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ABSTRACT

In the UK, the third and final stage of the Special Education Needs Disability Act (SENDA) comes into force in October 2005; the combined stages of which serve to force Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) to comply with various standards of providing accessible education for disabled students. Using a survey instrument, sent to academics across the UK, the extent and effectiveness of SENDA compliance in the built environment (BE) subject area has been investigated for the first time. The analysis framework draws from Locke and Latham’s conceptual model of goal setting theory (1979) where performance and factors contributing to performance, are measured in terms of four components: individuals’ goal-based effort, their abilities, the institution support they receive and the rewards they experience from their efforts. The results suggest that fully accessible learning and teaching practices are not widespread in BE departments. In general, academics are attempting to improve accessibility, but this is dependent on their own goal-based efforts and abilities. Current initiatives to improve SENDA compliance instigated by HEIs are not influencing performance of BE academics in this area; in addition, the current job-related rewards are not motivating performance. Survey findings and analysis, point to the benefits of improving provision of training, guidance and information bespoke to the BE subject area, on overall performance levels. Also, creating links between levels of course accessibility and extrinsic rewards, by for example, acknowledging SENDA compliance in academics’ performance review might prove beneficial. Ultimately, the results indicate that effective institution support is required to support the efforts of individuals.
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INTRODUCTION

The UK Government believes economic prosperity will benefit from an increasingly skilled population (Gibbs and Knapp 2002). To these ends, an objective has been set to widen participation in higher education (HE) to 50% of 18-30 year olds by the end of the decade (DES 2001). With disabled students being only 40% as likely to go on to
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university to do a first degree as their non-disabled peers (Curtis 2002), they represent an important and obvious target group to help meet these aims.

Widening participation in HE is not just a social imperative; it can also have economic implications. For instance, HEFCE now requires all higher education institutions (HEIs) to submit action plans for widening participation in order to secure funding (HEFCE 2002). In certain subject areas, such as built environment (BE), these issues are particularly relevant given the requirements to increase student numbers (Hamill and Hodgekinson 2003), and poor track record of attracting students with certain disabilities (Middlemass and Farrell 2004).

Recently, legislative changes have helped increase disabled student numbers in HE. Most significantly, in May 2001 the Special Education Needs Disability Act (SENDA) was passed, protecting the rights of disabled students in education for the first time. SENDA is being implemented in three stages. Stage one made it illegal for HEIs to treat disabled students ‘less favorably’ because of their disability from 1 September 2002. Moreover, ‘reasonable adjustments’ should be made so that they are not placed at a ‘substantial disadvantage’. Stage two came into force on 1st September 2003 and placed a duty on HEIs to make adjustments to auxiliary aids and services. Stage three comes into force on 1st September 2005 and will place a duty to make adjustments to physical features (DEMOS 2002). Each stage of the legislation increases the responsibility of creating accessible teaching and learning practices, on academics and their departments.

Regarding BE subjects specifically, Tupin Brooks et al, (2003: 335) stated that “construction educators need to re-evaluate their learning approaches to provide inclusive education” following SENDA. However, presently, it is unknown whether BE academics have made the necessary adjustments to create accessible courses. Moreover, where non-compliance exists, the specific issues which are causing SENDA to be problematic have not been established. Therefore, this paper examines both of these points, i.e. the current extent and effectiveness of SENDA compliance in UK BE departments. Meanwhile, it also establishes an investigative approach by which HEIs can diagnose barriers to achieving compliance with either SENDA or other legislative initiatives.

FACTORS INFLUENCING EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION AND PERFORMANCE

Given the nature of the challenge addressed by this paper, whereby the emphasis falls largely on the outputs of employees (rather than systems or processes); it is instructive to address the models which relate employee motivation to performance. To these ends, such theories include a number of models which describe employee motivation, such as Maslow’s and McClelland well-known needs theories (Maund 1999). More applicable to a work setting, Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory expresses the motivation of an employee in performing a task as a function of three variables i.e. expectancy (the belief that a task can be completed), instrumentality (the belief that task completion will lead to a reward) and valence (the belief that the reward is desirable).
However, while these models describe employees’ motivation to carry out a task, they do not explicitly relate the motivation levels with performance. To these ends, “goal models” have more recently increased in popularity in the workplace. In particular, Porter and Lawler (1968) represented the performance of employees as a result of their effort, ability, and the organisations’ support. Performance is assumed to precede the realisation of either *intrinsic rewards or extrinsic rewards*, which employees assess when experiencing a certain level of task satisfaction. A subsequent modification of this model was developed by Locke and Latham (1979), who described performance as resulting from specifically goal-based effort. In their “Goal-Setting” adaptation of Porter and Lawler’s original model, *goal based effort* (rather than simply “effort”) is defined to be a function of: *goal specificity* (the extent to which goal are clear), *goal difficulty* (the extent to which goals are achievable), *goal acceptance* (the extent to which individuals accept goals as their own) and *goal commitment* (the extent to which individuals feel committed to goal outcome).

It is supposed by Locke and Latham (1979) that each of these four variables represent antecedents that influence the level of goal-based effort which is ultimately made. At subsequent stages of the causal links between motivation and performance, the model reverts to the structure described by Porter and Lawler. Therefore, goal based effort combines with individuals’ abilities and traits and the level of institution support to produce the observed level of employees’ performance. The employee performance leads to intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards and, in turn, the observed level of job satisfaction, as shown in Figure 1 (Hannagan 2002, Maund 1999).

**Figure 1:** The Expanded Goal Setting Theory of Locke and Latham (1979)

Research has shown the validity of Locke’s theory: Pinder, (1984, cited in Hannagan 2002: 328) argued, “goal setting theory has demonstrated more scientific validity to date than any other theory or approach to motivation”. However, relatively few studies of job motivation, performance and satisfaction have been carried out in HE (Oshagbemi 2000). This is despite the fact that there is empirical evidence to suggest linkages between academic and institute performance levels and student satisfaction. This in turn, suggests
In terms of the specific goal for BE departments of developing accessible learning and teaching practices, this paper assesses the extent and effectiveness of SENDA compliance from the perspective of understanding academic and HEI performance using goal based theory.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

This study examines several aspects of achieving effective SENDA compliance in the BE subject area. The first research question to be addressed is not a hypothesis as such, but examinations of the indicators of the extent to which BE courses in the UK are SENDA compliant. To these ends, the accessibility of courses is examined, as perceived by academic staff, and also the extent to which academic staff have already started to make changes to curricula objectives. Questions elicit the strength of agreement or disagreement to a series of statements, which will be explained in the Results section and shown in Figure 2.

Based on the discussion of goal based theory, it seems reasonable to suggest that, as the level of goal based effort increases, the task performance increases. Task performance, in this instance, is ultimately represented by the accessibility of courses. The first hypothesis to be investigated is therefore:

\[ H1: \text{ As academics make increasing goal based effort, accessibility of their courses increase} \]

In turn, in Locke and Latham’s (1979) model, goal based effort is hypothesised to be created from four variables: difficulty, acceptance, commitment and specificity. Therefore, further goal-related hypotheses to be investigated are:

\[ H1.1: \text{ As academics’ experience increased goal clarity, goal based effort increases} \]
\[ H1.2: \text{ As academics’ experience increased goal specificity, goal based effort increases} \]
\[ H1.3: \text{ As academics’ experience increased goal acceptance, goal based effort increases} \]
\[ H1.4: \text{ As academics’ feel increased goal commitment, goal based effort increases} \]

In the second area of goal theory, Lock and Latham predict that performance is related not only to individual effort but also their ability. Therefore, the second key hypothesis to be tested is:

\[ H2: \text{ as academics’ ability to teach disabled students increases, the accessibility of their courses increases} \]

In turn, there are a number of factors that influence the ability to teach disabled students. The main areas are arguably, experience and knowledge. Further hypotheses related to
Factors affecting the implementation of the Special Education Needs Disability Act (SENDA) in higher education built environment departments in the United Kingdom

the contributing factors of ability to perform the task of developing accessible courses are then:

\( H2.1: \) As academics’ experience of teaching disabled students increases, so does their ability to teach disabled students  
\( H2.2: \) As academics’ knowledge of issues surrounding teaching disabled students increases, so does their ability to teach disabled students

The third principal factor in Locke and Latham’s (1979) model is institution support. It is hypothesised that both the motivation and ability of individuals and the support of the institution needs to be in place before performance can be optimised. Therefore, as institution support increases, then task performance increases. Therefore, the third key hypothesis to be investigated is that:

\( H3: \) As academics experience increasing levels of institution support, the accessibility of their courses increases

There are a number of ways that institutions can provide support, but in this context, mainly through the provision of expertise and time, but also through supportive colleague networks. Therefore, further institutional support related hypotheses are that:

\( H3.1: \) As academics perceive increasing training and guidance, the perceived levels of institution support increase  
\( H3.2: \) As academics perceive the increasing provision of advice, the perceived levels of institution support increase  
\( H3.3: \) As academics perceive increasing processes in place, the perceived levels of institution support increase  
\( H3.4: \) As academics believe that their department has audited the current accessibility levels, the perceived levels of institutional support increase  
\( H3.5: \) As academics experience lower workload pressures, the perceived levels of institution support increase

The fourth and final factor of Locke and Latham’s model involves both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. While Locke and Latham describe rewards as following on from performance, and influencing job satisfaction, the authors also hypothesise that the presence of rewards also leads to sustained goal-based effort. For example, in order for individuals to maximise their performance they need to feel satisfied with the rewards they receive for their ‘effort’. Thus, the fourth key hypothesis to be tested is that:

\( H4: \) As academics experience greater levels of satisfaction with the rewards they receive, the accessibility of their courses also increases.

To investigate the influence of intrinsic or extrinsic rewards, additional related hypotheses to be tested are:
H4.1: The more academics feel intrinsically rewarded, the perceived satisfaction with overall reward levels increases
H4.2: The more academics feel extrinsically rewarded, the perceived satisfaction with overall reward levels increases

METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire Design
The data was collected from a population of BE academics in the UK. Circa 1000 questionnaires were sent out in hardcopy to all higher and further education establishments teaching BE subjects. Ultimately, the sample size was n=90 giving a response rate of 9%, which although low, still allows for meaningful statistical inference. As it was not the intent for this study to assess the levels of compliance within individual BE departments, and also to encourage honest participation, questionnaires were returned anonymously.

The questionnaire structure was designed to test the hypotheses detailed in the previous section. Questions were structured by asking respondents to give a score to reflect their strength of agreement or disagreement to statements which directly referred to an aspect of Locke and Latham’s model. For example, goal acceptance was measured using the statement “I believe it is my responsibility to provide accessible courses”. For each of the four components to this model, an overarching question was asked to understand its contribution to overall performance regarding compliance to SENDA. Each component was also accompanied by between five and seven additional questions that investigated different aspects of the variable, and reflected factors found to be influential in previous studies (Hannagan 2002, Maund 1999, Turpin-Brooks et al 2003).

For all questions, seven-point end anchored scales were used (‘1’ equalled strong disagreement and ‘7’ equalled strong agreement to a list of statements) to increase variance over the five-point scale but reduce respondent fatigue, which can occur with ten-point scales (Allen and Rao 2000). The end-point, anchored scale was used to minimise semantic difference respondents may link to a label (Vara 1997). Validity was assured through questionnaire piloting and depth interviews with a selected group of BE academics both before surveying and in discussions once the results had been obtained. Further discussions were held with academic researchers and disability specialists, prior to the survey, to optimise question choice. Reliability was tested by the test-retest method (Litwin 1995).

Analysis
Data was firstly collated on various indicators of SENDA compliance in the UK. Pearson’s correlation coefficients were also calculated for each of the relationships between an important performance outcome (the accessibility of academics’ courses and/or SENDA compliance) and four overarching questions (for each component of Lock and Latham’s model). Further correlation analysis was used to relate the individual variables to each component, as described in the conceptual framework. Correlations were assumed statistically significant at a level of p≤0.05.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

SENDA Compliance in the UK
Firstly, the mean scores for all questions were calculated. As mentioned previously, the questionnaire scale ranged from one (totally disagree) to seven (totally agree). The first result is that all mean scores were in the range three to five i.e. clustered around the scale mid point. This reflects that there is a range of views in the sample and that SENDA compliance is not ubiquitous.

Figure 2 shows mean scores for six key questions that indicate levels of SENDA compliance. Scores below 4 (i.e. disagreement) were considered negative and those above 4 (i.e. agreement) were considered positive.

**Figure 2:** Mean scores of key questions relating to SENDA compliance

![Mean Scores of Key Questions](image)

Although two questions have positive mean scores, relating to BE academics believing their course delivery is accessible and that SENDA is realistic, the majority of questions have negative mean scores. Significantly, BE academics do not understand their responsibilities under SENDA, while offering negative perceptions of their ability to make adjustments to existing course material to increase accessibility.

To give further insight into variables affecting curricula accessibility, correlation coefficients have been calculated using Locke and Latham’s (1979) goal setting theory. Table 1 shows the correlations between overall performance (i.e. the academics’ perceived accessibility of their own BE courses) and the measured perceptions of the four components that influence performance levels (i.e. H1 to H4).
Table 1: Correlation of Four Main Components of Performance with Overall Performance, Interpreted as Course Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyp</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Goal based effort</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly, only two of the four components (goal-based effort and ability) correlate moderately and significantly with overall course accessibility, proving H1 and H2 but leaving H3 and H4 unproven. The lack of a significant correlation with institution support indicates that this component is having little effect where present. Similarly, the lack of correlation with rewards indicates that this component is also failing to contribute to performance. Therefore, the general current practices of HEIs, used to support academics in making curricula accessible, are not having an impact on overall performance. Experienced rewards are also ineffective, though constraints on HEIs to improve this area would require addressing at a management level; the feasibility of offering different incentives is unclear to the authors at the present time. Certainly, though, correlation with goal based effort and ability suggests that it is the individual academics’ own motivation and abilities which are currently dictating the extent of course accessibility.

Variables Affecting Levels of SENDA Compliance in the UK

Knowing goal-based effort and ability correlated with course accessibility, it is insightful to carry out further correlation analysis between the overall perceptions for these components and the further variables which measure aspects of these components. By understanding the variables that influence these two components, key variables that impact overall SENDA compliance levels can be exploited by HEIs.

Goal-Based Effort: The variables as described by Locke and Latham (1979) relate to goal specificity; difficulty; acceptance and commitment. These were measured by further questions which relate to results for hypotheses H1.1 to H1.4, as shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Correlation of Variables Affecting Goal Based Effort and Overall Goal Based Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyp</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1.1</td>
<td>Goal specificity</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.2</td>
<td>Goal difficulty</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.3</td>
<td>Goal acceptance</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.4</td>
<td>Goal commitment</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Congruent with Locke and Latham’s (1979) model, all four components correlated with goal based effort towards, proving H1.1. to H1.4. Significant linkages were also found between goal specificity (i.e. how well academics understand SENDA) and goal commitment (i.e. how committed academics feel about the overall goal of making BE courses accessible) and between goal commitment and goal acceptance (i.e. how personally responsible academics feel about making their own taught modules accessible). Arguably, therefore, this is a key area where HEIs can concentrate to maximise goal-based effort as a means to ensure BE academics have a good
understanding of SENDA and their associated responsibilities. This is done by ensuring clarity of goals, targets are achievable, goal acceptance is encouraged and there is a culture whereby commitment to goals is also encouraged.

**Ability and Traits:** Unsurprisingly, as shown in Table 3, linkages were found between increased ability levels in developing accessible BE curricula and increased experience of teaching students with visual, hearing and mobility impairments (VIs, HIs and MIs respectively) and increased knowledge of issues surrounding teaching disabled students.

Table 3: Correlation of Variables Affecting Ability to Teach Disabled Students & Overall Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyp</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2.1</td>
<td>Experience of Teaching VIs</td>
<td>Ability to Teach Disabled Students</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience of Teaching HIs</td>
<td>Ability to Teach Disabled Students</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience of Teaching MIs</td>
<td>Ability to Teach Disabled Students</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2.2</td>
<td>Knowledge of Issues</td>
<td>Ability to Teach Disabled Students</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, the BE subject area has a relatively poor track record of recruiting students with certain disabilities (particularly students with VHMI) (HESA 2004, Middlemass and Farrell 2004). Therefore, it is possible that many BE academics do not have experience of teaching students with VHMI. For this reason, it behoves HEIs to provide BE academics with information to aid teaching. As Table 3, illustrates there is a particularly strong link between increased abilities at making curricula accessible and the knowledge of the surrounding issues. There are weaker correlations between the ability to teach disabled students and relevant experience.

**Institution Support:** In contrast to goal-based effort and ability, perceived levels of institution support and rewards, did not significantly correlate with overall performance in making BE curricula accessible. Therefore, increasing current effort but using current practices is unlikely to increase any performance in achieving SENDA compliance. There are different possible explanations, including that current institution support initiatives are not effectively meeting needs such that different strategies are required.

Table 4 gives some indications of where increasing effort currently leads to the more positive perceptions of institutional support by showing the results for hypotheses H3.1 to H3.5. Four of the variables tested i.e. (H3.1) providing training and guidance on developing accessible curricula; (H3.2) having advice available; (H3.3) having procedures in place to accommodate the needs of disabled students and (H3.5) having a workload that permitted time to make necessary changes, increased perception of institutional support.
Table 4: Correlation of Variables Affecting Perceptions of Institution Support and Overall Perceptions of Institution Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyp</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Perceived institutional support</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3.1</td>
<td>Training and guidance</td>
<td>Perceived institutional support</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3.2</td>
<td>Advice available</td>
<td>Perceived institutional support</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3.3</td>
<td>Procedures in place</td>
<td>Perceived institutional support</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3.4</td>
<td>Access audit done</td>
<td>Perceived institutional support</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3.5</td>
<td>Workload permits changes</td>
<td>Perceived institutional support</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, while the survey results suggest that there may be institution initiatives proceeding, the lack of translation into accessibility suggests the results of these efforts should be measured against tangible standards of accessibility to ensure effectiveness.

Rewards: Similar to institutional support, current rewards are not influencing overall performance levels in developing accessible BE curricula. As mentioned previously, it is unclear to the extent that extrinsic rewards can be linked to SENDA compliance by departments, but it is clear that further thought in this area would be beneficial. Table 5, illustrates that only intrinsic rewards are linked to task satisfaction (H4.1).

Table 5: Correlation of Variables Affecting Satisfaction with Rewards and Overall Satisfaction with Rewards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyp</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Satisfaction with rewards</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4.1</td>
<td>Self fulfillment</td>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belief in career benefit</td>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4.2</td>
<td>Positive feedback</td>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate rewards for effort</td>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By contrast, measured levels of extrinsic rewards (H4.2) are not linked to satisfaction. While an issue of academics’ dissatisfaction with overall remuneration packages is, arguably, ongoing and outside the jurisdiction of department heads, it is questioned whether linkages to extrinsic rewards may be created through other means e.g. by giving positive feedback to academics who make strives to develop accessible BE curricula, or making SENDA compliance part of an academics’ annual review process. This would enable progress in this area to be discussed and monitored in relation to career development and progression.

CONCLUSIONS

The authors have investigated current levels of SENDA compliance in UK BE departments and have found that subject wide, accessible learning and teaching practices are far from universal. Using a conceptual framework based on Locke and Latham’s goal setting theory, it has been established that moves towards becoming SENDA compliant are being made, however, at the moment these appear to be generally dependent on academics’ individual efforts and abilities. The survey results and subsequent analysis suggest that there may be HEI initiatives in place to support academics’ developing inclusive learning and teaching practices, but currently these are not generally helping BE academics’ performance in this area. Possibly this could be because barriers to disabled students in BE subjects are subject specific, and consequently, not covered by generic HE
Factors affecting the implementation of the Special Education Needs Disability Act (SENDA) in higher education built environment departments in the United Kingdom

guidance aimed at all subject areas. More effective initiatives are therefore needed, to see increased accessibility in BE disciplines. In 2003, one year after the implementation of SENDA, Turpin-Brooks et al, argued that one reason for non compliance in the BE subject area was lack of bespoke guidance. To the authors’ knowledge, this is still the case. The survey findings corroborate this view and also point to the fact that improving provision of bespoke training, guidance and information, could also improve overall performance levels in developing inclusive learning and teaching practices. However, the application of goal theory also points to other levers by which performance may be improved: for those academics who are making strives to improve accessibility, the rewards which affect performance tend to be intrinsic rather than extrinsic. Therefore, ensuring positive feedback and recognition for contributing to SENDA compliance would help increase extrinsic rewards. Ensuring the optimisation of goal related aspects (e.g. by clarifying goals and achieving acceptance in personal review) would also benefit performance.

It should be noted that the Locke and Latham’s (1979) model, does not indicate to what extent each of the four components – goal-based effort; ability; institutional support and rewards – impact on overall performance levels. It is possible that these will change depending on the task in hand. However, the absence of any one component can cause significant performance issues. Therefore, current SENDA compliance levels show that HEIs must be conscious of all four components and strive to implement and improve further influential variables, if they want academics to be motivated towards the ultimate aim of developing fully inclusive teaching and learning practices in the BE subject area.

In terms of the limitations of the results and discussion in this paper, it is noted that certain variables are somewhat subjective, most notably self-stated measures of the accessibility of courses. However, feedback from participants informed the authors that the anonymous nature of the survey allowed honest assessments, such that one expects a positive correlation between real and perceived accessibility. In future, tangible metrics of accessibility are desirable as a means to measure and understand performance drivers. Nevertheless, the insights drawn from the paper tallied with further qualitative insights gathered from obtaining feedback on the results with a small group of academics after the survey, validating the exercise. This result also suggests that a goal theory approach is well suited to the task of diagnosing barriers to compliance with new initiatives, and so might be usefully applied to other areas of HE.
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