for a flexible, highly contingent skilled labour force deriving from a reliance on short-term grant funding cycles, were the most responsive to the challenges of Brexit. The irony is that while many employees wanted a stronger voice and greater protection from the University in light of their more traditional model of University mission, it was the pressures set by the demand for a contingent workforce most dependent on competitive funding, in other words a response to *specifically* market demands, which resulted in a stronger response from university employers.

Policy Recommendations

Policy recommendations for higher education institutions arising from this research are as follows:

- Symbolic support is relatively low cost but strongly appreciated by staff. Statements of appreciation should continue and potentially be strengthened during this time of uncertainty running up to the departure date.
- Any required monitoring of EU staff needs to be implemented sensitively given their heightened concern and suspicion of the Home Office. Care needs to be taken in correspondence concerning legal status and residence applications.

- If possible, individual assistance or small-group immigration workshops are not only appreciated but surprisingly necessary, despite the high education and excellent English ability of EU academics and professional staff. Many have complicated migration histories which make navigating applications for permanent residence and citizenship difficult. Application assistance should ideally be extended to family members of staff as well.

Dissemination Plans

Completed Outputs

- Completed Presentation at the Essex Centre for Migration Studies annual academic workshop *Migration Challenges in the UK at the Dawn of Brexit*, September 2018
- Accepted for presentation in seminar session “Internal Migration” at the 2019 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, August 2019
- Policy briefing completed for dissemination to participating universities
- Journal article currently under review at *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*

Planned Outputs

- Submission for presentation at the Society for Research into Higher Education Annual Research Conference
- Dissemination of policy briefing via SRHE and other channels

References and Footnotes

ⁱ For instance see the publications and survey results from the CIPD <https://www.cipd.co.uk/knowledge/strategy/resourcing/surveys>, guidance from UCEA <https://www.ucea.ac.uk/en/empres/epl/brexit/issuesforeea.cfm>

ⁱⁱ <https://www.gov.uk/uk-visa-sponsorship-employers/your-responsibilities>

ⁱⁱⁱ <https://royalsociety.org/~media/policy/Publications/2017/2017-05-technopolis-role-of-EU-funding-report.PDF>

^{iv} <https://royalsociety.org/~media/policy/Publications/2017/2017-05-technopolis-role-of-EU-funding-report.PDF>

REFERENCES

Altbach, P., Knight, J., 2007. The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of studies in international education* 11, 290–305.

Armenta, A., 2017. *Protect, serve, and deport: The rise of policing as immigration enforcement*. University of California Press.

Arnorsson, A., Zoega, G., 2018. On the causes of Brexit. *European Journal of Political Economy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2018.02.001>

Bauder, H., 2015. The international mobility of academics: A labour market perspective. *International Migration* 53, 83–96.

Boden, R., Nedeva, M., 2010. Employing discourse: universities and graduate ‘employability.’ *Journal of Education Policy* 25, 37–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930903349489>

Carpentier, V., 2018. Expansion and differentiation in higher education: the historical trajectories of the UK, the USA and France.

Clegg, S., 2008. Academic Identities under Threat? *British Educational Research Journal* 34, 329–345.

Deem, R., Brehony, K.J., 2005. Management as ideology: the case of ‘new managerialism’ in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education* 31, 217–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980500117827>

Freeman, G.P., 1995. Modes of immigration politics in liberal democratic states. *International migration review* 29, 881–902.

Gioia, D.A., Thomas, J.B., 1996. Identity, image, and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative science quarterly* 370–403.

Goodwin, M., Milazzo, C., 2017. Taking back control? Investigating the role of immigration in the 2016 vote for Brexit. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 19, 450–464.

Hobolt, S.B., 2016. The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy* 23, 1259–1277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2016.1225785>

Jørgensen, M.B., 2012. The Diverging Logics of Integration Policy Making at National and City Level. *International Migration Review* 46, 244–278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2012.00886.x>

Lipsky, M., 1971. Street-level bureaucracy and the analysis of urban reform. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 6, 391–409.

Marini, G., 2018. Are EU university academics leaving the UK because of Brexit? [WWW Document]. Centre for Global Higher Education. URL <https://www.researchcghe.org/publications/policy-briefing/are-eu-university-academics-leaving-the-uk-because-of-brexit/> (accessed 1.2.19).

Marrow, H.B., 2009. Immigrant Bureaucratic Incorporation: The Dual Roles of Professional Missions and Government Policies. *Am Sociol Rev* 74, 756–776. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240907400504>

Mckenzie, L., 2017. The class politics of prejudice: Brexit and the land of no-hope and glory. *The British journal of sociology* 68, S265–S280.

Nisbet, E., 2018. Expanding the Field of View: The Role of Agricultural Employers in Street-Level Immigration Policy Implementation. *Administration & Society* 50, 1097–1124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399715598339>

Nixon, J., 1996. Professional identity and the restructuring of higher education. *Studies in Higher Education* 21, 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079612331381417>

Pressman, J.L., Wildavsky, A., 1984. *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland; Or, Why It's Amazing that Federal Programs Work at All, This Being a Saga of the Economic Development Administration as Told by Two Sympathetic Observers Who Seek to Build Morals on a Foundation*. Univ of California Press.

Salter, B., Tapper, T., 2000. The Politics of Governance in Higher Education: The Case of Quality Assurance. *Political Studies* 48, 66–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00251>

Torjesen, I., 2017. Four in 10 European doctors may leave UK after Brexit vote, BMA survey finds. *BMJ: British Medical Journal (Online)* 356.

Williamson, A.F., 2018. *Welcoming New Americans?: Local Governments and Immigrant Incorporation*. University of Chicago Press.

Wright, C.F., 2017. Employer Organizations and Labour Immigration Policy in Australia and the United Kingdom: The Power of Political Salience and Social Institutional Legacies. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 55, 347–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjir.12216>