A Sheffield Hallam University thesis

Leadership, downshifting and the experience of power in higher education

Rachel L. Cockman

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of Sheffield Hallam University for the degree of doctor of philosophy

October 2015

Abstract

The world of higher education is changing and as such what academics must do is different, they must *be* different. Academic identity is thus considered to be a necessary site of change. This thesis explores what academics are, their identities, as well as what they might be. Identities are considered to be sites of power, in which processes of power, specifically interactions with discourses, produce subjects who think, act and speak in particular ways. Identities allow academics to exert power, both over themselves and others. They are sites of struggle, as particular identities are constrained or enabled by the exercise of power. Focusing on two discourses, leadership and downshifting, this study explores the identities of nine Principal Lecturers within one post-1992 university. Through a discursive analysis of focus group and interview data, and institutional points of contact including; consultation documents, strategy documents and employee opinion survey results, the thesis renders as problematic both the premise for change and the reorientation itself, of what it means to be an academic. The thesis concludes that the focus on the individual and their need to take personal responsibility for change, to in effect change themselves, averts attention from the institution and its practices as necessary sites of change. Instead, academics are encouraged to focus on the notion of performance and to monitor themselves and others in relation to ever more elaborately refined 'markers of development', which diverts their attention from their pedagogical and scholarly practices. This creates the potential for a collective misrecognition, as people battle workloads, and the proliferation of these 'markers of development', but fail to recognise, what that work does. My hope is that this thesis provides a place to begin the process of developing an understanding of how identities are limited.

Contents

Acknowledgements

To the friends, family and colleagues, old, new and fleeting, with whom I have shared my struggles, tried to forget those struggles, and struggled together, thank you. To everyone who committed their time and energy to taking part in this study, thank you. To my supervisors Dr Karen Dunn and Dr Murray Clark for your tact, humour and candour in times of crisis, excitement, misery and joy, thank you.

Conference presentations

Barton, Rachel (2014). *Neoliberalism and the reinvention of leadership identities in higher education*. Society for Research in Higher Education International Conference, Newport, 10-12 December 2014.

Barton, Rachel (2014). *At least we're not in the NHS!* British Sociological Association Education Study Group Conference, Sheffield Hallam University, 12 June 2014.

Introduction

This thesis is a study of power. Specifically, a study of the power relations which result in the formation of academic identities, identities which are themselves vehicles for power (Foucault, 1980a). It is therefore, focused on consideration of; how power relations result in differing identities, and, how power is exercised through these identities. To study this, I have focused upon one university, Acorn University, and the identities of one group of academics, Principal Lecturers, of which nine, from across the four faculties of the university were my studied group.

A Foucauldian interpretation considers identities to result from interactions with discourses, which are themselves products of power relations (Foucault, 1976; and Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). 'Discourse is the conditions under which certain statements are considered to be truth' (Ball, 2013, p19). Thus discourse constrains or enables what can be thought, practiced, spoken and written (Ball, 2013). Discourse constrains or enables identities. I chose to focus on two discourses in particular, leadership and downshifting. Leadership is not only a dominant discourse within higher education (Bolden et al, 2009; Lumby, 2012; and Morley, 2013a), but also a requirement of the role of Principal Lecturer. It was therefore, a familiar discourse to the group. Downshifting, initially understood to be the act of slowing down at work in order to improve other areas of life (Laabs, 1996), was unfamiliar, and facilitated an exploration of the interconnections between the personal and the professional, which enabled me to stretch my understandings of their identities.

The discourse analysis which I undertook examined the data offered by my participants in focus groups and interviews and a number of institutional 'points of contact' (Ball, 2014), in particular; consultation documents, university, faculty and departmental strategies and the results of the employee opinion survey. The analysis attempts to explore the strategies being employed, through discourse, in the formation and utilisation of identities. To be attentive to that which is considered natural and unquestionable as well as to that which isn't said, or written, to uncover the truths through which these Principal Lecturers are encouraged to recognise themselves and others.

In the chapters that follow I consider the *identities* of the Principal Lecturers as opposed to their *identity* singular, and in so doing posit that individuals might simultaneously hold multiple identities. Thus, despite our desires for coherent accounts of ourselves as Butler (2001) suggests, these identities are just as likely to be contradictory as they are complementary. This points to something of the struggles encountered in the formation of identities. Struggles which Foucault (2007a) argues, occur not 'in the self-consciousness of the subject' (Mayo, 2000, p114), as essentialist views of identity consider, but through interactions with discourses.

An understanding of discourses is therefore central to such an understanding of identities. Foucault (1976) writes that in discourse 'power and knowledge are joined together' (p100). Discourses are not projections of power, but 'discourse transmits and produces power, it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it' (Foucault, 1976, p101). Discourses are used to produce/affect different outcomes; by legitimising or concealing they make possible/hinder the possibility of, differing identities. Discourses are unstable and fragmented; historically, politically, socially and economically located (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000; and Ball and Olmedo, 2013). It is this instability and their fragmented nature which creates space for people to be and do other, than that which is preferred by dominant discourses. As our identities are forming and reforming, we are continuously engaged in struggles of power, which create our desires, to have, to be, to do, to claim or to refuse particular identities (Butler, 1997a). Our knowledge of who we understand ourselves (and others) to be, or want to be, is a result of processes of power (Oksala, 1998; Mayo, 2000; and Foucault, 1982), which both 'subjugates and makes subject to' (Foucault, 1982, p212). In other words, power relations control us by legitimising or constraining particular identities, whilst at the same time we subject ourselves (through self-knowledge) to disciplinary efforts designed to meet the expectations of these identities. We are therefore active in these processes of production of identities, but we are constrained as well as enabled.

This understanding suggests that the Principal Lecturers are actively engaged in identity formation; both of themselves and others, and that each identity produces/facilitates differing effects. But processes of power make particular

identities attractive, (which limits other possibilities), and encourage the Principal Lecturers to regulate their own and others' behaviours in keeping with these identities. The analysis, then, focuses both on the processes of power through which they discipline themselves and others, and on those which attempt to limit/enable their possible identities.

Foucault (1982) suggests that the analysis should go further, rather than stopping when we have found 'what we are', our identities, we should be interested in refusing what we are, 'to imagine and to build up what we could be' (p216). For in this way we might resist the forms of power which mobilise 'an individualizing "tactic"', or strategy, designed to turn our attention to an analysis of the individual, so that they might be categorised and more effectively governed. To Foucault, refusal is an act of resistance to particular forms of governance, including self-governance (Foucault, 1982). The notion of refusal, reminds us that there are opportunities for resistance, that this is not a fatalistic understanding of power. Thus, in analysing the discourses with which my group of Principal Lecturers interact in the formation of their identities, I sought to understand how the power relations operating in the context of higher education within this one institution, influenced both what it means and what it might mean to be an academic. Therefore, I was attentive to that which was taken-for-granted and considered natural and desirable, as well as to that which wasn't said, and was unthinkable, unsayable and undoable (Ball, 2013). This was an analysis of that which was legitimated, (the particular identities), through the strategies with which discourses were employed, as well as that which was resisted/refused, to offer opportunities for recognition of limits and possibilities for reimagining what might be.

As a group, Principal Lecturers interact with multiple discourses including those of; quality, research, teaching, enterprise, leadership, work-life balance, flogging oneself, age, professionalism, and managerialism, all of which were identified in the course of this study and are discussed in later chapters. A Foucauldian reading suggests that each of these is itself multifaceted, there is not for example, a monolithic discourse of research, research is more than a signifier it is a contested and ambivalent discursive construction, which is incoherent and inconsistent. Discourse, Foucault argues, is not 'divided between accepted discourse and excluded discourse, or between the dominant discourse and the

9

dominated one', but is a 'multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies' (Foucault, 1976, p100). Here, I must make a careful distinction, I do not wish to suggest that there are no dominant discourses, there is for example, I believe, a dominant discourse of leadership in higher education, which continues to posture the need for heroic leaders (Chapter 2). But this is an incomplete understanding, whilst this discourse attempts to construct the players, (the leaders); what they do, how they do it, and how they think about what they do, whilst at the same time constructing the field within which they play, it is never possible to do so entirely. The discourse is fragmented and unstable, it also merges and collides with other discourses, and is used to create different outcomes/possibilities for outcomes. The contradictions and tensions within this dominant discourse of leadership create spaces to be, to think and to do in ways other than that of the heroic leader. The analysis that follows in later chapters is an attempt to reconstruct the strategies which are being employed to signify particular identities as the right order of things, and others as unnatural and undesirable. To explore that which is enabled as well as that which is constrained by discourse.

I have in the example above touched upon the discourse of leadership. Leadership is a frequently used term in higher education and it has become an organisational panacea (Morley, 2013a; and Lumby, 2012), seen as necessary to the successful functioning of an institution. Bolden et al (2009), Morley (2013a), and Lumby (2012), note the dominance of the leadership discourse in higher education. Academics are thus continuously exposed to the notion of leadership and for many, including the Principal Lecturers, who are the focus of this study, it is a formal requirement of their role. The term leadership is, therefore, salient to the group. However, as I have explained above this discourse is contradictory and complex. In Chapter 2 I illustrate how heroic leaders, as opposed to a single heroic leader, are discursively constructed in the literature, each expected to behave/do leadership in particular ways, and if, as I argue, identities are formulated through interactions with discourse, numerous other identities are also likely.

The discourse of leadership, its contradictions and tensions, provided a rich basis for exploring the multiple ways in which the Principal Lecturers' identities

were negotiated and the processes of power through which they were facilitated or constrained.

However, the discourse of leadership was not my only focus. I was also interested in the notion of downshifting, which Laabs (1996) defines as the act of slowing down at work in order to improve other areas of life. Downshifters, she writes, employ an array of strategies to achieve their desired balance, including but not limited to; declining promotions or not seeking them, reducing working hours, changing careers or withdrawing from the workforce (Laabs, 1996).

The notion of downshifting appealed to me on a number of levels, on a personal one, I connected with the desire for the reassertion of other aspects of life as equally or more important than one's place in work. In terms of its connections with the leadership literature, it offered an antidote to the valorisation of leadership as a desirable and glorious state of being and doing. It also enabled recognition of the whole lives of leaders. Hence formal leadership positions, whether they are sought, and how they are experienced are interlinked with lives beyond the boundaries or context of the particular organisation. This view represents a departure from the dominant leadership literature which disconnects the personal from the professional and in many cases leadership from context (Ford, 2005; and Cope, Kempster and Parry, 2011).

The notion of downshifting therefore enabled the interconnections between the work and personal lives of the Principal Lecturers to be explored, which facilitated a more complex and nuanced picture of identities and power relations to emerge.

Conceiving of the notion of downshifting as a strategic act, designed to improve life outside of work, (as Laabs (1996) suggests), is insufficient in explaining the experiences of my study group, which as my analysis reveals later, suggests a far more complex act of both a physical and psychological nature designed to improve life both within and outside of work. These acts have complex and contradictory implications for identities and are themselves an exercise of power. Downshifting, I contend, is an act which is the result of processes of power and produces particular ways of being within an organisation (Chapter 5).

Downshifting, then, represented an opportunity to explore how the personal is implicated in the professional and vice-versa, to stretch my understanding of the Principal Lecturers' identities and the power relations from which they are formed, than a study solely focused on leadership might have.

Having said all of this, I hope that this research might contribute to an expanded understanding of power in higher education. Through an exploration of identities, I attempt to reconstruct the power relations which are used (strategically) to produce differing identities, and examine how power is exercised through these identities. I also seek to contribute to an expanded understanding of the concept of downshifting, (considered to be an act resulting from the processes of power), and particularly its relevance in higher education. This is a study of 'historical limits' in which 'we are always in the position of beginning again' (Foucault, 2007c, p115), for we can never be free from power, as we cannot develop 'complete and definitive knowledge' (Foucault, 2007c, p115) of power relations. By focusing on this group of Principal Lecturers I have sought to examine their 'historical limits', to bring to light and analyse the power relations which are constraining their capacity to think, to be and to do, other. This analysis can never be complete, but it can be helpful in illuminating the taken-for-granted, to demonstrate the possibilities for identities (Biesta, 2008; and Ball, 2013), both of the Principal Lecturers, and by examination of our own limits, ourselves, providing avenues for refusal and helping us to imagine 'what we could be' (Foucault, 1982, p216).

The use of terms: Principal Lecturer and post-1992

The role of Principal Lecturer is not found in every university and is more common in post-1992 institutions. Principal Lecturers represent a group within the hierarchy of university leadership who are rarely the focus of research. Historically leadership research has focused on those in formal leadership positions either at the top or close to the top, in the post of head of department or department chair, of the institution (Bryman, 2007). This group of designated formal leaders represent an underexplored focus of research.

Job adverts for Principal Lecturers typically refer to leading and managing; staff, research and consultancy activity (see University of East London, 2014; or Nottingham Trent University, 2014). The role sits between Senior Lecturers and

Heads of Department in the university hierarchy. In Acorn University, a Principal Lecturer role refers to a specific job, which could involve the post-holder having responsibility for any manner of areas including but not limited to; research centres, quality assurance, internationalisation agendas, community engagement or business development. To become a Principal Lecturer staff have to apply and interview for a vacant role. There are thus a limited number of opportunities for promotion to this level. As Principal Lecturers they are therefore, both 'subject to' and 'subject of' disciplinary power and the 'norm of progression' for academics, in which not everyone can be considered suitable, (Foucault 1978), for not everyone can be a Principal Lecturer. This has profound implications for their identities which are discussed in later chapters, particularly Chapter 7.

According to Universities UK (2013) there were 163 higher education institutions in the UK in 2011-12. The complexity of the higher education sector is demonstrated by the lack of clarity regarding the number of universities. There is a plethora of reporting on the sector, which all appear to use different and/or inconsistent accounting mechanisms, for example Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons (2009) reported that there were 90 universities in England 'and this figure increases to 133 if other higher education institutions are included'. Meanwhile HEFCE, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (2010) reporting on the same period stated that there were 132 English institutions, of which 38 were classed as pre-1992 universities and 37 post-1992 universities. HEFCE revised these figures in 2012, to 130 HEFCE funded institutions, of which 40 were classified as pre-1992 institutions and 51 as post-1992 institutions (HEFCE, 2012).

Despite the discrepancies these figures demonstrate that the number of English universities has more than doubled since 1992. The significance of this year was the passing of The Further and Higher Education Act 1992 which enabled former polytechnics and colleges to acquire university status (Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons, 2009). Which is why this group of universities is often referred to as post-1992 or new universities. The pre-1992 universities are those:

Higher education institutions which had university status before the provisions of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992 came into force; and the two Northern Ireland universities (HEFCE, 2014).

Post-1992 institutions are distinct from pre-1992 institutions in terms of their governance which specifies:

- A more powerful role for the vice-chancellor as chief executive;
- A larger majority of external members on the governing body;
- Limited participation of staff and students in governance;
- And a lesser role for the academic board
  (Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, 2014).

However, the prefixes are often used as shorthand to denote distinctions other than the date of change of status, or governance. For instance Garratt and Hammersley-Fletcher (2009) use the post-1992 label to position these universities in comparison to their 'elite neighbours'. Thus there is a discursive creation of a superior-inferior relationship. Yet, in which ways these universities can be considered 'elite' or otherwise is not critically examined by the authors.

The participants in my study often drew on the discursive positioning of one group of universities as superior to the other, both to replicate and challenge this system of differentiation. Pirrie, Adamson and Humes (2010) draw our attention to the discursively produced 'differences within the sector' perpetuated by the use of terms such as 'post-1992', 'new', and 'elite universities' (p100). The use of such terms both creates and sustains power relations. Pirrie, Adamson and Humes (2010) discuss some of the mechanisms, which are used by parts of the sector to 'set themselves in opposition to others' (p98), or to use Foucault, to bring power relations into being (1982). Focusing their attention on university mission groups, they identify the significant role that groups such as the UK's Russell Group, formed in 1994 by university vice-chancellors from institutions which they themselves labelled research-intensive, have played in discursively establishing their superiority in comparison with the rest of the sector (Pirrie, Adamson and Humes, 2010).

The use of the term post-1992 university is therefore not a straightforward signifier. I use it with care, acknowledging that it has the potential to carry meanings which I don't intend it to have. With that in mind, Acorn University - a pseudonym for the university within which this study took place, can be

14

classified as a post-1992 university, in terms of its date of acquisition of university status and governance arrangements.

The figures for English institutions also demonstrate the continued expansion of the sector, with the increasing development of higher education provision outside of universities. This includes provision by private and for-profit organisations, which in 2010 had nearly 38,000 registered students (Universities UK, 2012). Since 2012, the relaxation of student loan controls has meant that students at private institutions have been able to access government financial support. This has resulted in the rapid expansion of student numbers and an increase of £860 million in public funding since 2010 (McGettigan, Malik, and Domokos, 2014).

The changing landscape of higher education is often positioned as externally driven (Davies, Hides and Casey, 2001). Yet, as with the discursive creation of a superior-inferior relationship between certain groups of universities, universities themselves, their mission groups and leaders are and have been actively involved in these changes. Indeed, they have contributed to the rapid expansion of the sector through the creation of validating partnerships with private colleges both in the UK and overseas (Universities UK, 2012; and Ball, 2012a).

My point is that as with an individual's identities, in which they are active in their formation, universities are also active in the processes of power which call for and result in change. They are not only 'subject to' external power relations, (in other words, controlled by others), but are the 'subject of' power relations (they control themselves). Acorn University responds to external drivers of change, such as quality or research agendas, but it creates, through university, faculty and departmental strategies, consultation processes and communication practices, its own version of what it means to be an academic, what it is that Principal Lecturers should do and how they should be judged.

Organisation of the thesis

The re-telling of the story of my doctoral studies, with the reader in mind, necessitates the representation of a flow through this experience, which merely hints at the shadows and the edges of this journey. What I imagined I would study at the beginning of this process, and what I actually did were very different.

The role which has enabled me to complete my doctorate was created as part of an investment programme designed to develop 'academics of the future' and involved teaching as well as research. The post that I was appointed to was in the research specialism of leadership. The submission of a research proposal was an aspect of the recruitment process. Once in post, my initial ideas began to change as I engaged further with the literature. Early exploration of the business and management leadership literature led me to consider both the concept of downshifting and the notion of power. It is the idea of power to which I have frequently returned and have wrestled with mentally, emotionally and practically.

Through my readings on power, I became increasingly exposed to the educational literature and in particular to the work of Foucault. Foucault's ideas about power have continued throughout this process to provide avenues for personal challenge in confronting my own taken-for-granted assumptions about the world and how things are. I discuss this in Chapter 3.

Initially, I intended to focus on leadership in Small and Medium sized Enterprises (SMEs). The decision to focus on Higher Education was done in consultation with my supervisors, who both believed that because of the nature of my research interests it would provide a rich setting for my study, as well as access to willing participants.

Principal Lecturers were chosen for a number of reasons. Firstly, because my supervisors had a hunch that people at this level would resonate with the issues with which I was engaged. Secondly, because they hold formal leadership positions within the hierarchy of the institution, yet remain under-researched.

An assumption made in this study is that leadership is a social and relational influence process. Similarly to Foucault's conception of power, in which power is

neither a possession nor property of a person (Hardy and Clegg, 2006), this perspective of leadership maintains that leadership is an outcome of dynamic interactive processes (Gronn, 2002) shaped by discourses. I define discourse as 'that which constrains *or enables*, writing, speaking and thinking' (Ball, 2013, p19).

In the end, this is not a study of leadership per se, but the concept of leadership together with the concept of downshifting provide the basis for exploring academic identities and the discourses and power/knowledge which are used to claim or assign identities and qualify them as truthful. When we choose to explore power in a Foucauldian sense, it is necessary to study discourse, in order to do so; I chose to focus in particular on the discourses used in talk. Leadership has proved to be a fruitful way to gain access to the group of people with whom I was interested and to explore their perspectives and experiences.

This thesis comprises eight chapters. In Chapter 1 I explore the Foucauldian interpretations of power and identities which are central to this study. Chapter 2 explores the leadership and downshifting literature. Chapter 3 explains how my engagement with the literature and interest in Foucauldian notions of power and identities, influenced both what I studied and how I did it.

The next four chapters (Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7) use the data gathered from the focus groups, interviews, consultation and strategy documents, and employee opinion survey results, to analyse the power relations which operate within discourse. Chapter 4, 'Leadership Identities', focuses on the leadership identities suggested by the data and how these are discursively constructed. Chapter 5, 'Downshifting', considers who is constructed as suitable for downshifting and the discourses which are drawn on to legitimise or delegitimise these identities. Chapter 6, 'Discourses of the individual and their consequences', examines the notion of the ideal academic and considers the ways in which this norm functions to regulate behaviours and discipline academics. Chapter 7, 'Our version, your version', analyses institutional points of contact, as well as the data offered by my participants, to uncover the truths through which these Principal Lecturers are encouraged to recognise themselves and others.

In the final chapter, Chapter 8, 'Concluding thoughts', I draw together the analysis to propose that the underlying objective of the various discourses circulating in this institution is to focus attention on the individual academic as opposed to the university. This, perhaps, serves a number of purposes. Firstly, it encourages academics to consider themselves as the necessary sites of change, as opposed to the institution and its practices. Secondly, it encourages academics to focus on their performance and meeting the requirements of ever more elaborately refined 'markers of development' as opposed to focusing on their pedagogical and scholarly practices, which is reorienting what it means to be an academic within this institution. This study suggests that this focus reduces awareness of, and resistance to, this re-orientation.

But, as I indicated earlier, the study of power relations and our 'historical limits' can never be complete, we only ever have a partial understanding and we are always at the beginning. It is my hope that this thesis might have emancipatory effects; that it might offer others a place to begin an exploration of the limitations and possibilities for their own identities, so that they might develop an understanding of how power relations both constrain and constitute them and their relationships with others. That it might help people in the struggles that they are experiencing to be and do other, struggles which are expressed by the Principal Lecturers in this study, and in the work of others, such as Archer (2008a) and Hanson (2009). Encouraging collective recognition of the importance of individual actions, as well as a re-examination of the ways in which academics are becoming increasingly separated from one another.

Chapter 1: Positioning this study

Introduction

As I described in the introductory chapter, a Foucauldian interpretation of power is the central tenet of this thesis. In the chapter that follows I will explore the topics of power and identities and explain how my understanding of Foucault's work has influenced my study. I hope to demonstrate how I came to an understanding of Foucault, as interested not in the exploration of power for its own sake, but in how we become subjects, how identities are formed and reformed, and legitimised or constrained (Foucault, 1982).

The chapter begins with a consideration of power, briefly locating Foucauldian ideas of power within the broader business and management literature regarding power. Given the focus of my exploration of academic identities on the discourses of leadership and downshifting, I explore the interplay of these discourses in relation to a Foucauldian understanding of power. The following section, further develops the Foucauldian ideas regarding identities discussed in the introduction, and adds to this a discussion of the literature which specifically examines academic identities. A number of important considerations for framing my study, in terms of what I should be attentive to, as I plan, collect and analyse data, arise.

A Foucauldian understanding of identity is one in which, identities are understood to be formed through interactions with discourses, discourses which are partial, fragmented and fluid and are themselves the results of power relations (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000; and Foucault, 1976). Such an understanding denies the possibility of a coherent unified essential self, instead it embraces the possibility of multiple identities (Zembylas, 2003). Knowledge and power are interlinked (Foucault, 1980b), thus knowledge can limit our capacity to think beyond our socio-historical context (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000), to think of other possible identities, or ways of being. This is an understanding of identity formation in which we have agency, but our agency is a site of continuous struggle, between power and resistance (Mayo, 2000). Foucault (1982) suggests that analysis should go beyond finding 'what we are', (our identities), to refusing what we are and imagining what we might be. For in this way, we might resist forms of governance, linked to the state, which

combine 'individualization techniques' and 'totalization procedures' (Foucault, 1982, p213), designed to create knowledge which enables universal, quantifiable 'truths' to be applied at the population level and the direction of thoughts and behaviours at the individual level (Foucault, 1982).

Power

Shackleton (1995, p72) states that it is 'impossible to talk of leadership without discussing the question of power and influence' and yet the vast majority of research and theorising on leadership within the business and management literature has taken what might be described as an apolitical approach (Gordon, 2002a; and Gronn, 2015). As such, an assumption of leaders as dominant, (in other words as having power), pervades the literature, even the distributed leadership literature, in which 'the sharing of power appears to be of central importance' (Gordon, 2002b, p43), has considered this sharing to be unproblematic (Gordon, 2002b).

This is perhaps to do with the understanding of power inherent in the mainstream business and management literature, which takes a functionalist view. Whereby, power embedded in the organisational hierarchy (the leaders) is considered 'legitimate', non-problematic and devoid of issues of personal interest, whilst power exercised outside of this hierarchical structure is 'illegitimate', amounting to attempted or actual disruptions to the fulfilment of organisational/societal needs/desires (Hardy and Clegg, 1999). Thus, research undertaken from this perspective has focused on how groups acquire and utilise power, (which is conceptualised as a resource), of an illegitimate nature (Hardy and Clegg, 2006) and how this can be prevented.

Critical understandings of power, built on the work of Marx and Weber, conceptualise power as domination, and the challenging of power as resisting domination. Such work is underpinned by an emancipatory view that the illumination of the processes through which 'power becomes embedded in organisational structures in a way that serves certain, but not all, interest groups' (Hardy and Clegg, 2006, p754), will enable the subjected to reject their domination (Hardy and Clegg, 1999).

Foucault has a different interpretation. For Foucault power is neither good, nor bad, it is not a resource or commodity and it cannot occur in social isolation (Shackleton, 1995), but is 'diverse and dispersed' (Gallagher, 2008, p402):

> Power must be analysed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localised here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation (Foucault, 1980a, p98).

Hence, a Foucauldian understanding of power suggests that power is not a possession or property of a person; therefore it cannot be contained by formal organisational structures but is a fluid relational concept, which impacts upon all groups within society (Hardy and Clegg, 2006).

Theories of leadership often classify leaders as those with power and followers as those without (Gordon, 2002b). A position that Foucault would clearly contest, for leaders do not own power, power cannot be contained by their formal role within an organisation, therefore followers also have access to power. Leaders may exercise power, but they can only do so when others accept that exercise of power. According to the organisational structure of Acorn University and the job descriptions of the Principal Lecturers, leadership is a formal condition of their role. Gordon's (2002b) insight suggests that they might therefore, assume that they are in a position of power. Yet, a Foucauldian understanding proposes that holding a formal leadership position will not simply confer power. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, (that in this context are the followers), also have access to power and determine whether acts of power on the Principal Lecturers' part are accepted. Thus, the Principal Lecturers might experience tension in their roles, as they wrestle with an organisational understanding of leadership and power, which privileges their formal position, and experiences of the nature of power as fluid and dispersed as Foucault (1980a) suggests.

A Foucauldian conception of power suggests that it might be useful to consider, within the context of a specific organisation, the ways in which power is exercised through relationships at multiple levels within the organisation. Thus the analysis extends beyond the consideration of how leaders exercise power over employees or vice versa, to consider how management exercises power

over owners (and vice versa), how governments exercise power over owners (and vice versa), and so on (Gallagher, 2008). Thus power is not hierarchical, flowing from the top of an organisation downwards, operating as and when decisions are made, the act of decision making is not of itself powerful, decisions are powerful when, and if, they are implemented by the actions of others (Gallagher, 2008). This is again a critique of hierarchy/formal positions as capable of capturing/containing power. It also points to the importance of individuals and their actions. A decision may be made by the university executive, for example, but they are incapable of implementing this on their own, the actions of multiple others determine whether or not that decision is realised. Within the organisational structure, Principal Lecturers are part of this chain of implementation. They are subject to the implementation will of those above them, but they are also responsible for subjecting others to their own will. The key, Gallagher (2008) highlights, is that built into such a system is a capacity for resistance.

Foucault distinguishes between intentions and effects, and suggests that researchers should not concern themselves with the intentions of acts of power, but should focus on the results (Foucault, 1980a). Hence, researchers investigating leadership could gain important insights by looking at the effects of leadership policies, rather than at the professed intentions of the people involved in designing and implementing those policies (Gallagher, 2008).

> But if, following Foucault, we understand power as forming the subject as well, as providing the very condition of its existence and the trajectory of its desire, then power is not simply what we oppose but also, in a strong sense, what we depend on for our existence and what we harbour and preserve in the beings that we are (Butler, 1997a, p2).

Butler's (1997a) words highlight the complexities of power and suggest that perhaps the emancipatory ideal of Marx and Weber is overly simplistic, knowledge does not simply equate to freedom from domination, knowledge is itself powerful, what is accepted as true is itself a product of power relations (Hardy and Clegg, 1999; and Chapter 3). The notion of organisational outflanking is an example of knowledge failing to lead to freedom, whereby individuals know what needs to change, the costs of change and the likelihood of failure, and this knowledge ensures that they maintain the status quo (Hardy and Clegg, 1999). If we consider potential downshifters, they may know what

needs to change within Acorn University, to enable them to improve other areas of their lives, yet the potential costs associated with being seen as problematic, 'whinging', or lacking in commitment, might prevent them from seeking change.

Within a Foucauldian understanding of power the act of naming is significant as it identifies both what we are and what we are not, names and labels distinguish individuals from each other - they differentiate us (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). A name 'both subordinates and enables' (Butler, 1997b, p163). The title then, of Principal Lecturer, distinguishes the holder, signifying to others both what they are and what they are not, (Lecturer/Senior Lecturer), they are both constrained by this label as well as enabled. The importance of naming leads us to the importance of discourse in Foucault's understanding of power. For Foucault discourses create the conditions for determining what is thought and what is practiced and what can be thought and practiced (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). Discourses carry wider social meanings, for example, what counts as leadership constitutes 'groups of statements' that compose the discursive formation of leadership within an organisation (Ball, Maguire and Braun, 2012). Yet these formations are constituted historically and, therefore, are only a representation of the possible understandings of phenomena (Hardy and Clegg, 1999) and contain 'gaps, voids, absences, limits and divisions' (Foucault, 1986, p119). This is a very important point, for it shows us how discursive formations are incomplete and create within them spaces which people can use to be and do differently, to refuse who they are. What counts as leadership within Acorn University, isn't fixed or complete, there are spaces within the dominant discourse in which people can be and do other, (have other identities), and it is these spaces, which I hope to find in my study. For they offer the opportunity to extend the analysis beyond finding what the Principal Lecturers are, to imagining and building up what they could be (Foucault, 1982).

Apple (1995) argues that the internalisation of discourses, such as organisational goals, reduces conflict and over time, tends to result in 'a homogenization of overt interests between management and employees' (p140-141), as employees come to govern themselves. The notion of self-governance is an important act of self-discipline and an example of being subjected to power from oneself (Foucault, 1982), as employees learn to monitor their own

and others' behaviour to meet, in this example, the expectations of management. Self-governance is, a 'means of bringing power relations into being' (Foucault, 1982, p223) and is likely to be an important aspect of my discursive analysis.

In her paper, exploring the disciplining of the student body, Grant (1997) describes how students come to discipline themselves, to meet the expectations and identity of the 'good student'. Alongside these practices of self-governance, institutional practices of assessment, timetabling and rules regulate their desires to be 'good students', and to meet the associated expectations regarding behaviours; to attend lectures and seminars, to submit assignments on time, to be quiet/to offer answers when asked (Grant, 1997; and Acker and Armenti, 2004). It is hardly a stretch to suggest that the academic body is similarly disciplined. Indeed McWilliam, Hatcher and Meadmore (1999) conclude that what is required are ever greater levels of physical stamina and fitness. I discuss this in more detail later in the chapter.

'Things are not just the way they are', 'they are made the way they are by social norms and practices, by institutions and discourses that regulate our behaviour, and by the way we regulate ourselves' (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000, p136; or see Smart, 1996).

This practice of self-governance is further embedded as people are subject to a constant disciplinary gaze and continuously divided and sub-divided as 'in' or 'out', 'leader' or 'non-leader' (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). Yet Foucault's conception of power is not limited to considerations of discourse but includes the non-discursive mechanisms of power such as the organisation of office space, the artefacts and materials that are displayed within it, and how these become aspects of the tools and techniques of power (Ball, Maguire and Braun, 2012; and Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). Whilst my analysis will not be focused on these non-discursive mechanisms of power, it may be that they are referred to by the Principal Lecturers and I will need to be attentive to this possibility and open to exploring how these become tools and techniques of power.

This is not a fatalistic understanding of power, people are capable of resisting, yet this resistance does not occur outside of power relations and may in fact

24

lead to their reinforcement (Hardy and Clegg, 2006). Researchers are grappling with the issue of how to recognise and understand resistance (see Ball, Maguire and Braun, 2012). The expansion of an understanding of resistance as more than organised action has led to the identification of subtle practices of resistance including; 'humour, cynicism, scepticism, parody, hidden transcripts, bitching and fiddles' (Hardy and Clegg, 2006, p768). Ball and Olmedo (2013) urge an approach to the study of resistance, which examines these specific and empirically based *'practices of resistance'* (p86), and focuses on the complexities and subtleties of resistance so that power relations might be examined. In their case study work which looked at policy enactments in four state secondary schools in the UK, Ball, Maguire and Braun (2012) found evidence of disengagements, including 'role distancing', whereby staff members disdainfully detached themselves from the role that they were performing. Within such an expanded understanding, downshifting might be considered to be a practice of resistance, which occurs, as Foucault suggests, within and not outside power relations. Bourdieu's concept of habitus might explain how the actions of individuals are mediated by 'their relative symbolic capital (incorporating educational, cultural, and social capital)' (Benson and O'Reilly, 2009, p618). Thus, the decision to downshift, the nature of the downshift undertaken, and the life then led are limited, both knowingly and unknowingly by an embodied class-culture. This habitus is not rigid but 'allows for invention and improvisation' (Benson and O'Reilly, 2009, p617), yet this is informed by their previous life, skills and expectations, which therefore limits the possibilities of the changes undertaken.

Hardy and Clegg (1999) offer a note of caution; 'a theory of power does not, and cannot, exist other than as an act of power in itself' (p382). However power is conceptualised, the result is that many organisational phenomena become invisible or unimportant. There are limitations with regards to what can be achieved. This study can only develop a partial and incomplete understanding of the power relations which are formulating, sustaining and challenging the identities of these Principal Lecturers. Hardy and Clegg (1999) propose that contextual studies are needed which listen to the voices involved and the stories told, through which we can understand 'how certain voices come to be silenced and how resistant subjects are constituted' (Hardy and Clegg, 1999,

p383). Such an analysis enables the contradictions between the public and private discourses of leadership, what is said or written compared to what is done, to be brought to light (Kenway and McLeod, 2004; and Gallagher, 2008). This analysis suggests that any discursive formation utilised at Acorn University, be that of leadership or downshifting, will be contradictory, as discourses are employed to achieve different ends. It recommends that I undertake a contextual study, in which I listen to the voices of the Principal Lecturers, paying attention to; contradictions, the identities which are silenced and how this is achieved, and practices of resistance.

The analysis of power was central to Foucault's work, yet he was clear, that his goal was 'to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects' (1982, p208). Thus, he stated, 'it is not power, but the subject, which is the general theme of my work' (1982, p209).

Foucault, wished to analyse and understand how power is exercised, in order to understand how these processes produced particular subjectivities and to highlight the limits of possibility, in terms of subjectivities and identities that were also created (Biesta, 2008). This insight led me to consider the notion of identities in relation to my own work.

Identities

In 1995, Butler, in a critical response to a book entitled Identities, wrote of the 'shift in public discourse' 'from the preoccupation with "identity" in the singular' to 'a complicated effort to think plurality' (p439). Thinking identities plural is complicated because the notion of identity is imbued with connections and questions regarding other concepts, such as culture, agency, transformation and representation. Frequently, in thinking identities plural, as I shall demonstrate, researchers return (unwittingly) to a metaphysical notion of identity and its implicit underpinning assumptions, (which are incompatible with understandings of plurality).

Foucault challenged the notion of identity in the singular, which considers that we have a central, knowable, essential self (Zembylas, 2003) and offered us a more complex and tenuous notion of identity.

He used the term subjectivity 'in a two-fold sense, that of being a subject and that of being subject to' (Mayo, 2000, p114). Subjectivity in a Foucauldian sense is multiple, complex, contradictory and historically and socially constituted. It is a political notion, the site of processes of power which produce subjects (Oksala, 1998; Mayo, 2000; and Foucault, 1982); subjects, who think, act and speak in particular ways. These individuals are understood to have agency, but Foucault contends that this agency is a site of local struggle 'between strategies of power and resistance, not in the self-consciousness of the subject' (Mayo, 2000, p114).

Subjectivity is created through interactions with discourses. These discourses are socially and historically located and enacted through relationships; the subjects that are produced are done so within these contextual limits (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). Awareness of these limitations and the ways in which we are categorised or defined and define ourselves represent avenues for resistance.

When it comes to the notion of identity, the political process through which people come to recognise themselves as subjects, and how they maintain and legitimise their understanding is central to a Foucauldian analysis. Foucault (2007a) contends that techniques of domination and techniques or technologies of the self are the most important in this analysis, although he does not exclude techniques of production or signification.

> We should not understand the exercise of power as pure violence or strict coercion. Power consists in complex relations: these relations involve a set of rational techniques, and the efficiency of those techniques is due to a subtle integration of coercion-technologies and self-technologies (Foucault, 2007a, p155).

It is not possible for us to sit outside of these power relations; we are both subject to them and creators of them in our relationships. Foucault's ethical self-formation requires us to treat oneself as an object of investigation, to question and think about oneself in relation to others and to consider our subjectivity as a problem (Foucault, 1982). We are to question how we have come to understand ourselves, how has discourse protected us from and created the needs which we have presumed to have originated in ourselves? (Mayo, 2000). Such self-questioning forms an integral aspect of this study, for it enables me to consider,

how I am implicated in the knowledge which has been produced in the course of this research (Coffey, 1999; and Bryman and Cassell, 2006). It allows me to explore the power-knowledge nexus, within which I construct my own identities and the identities of the participants, this I discuss in detail in Chapter 3.

Foucault would not be interested in categorizing individual identities as much of the academic identity literature does, for example; Barry, Berg and Chandler's (2006) Stressed Professor, Managerial Advocate, or Administrative Patrician; Garcia and Hardy's (2007) overworked academic; or Ylijoki and Ursin's (2013) academic rebel, victim, exhausted worker, or wage earner. But rather in the regimes of discourse or power/knowledge which enable such identities to be assigned and legitimised as true.

In my own work then I am interested in more than simply classifying identities but in how these academic identities emerge, and the discourses and power/knowledge which are used to claim or assign identities and qualify them as truthful. Understanding how we have come to consider the self in modern western society, is vital in thinking, researching and writing about identity. Foucault (2007a) traces the genealogy of the subject, through Greek and Roman times, into and beyond Christianity. This work identified the moral obligation inherent in our society to know oneself, and through this act of knowing to become an object for analysis both by oneself and others. This obligation extends to our thoughts which have become data requiring continuous interpretation as we strive to discover who we really are. This process of interpretation necessitates verbalisation, an act rooted in the Christian tradition of confession, it is through the verbalising of our thoughts that the 'truth' can appear. The constant verbalisation and search for our true selves, Foucault (2007b) terms a technology of the self; techniques which allow a person to change themselves, their thoughts, actions and so on in order to reach their desired state of happiness, spirituality, or perfection. In effect, we are encouraged to take personal responsibility for making ourselves happier, or better leaders, or improving our lives via downshifting. The onus is on changing the self, rather than changing the contextual conditions within which we find ourselves.

Foucault questions the act of searching for the truth about oneself, because it suggests that within each of us there must be something which is hidden from ourselves, an identity or an essential self, which precedes our ability to think about it and to act. Such a notion suggests that with awareness of our selves comes freedom, that we are able to alter our situation, 're-make the world that precedes the subject' (Mayo, 2000, p105). But it is knowledge that gives us our understanding of ourselves, 'knowledge makes us its subjects, we understand ourselves by referring back to it' (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000, p50). Thus any notion of self and our understanding of it is created by our knowledge, which cannot precede our ability to think about ourselves. Danahar, Schirato, and Webb (2000, p131) summarise this:

> For Foucault, the self does not emerge in society naturally. Rather it is constituted through a game of truth, relations of power, and forms of relation to oneself and to others

The self, is therefore, constrained by the context within which we live. The rules, discourses and ideas of our culture, limit the ways in which we can be defined; the freedom which our true self purports to offer is impossible, because what we might understand of our self is bounded by the possibilities of our socio-historical context (Mayo, 2000; and Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). In this study, the Principal Lecturers' identities are understood to be constrained by their socio-historical context and their knowledge which regulates their thoughts and actions. Whilst this research might offer them new ways to understand their identities, they will still be constrained. This is distinct from a view of power as domination, and studies which seek to free the dominated (Hardy and Clegg, 1999). A Foucauldian view, acknowledges that we can never be free of power, we are always embedded in power relations. The purpose of studying power relations in researching identities is to enable resistance and refusal, but we can never sit outside of power (Foucault, 1982).

For Foucault we are both subject to power from others whilst simultaneously subject to power from ourselves as our self-knowledge attaches us to our identity (Foucault, 1982). Our subjectivity is a creation of power, situated within our historical and cultural context (Oksala, 1998). Our self-knowledge and our ability to act on this knowledge, our agency, is a site of continuous struggle, between power and resistance. The way we think about ourselves is impossible

29

to separate from our environment, because networks of power within our environments create the conditions within which we think. They assign us to categories by which we are both recognised by others and ourselves (Foucault, 1982; Butler, 1997a; and Oksala, 1998). It is impossible for the individual subject to be independent; the notion of individuals having a central, enduring identity, a self-consciousness which precedes the subject is unfeasible. This does not deny the possibility of action by individual subjects. It is not fatalistic or deterministic, but it recognises that the actions that are taken and the identities that are intentionally chosen, constructed, nurtured or resisted are not infinite but limited and constrained as 'needs and desires are constructed through networks of power' (Oksala, 1998, p41).

Denying the possibility of a coherent, unified self, allows the possibility of a multiplicity of identities:

> The concept of subjectivity implies that self-identity, like society and culture, is fractured, multiple, contradictory, contextual, and regulated by social norms. Subjectivity is produced, negotiated, and reshaped through discursive practices (Zembylas, 2003, p113).

Our identity is thus continuously produced, never fully formed, but fluid and relational, situated within and constrained by our historical and cultural context. Discourse does not merely describe or reflect social reality but it creates it. As a discursively produced individual the search to find ones true self is futile, because how I am categorised, compared and measured is historically produced (Weir, 2009). Vectors of power create normative ideals of what it means to be female, an academic, a researcher, which are maintained by mechanisms of self-surveillance (Weir, 2009) and determine how different identities should be performed so that I can be understood by my actions (Oksala, 1998). The notion of performance implies the interactivity required in identity formation. As individuals use discourses to shape both their own identities and those of others (Beech, 2008; and Watson, 2008). Normative ideals of what it means to be 'Principal Lecturer', will exist at Acorn University, maintained both by the surveillance of self and others. Given their hierarchical positioning, the Principal Lecturers might experience competing expectations, from those above and those below them, which may create contradictions and tensions for the performance and regulation of their identities. This also

highlights the role that they will play in the discursive formation and regulation of the identities of others'. All of which I will need to be attentive to.

Barry, Berg and Chandler (2006) draw on the notion of positionality to emphasise the interactive nature of subjectivity formation and the process which they term academic shape shifting, through which academics engage in negotiating and renegotiating their subjectivity in order to manage continuous organisational change.

Interestingly this suggests that organisational change creates the conditions for multiple subjectivities or as they call it shape shifting, the implication being that without it academics could in fact sustain an essential self, a core identity. Such an understanding would be strongly contested by Foucault, as the search for one's true self is the modern illusion (Oksala, 2010). Foucault (1976; and 2007b) argues that it is the product of power relations designed to discipline ourselves and create subjects who are manageable.

Whilst I might disagree with the implications of Barry, Berg and Chandler's (2006) work in terms of it re-establishing the idea of an essential self, their use of positionality highlights the importance of the context within which a person is located in relation to others. Their relative position determines the powerfulness or otherwise of their subjectivity. Thus academics are actively engaged in the development of their subjectivity, but these processes are embedded within their organisational experiences and constrained by the actions of power.

However, Butler (1995) warns that the language of subject positions, and the notion that subjects 'speak "from" these positions' (p440) creates the potential for subject positions to be considered as fixed and preceding the act of speech. Again, this could lead to a return to the thinking which led to the notion of essential selves and the search for freedom.

The changing higher education context is frequently discussed in relation to academic identities and a complex array of views emerges from the literature of its consequences. There are those like; Winter (2009), Hanson (2009), and McWilliam, Hatcher and Meadmore (1999), who describe the negative impacts of change, and the reshaping of academic identities in line with corporate, managerialist ideals and the notion of professionalism (also Gale, 2011; and

Elkington and Lawrence, 2012). This work, describes the pervasiveness of neoliberalism and its ability to produce self-governing subjects (Winter, 2009; Hanson, 2009; and McWilliam, Hatcher and Meadmore, 1999).

As previously discussed, self-governance is a 'means of bringing power relations into being' (Foucault, 1982, p223) and the literature suggests that there are many ways in which academics engage in these practices. For example, Acker and Armenti (2004) discuss academics 'going without sleep' (p19). McWilliam, Hatcher and Meadmore (1999) describe the personal responsibility that academics are encouraged to take for their success and development. These are practices which are experienced bodily (Acker and Armenti, 2004). McWilliam, Hatcher and Meadmore (1999) discuss the physical demands required of winners of the Australian government's university teaching awards:

> To be excellent is to be both physically fit and to stretch the limits of teaching-as-work (p68).

Physical prowess is, therefore, important; the body of the academic must also be disciplined. Yet, bodies have largely been ignored in academic work, which is constructed as an intellectual endeavour (Bell and Sinclair, 2014; and Sinclair, 2005b). Ignored, perhaps, for the academic body has been considered to be male (Sinclair, 2005b; and Archer, 2008b), as Clegg (2008b, p213) describes, 'the intellectual life is still understood, largely in masculine terms'. As well as examples of self-governance, these physical demands also suggest the continuance of the gendering of academic work, as the male body is constructed as most suited to meeting the demands of masculine discourses of work which normalise high workloads and total commitment (Acker and Armenti, 2004; and Chapter 2).

An aside, regarding neoliberalism is necessary, as like leadership it is an oft used and ill-defined term (Ball, 2012a). I refer to Shamir's (2008) definition of 'a complex, often incoherent, unstable and even contradictory set of practices that are organized around a certain imagination of the "market" as a basis for the universalization of market-based social relations, with the corresponding penetration in almost every single aspect of our lives' (p3). Ball (2012b) highlights money, specifically profit, as the subtext of neoliberalism, which

'encourages educational institutions to be entrepreneurial, and thus to generate increasing amounts of their budget from non-state sources, as well as to seek ways of cutting their costs' (Ball, 2012b, p24) and replaces 'the logic of exchange with that of competition' (Ball and Olmedo, 2013, p88).

Other terms which are also used frequently and often interchangeably (see Winter, 2009) in relation to higher education, and the discussion of academic identities, are managerialism and new public management, to refer to 'strong hierarchical management, budgetary control, income maximisation, commercialisation and performance management indicators' (Winter, 2009, p121). Managerialism is also associated with greater differentiation, competition, private sector management practices, and individualism (Winter and O'Donohue, 2012; Archer, 2008a; Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002; and Ogbonna and Harris, 2004).

In light of Shamir's (2008) definition, managerialism and new public management, can be considered to be contradictory practices of neoliberalism, organised around the imagined market, encouraging us to self-govern (Ball and Olmedo, 2013), and changing our thoughts, practices, relationships and identities (Ball, 2012a).

To return to the academic identity literature, there are those, who recognise the pervasiveness of neoliberalism, but also acknowledge its positive productivity, as it offers opportunities to be different, or as Holligan (2011) describes to make academia 'more equitable and diverse' (p69). Clegg (2008a) similarly concludes; 'it appears that identities in academia are expanding and proliferating and that there are possibilities for valorising difference' (p343). People, therefore, aren't necessarily simply absorbing the practices of neoliberalism, that are managerialism, but are finding ways to be other. This position is more hopeful, Archer (2008a) for example, discusses how some younger academics in her study 'were attempting to find ways of 'being otherwise' (p281). Yet, the struggles that they encounter in attempting to do this are also clear. Both Archer's (2008a) and Hanson's (2009) descriptions of struggles, demonstrate subjectification in the Foucauldian sense, as academics struggle to challenge ideas of which they are also part, ideas which constrain their ability to be and understand themselves and others in different ways.

Deem and Brehony (2005) conclude that managerialism can also be productive in other ways, to further, for example, academics' own agendas/careers, thus some academics in their study, used managerialism to justify their 'focus on research to the exclusion of other activities such as teaching', whilst others used it to 'bring about a focus on students conceived as customers' (Deem and Brehony, 2005, p229).

This analysis suggests that the discourse of managerialism is productive in various ways, enabling particular identities to be legitimised whilst simultaneously excluding others. Whilst it is associated with particular practices, it is clear from this analysis that managerialism can be utilised to serve a variety of interests. The contradictory nature of neoliberalism as described by Shamir (2008) is evident.

Billot (2010) and participants in Archer's (2008a) study, suggest that we need to stop looking back at an 'imagined past' and abandon academic identities which are in conflict with the current context. Such a position challenges the 'golden age discourse' (Archer, 2008a) which constructs the past in opposition to the present, (as with leadership discourses, Chapter 2). This view, accepts the conditions of work as inevitable, and positions the possibilities of change in terms of the academic's ability to change themselves as opposed to their ability to change their contextual environment or the necessity of such change.

So, whilst Billot (2010) calls for the recognition of the multiplicity and dynamism of academic identity, a call in keeping with a Foucauldian understanding of identity. Her understanding is that managerialism is essential; it is the only way for higher education institutions to operate, as Archer (2008a) writes, 'the power of managerialism lies in its capacity to appear as the only 'thinkable context' (p272). Managerialism is therefore constraining Billot's ability to think beyond, for it is a taken-for-granted necessity. Foucauldian analysis offers us the ability to illuminate such limitations, to bring to peoples' attention the taken-for-granted, (Biesta, 2008; and Ball, 2013), in order 'to make possible different ways of being and doing' (Biesta, 2008, p202).

Winter (2009) also accepts the conditions of managerialism, and similarly positions academics as the necessary sites of change. He, like Churchman and King (2009) writes against the tendency for managerialism to seek unifying

perspectives, and its desire for a homogenous academic identity. Proposing instead 'a multi-vocal institutional identity' (p128). Yet his 'complicated effort to think plurality' (Butler, 1995, p439), is framed within a managerialist agenda 'of resource constraints and business development' (Winter, 2009, p129). His work also considers plurality only in the sense that institutions contain groups of people with different identities, as opposed to the possibility of individuals sustaining multiple identities. So he explores the academic manager and the managed academic, but always sets these in contrast to one another, you are one or the other, no consideration is given to the possibility that people might simultaneously claim both kinds of identities (Winter, 2009).

This analysis suggests that neoliberalism and the practices of new public management and managerialism of which they are a part, are likely to be significant in the identities constructed by my participants, constraining and enabling their possibilities 'of being and doing' (Biesta, 2008). As Winter and O'Donohue (2012) write, 'managerialism is an important identity shaping mechanism' (p566), and as such I will need to pay particular attention to the way that academics locate themselves and others in relation to it. For it is likely that even those who oppose its influence will struggle to think beyond, to other possible contexts and identities (Archer, 2008a).

An important aspect of the analysis will require me to question, what is being taken-for-granted? What and how are power relations operating to maintain these understandings? Yet, as Foucault (1986) points out, all discourses are incomplete, including that of neoliberalism, which is fluid and fragmented and used as part of various strategies, as we have seen with the practices of managerialism, to produce different outcomes. Thus, it creates spaces within it and between it, in which people can be and do differently. As Clegg (2008a) concludes; 'despite all the pressure of performativity, individuals have created spaces for the exercise of principled personal autonomy and agency' (p342). It is these spaces that I hope to find in my work and the possibilities for identities which emerge from them.

Mayo (2000) provides an account and critique of the uses of Foucault by educational theorists. One group he argues has focused on 'the micro-level power at play in educational policy and practice' (p105), examining the

'normalizing power through which we are all engaged in relating to one another' (Mayo, 2000, p105). Such work focuses on the power which constrains and constitutes individuals and has paid less attention to resistances to this power. Yet a Foucauldian interpretation of power is attentive to both the repressive and constructive workings of power (Foucault, 1976), to the identities that are refused as well as those that are uncontested. As such in my own work, I will attempt to consider both; to explore the power relations which enable people to lay claim to *and* contest/refuse particular identities, through examination of the discourses that are used.

Another group Mayo (2000) argues has examined subjectivity and subject position through the use of narrative accounts. This work has tended to neglect an examination of the subject's accounts of their subjectification, in other words there has been an uncritical overemphasis on the individual's subjectivity and a lack of exploration of how they are historically constituted. The focus is then on the individual at the expense of consideration of the conditions within which they are situated and which they themselves actively construct. In order to address this I will need to consider how power is exercised to create them *and* their situation, how they are contextualised.

Mayo (2000) challenges educational theorists to combine an examination of normalizing power with an examination of resistances to this power. Part of the task is not to define who we are but to challenge what we are, 'to imagine and to build up what we could be' (Foucault, 1982, p216) to problematize our 'own situatedness in power and' our 'responsibility for their power effects' (Mayo, 2000, p116).

'To imagine and build up what we could be' (Foucault, 1982, p216) is the greatest challenge, and it is both a personal challenge and a challenge for this study. As you will discover in Chapter 3, the examination of my 'own situatedness in power' has been a difficult and integral process of this research. I have been driven by an emancipatory effect agenda (Chapter 3). I have wanted to enable my participants to explore the limitations and possibilities for their identities, to imagine what they could be (Foucault, 1982). I explore my attempts to do this in Chapter 3. However, I have come to realise, that in order to disrupt taken-for-granted exercises of power and illuminate possibilities of

being differently, (Foucault, 1982; Ball, 2013; and Biesta, 2008), the audience for the 'findings' which result from this study, should be broader than simply my own participants, that this research has an important role to play in alerting others to the site of struggle of power; their bodies, their identities (Ball, 2014).

Churchman and King's work (2009) suggests that challenging identities and provoking exploration of their limits and possibilities, is likely to be difficult because people deliberately seek out relationships with similar others, or maintain 'isolated conditions' in order to preserve their academic identity and avoid confrontation (Churchman and King 2009). Gale's (2011) work supports this conclusion, and highlights the importance of a teacher identity in post-1992 universities.

This implication for academic identities, of working in a post-1992 context, is important as my own research is in such a setting. Gale's (2011) work with early-career academics, suggests that being employed for their vocational expertise, and not for their research profile, ties their understanding of being an academic to their teaching role and relationships. Thus, the power relations which are operating within their context enable them to legitimately claim an identity as a teacher, because other identities, such as "writer' or 'networker' or 'researcher" (p224), are, at the time, illegitimate.

Intricately linked then with the identity of the teacher, is also that which it seems to exclude, research. Clegg (2008a), Gale (2011) and Harris (2005), all describe the increasing separation of teaching and research. Harris (2005) writes:

> The relationship between research and teaching has become increasingly complex and problematic (p426).

We are seeing the increasing employment of academics on teaching-only contracts (Gale 2011), as institutional policies facilitate this fragmentation. Yet research is often seen as integral to being a 'proper academic' (Leathwood and Read, 2013), and a 'longing for inclusion and recognition' (Leathwood and Read, 2013, p1171), is evident amongst some who see themselves positioned as other. I propose that a system of differentiation is at work (Foucault,1982), in which research is accorded a higher status than teaching, as are the institutions within which research takes place. Research is one of the primary tools used by particular groups of universities to discursively position themselves as superior

to others, (Pirrie, Adamson and Humes, 2010), and to maintain differentials between institutions. The Research Excellence Framework (REF) provides a 'means of bringing power relations into being' (Foucault, 1982, p223), as a system of audit and surveillance of research outputs and of those who produce them (Leathwood and Read, 2013). Achieving within this system is beneficial at various levels, for the individual, department, faculty, and institution.

This analysis suggests that an identity as a researcher offers individuals a superior status in relation to a teaching identity. But the researcher identity is gendered, as women 'have been, and are, excluded from intellectual spaces and identities' (Leathwood and Read, 2013, p1171). Given all of this, research is likely to be significant to the identities of my participants, because as academics within a post-1992 institution they are implicated within, and sustain this system of differentiation, which discursively positions them as inferior within the wider higher education context. According to which they are 'teachers' and 'not proper academics' (Leathwood and Read, 2013; Garratt and Hammersley-Fletcher, 2009; and Gale, 2011).

Conclusions

A Foucauldian interpretation of power suggests that power is fluid and relational, can never be owned, nor contained by formal organisational roles (Foucault, 1980a). Discourses are integral to Foucauldian analyses of power, for they create the conditions for determining what can and is thought and practiced (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). Identities are constructed through interactions with discourses. Discourses are socially and historically produced, and can only ever partially represent a phenomenon, thus the discourses of leadership or downshifting are incomplete and contradictory. Their partiality creates spaces, which people can use to be and do differently, to resist and refuse. Because of this I decided to focus on studying discourse, particularly, (although not entirely), those used in talk. In analysing the resultant transcripts, I was careful to consider the partiality of the discourses used and the spaces that arose for people to be other. I discuss these decisions, the importance of discourse and my approach to the data in Chapter 3.

Foucault's (1982) work suggests that the notion of self-governance is likely to be a significant 'means of bringing power relations into being' (p223) in my

study. This is borne out by the identity literature which highlights practices such as academics 'going without sleep' (Acker and Armenti, 2004, p19). These self-governing practices extend therefore, to disciplining the academic body, as well as their thoughts and actions.

A Foucauldian understanding of identity is of non-essentialism, in other words our identities do not precede us (Mayo, 2000). Knowledge does not free us, but limits our capacity to think beyond our socio-historical context (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). This is not a deterministic view of power, Foucault is clear that power is both repressive and constructive (Foucault, 1976). We have agency, we are active in the production of our identities, but our agency is not limitless, it is a site of continuous struggle, between power and resistance.

If power is fluid and relational and identities are formed through interactions with discourses which are partial and socially and historically produced. Then our identity must also be fluid and relational and never fully formed. Denying the possibility of a coherent, unified self, allows the possibility of a multiplicity of identities (Zembylas, 2003); of academics simultaneously claiming different identities. This study will be attentive to the possibilities of plurality and the contradictions which might arise.

This thesis is a study of the power relations which result in the formation of academic identities, identities which are themselves vehicles for power (Foucault, 1980a). This analysis suggests that the contradictory practices of neoliberalism, including those of managerialism are likely to be significant to the Principal Lecturers in this study, constraining and enabling their possibilities 'of being and doing' (Biesta, 2008). It also suggests that the particular identities of teacher and researcher are likely to be important as my participants seek legitimacy both within and outside their post-1992 institution. These identities are vehicles for power, the identity of researcher, for example, appears to offer a particular preferential status in comparison to that of teacher. Differences between the organisational view of power, (power invested in formal positions), and their experiences of the nature of power as fluid and dispersed, may well create tensions and contradictions for their identities.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The literature review which follows is focused on three topics; leadership in business and management, leadership in higher education and downshifting. Whilst the context of my study is higher education, I found it necessary to look to the business and management literature for a number of reasons. Firstly, as Bryman and Lilley (2009) note there is a lack of leadership research in higher education, in contrast, there is a vast array of leadership research which has been undertaken in the business context, which I considered might offer insights into higher education. Secondly, Bolden et al (2009) argue that there has been an increase in private sector thinking and corporate models of leadership introduced in higher education (Nikunen, 2012), which requires that an understanding of these models of leadership is developed. Finally, it was in my exploration of the business and management leadership literature where I first came across the notion of downshifting.

As I described in Chapter 1, leadership is a frequently used term in higher education and a requirement of the role of a Principal Lecturer. The contradictory nature of the leadership discourse provides a rich basis for exploring the multiple ways in which identities are negotiated and the processes of power through which they are legitimised or constrained.

I consider that leadership does not reside in a person, it is constructed discursively (Haake, 2009). This shifts the focus from the individual and their personal leadership qualities to their context, moving beyond consideration of the ability of context to alter leadership effectiveness as in contingency approaches to leadership (Parry and Bryman, 2006) to consider context as essential to the creation of leadership practices (Middlehurst, Goreham, Woodfield, 2009). The discourse of leadership therefore does not merely describe or reflect social reality but it creates it. Creating the conditions for determining what can be thought and practiced (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000).

I shall argue that the dominant discourse of leadership both in the business and management and higher education literature, constructs an individual heroic male leader, who is master of both his body and mind. Given its dominance, I

imagine that this identity will be pertinent to the Principal Lecturers and will constrain and enable their own leadership identities. However, Foucault, (1986), reminds us that any discourse is incomplete and fragmented, this identity isn't all-encompassing, it does not mean that people can't find ways to be and do other, but that it makes it more difficult for people to do so.

The perspective of leadership which guides this study maintains that leadership is not a possession or property of a person, but an outcome of dynamic interactive processes (Gronn, 2002). Thus leadership is not contained by organisational roles, but occurs throughout organisations. It is impacted upon by the context of the site of study, i.e. the specific organisation and its histories and ideologies (Cope, Kempster and Parry, 2011). The people involved draw on their previous experiences and knowledge of the organisation to understand and interpret the practices of leadership. Furthermore, this conceptualisation is interested in leadership configurations, and as such allows for mixtures of solo and distributed/collective forms of leadership to emerge (Gronn, 2008). It seeks to acknowledge both the official and unofficial, often invisible, but tacitly understood processes of leadership (Gronn, 2002). This understanding has developed from my engagement with both the business and management and higher educational leadership literature and a Foucauldian understanding of power.

I begin my review by exploring leadership as it is discussed in the business and management literature.

Leadership in business and management

Introduction

Central concerns in leadership research have often revolved around the nature of leadership and how it can be enhanced (Tuori and Vilen, 2011). Leadership is seen as an organisational panacea (Ford, 2005), essential to the successful functioning of any organisation, be they a small business, a multinational corporation, a school, or a higher education institution. Engaging in leadership and being a leader is seen to be a positive and desirable experience. Indeed, at Acorn University engaging in leadership is a requirement of career progression (Acorn University, 2013a).

A theme which resonates strongly within the research and policy contexts is that the purpose and characteristic of leadership is successful organisational performance (Kempster and Cope, 2010; Gray, Densten and Sarros, 2003; Leitch, McMullan and Harrison, 2009; and Andersson and Tell, 2009). This enables leadership success to be equated with the individuals' leadership qualities (Jones, 2011). As a result a deficit model of leadership has arisen in which the individual leader is continually found lacking, in education, training or development (see Chapter 4, Great Britain Department for Business Innovation and Skills 2012, or Mannion, 2009, for examples).

Who is being studied?

The examination of the literature revealed a historical focus on the observation and collection of data on individual leaders and leadership. The research has focused on formal leaders in top management positions (Billing and Alvesson, 1989; Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe, 2005) and is dominated by studies of western, particularly American, white men (Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe, 2007). This focus has led to research which is interested in the personal traits or characteristics of the leader, their motivations and actions. Leader-centric approaches have dominated theorizing. These include trait theory, style theory and contingency theories (Cope, Kempster and Parry, 2011; and Bebbington, 2009). Other leader-centric approaches have developed, under the umbrella of 'New leadership', including; charismatic, transformational and visionary leadership (Parry and Bryman, 2006).

These approaches are underpinned by the notion of the leader-follower relationship, which has taken on a dualistic form and an inhibiting assumption 'in which leaders are given a position of privilege because they are considered to be, either through natural ability or the possession of appropriate attributes, superior to their followers - the argument being that if leaders were not superior, people would not follow them' (Gordon, 2002a, p155; and see Gronn, 2002). This power differential has come to be accepted as unproblematic and developing an understanding of the relationship between power and leadership has been overlooked (Gordon, 2002b; and Gronn, 2015). Such an interpretation fails to acknowledge the possibility of a closeness in the relationship which renders the distinguishing of leaders or followers as meaningless (Gronn, 2010; Parry and Bryman, 2006; and Jackson and Parry, 2009).

A number of methods have been adopted to reframe the notion of followership in order to dispose of their dependent and obedient characterisation. One of these is the romance of leadership, at the heart of which is the understanding that followers decide whether an act is an act of leadership or not (Jackson and Parry, 2009). The romanticised notion of leadership describes the tendency for followers to use leadership as a simplified way to understand organisational performance. An effect which seems to be more pronounced at the extremes of success or failure (Jackson and Parry, 2009; Epitropaki and Martin, 2005; and Denis, Langley and Sergi, 2012). Thus leadership is socially constructed by the interactions of the followers with each other and their expectations of leadership. How leadership is perceived is effected by social contagion, the spontaneous process by which particular reactions to leadership are spread throughout a group (Jackson and Parry, 2009; and Cope, Kempster and Parry, 2011). Epitropaki and Martin (2005) found that employees use their implicit leadership theories to evaluate the behaviour of their manager and that once an impression has been made 'then subsequent information tends to be interpreted through this original categorization even in the presence of disconfirming evidence' (p673). Even after a year of further interactions with their managers and exposure to disconfirming evidence employees' perceptions did not change. Such research emphasises how little of the leaders' identity is in control of the leader themselves. Their leadership effectiveness is considered in terms of their follower perceptions, which are themselves a function of previous experiences and expectations. Similarly Chen and Meindl (1991) found that reconstruction of the image of the leader was limited to incremental revisions of initial impressions as opposed to radical transformations. So, whilst employees desire a state whereby they can attribute organisational success or failure to leadership. The effects of leadership are based on pre-existing understandings and not objective measures of success, despite that being the impression created. Thus the success or failure attributed to leadership is significantly dependent on the ability of the leader to create and maintain an image of success, which convinces employees that they, the leader, are important and necessary to the organisation (Chen and Meindl, 1991). Success requires leaders to create power differentials, which are in keeping with cultural understandings of leadership, whereby leaders have a position of 'expertise' and employees as unreliable 'others'.

Chen and Meindl (1991) highlighted the significant influence of cultural ideological factors on the processes of social construction and social contagion and the important role of the media in this. The celebration of the heroic Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and the links made in media reports between their personal characteristics and the success of their companies, influence the expectations of followers with regards to the desirable behaviours, attributes and performance of leadership, i.e. their implicit theories of leadership (Cope, Kempster and Parry, 2011; and Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe, 2005). The work of Kemavuthanon and Duberley (2009) illustrated the influence of social and religious contexts upon understandings of leadership both for followers and leaders. In their study of leadership in community organisations in Thailand, the respondents' understandings of the personal characteristics necessary in a leader, and the purpose and nature of leadership, were framed within their understandings of Buddhist teachings (Kemavuthanon and Duberley, 2009). The Buddhist teachings, therefore, influenced what is considered possible in terms of identities; they constrained as well as enabled leadership identities.

Within the United Kingdom, the notion of family plays a significant role in the leadership literature. Family businesses represent a particular context of analysis. However, the notion of family extends beyond this, to the climate or culture of an organisation and the language used to describe it (Wang and Poutziouris, 2010), as well as to the symbolic frameworks in which leaders construct their understandings of leadership (Kempster, 2009). The notion of family pervades the business context, even in non-family owned businesses. In their study of observational learning, Kempster and Cope (2010) found that for owner-managers the influence of family members on their leadership development was most salient, in particular paternal influences. Thus owner-managers draw on gendered examples of leadership and use these to guide and understand their own behaviour. Such gendered thinking, serves to reinforce patriarchal understandings of leadership.

Within the Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) context, Cope, Kempster and Parry (2011) argue that employees are most likely to associate leadership with the notion of the heroic individual, due to their limited exposure to alternative forms of leadership. The work of Chen and Meindl (1991), Kemavuthanon and Duberley (2009), and Kempster and Cope (2010), suggests that wider social,

political and cultural conditions, and (in the United Kingdom) in particular the influence of the media, will similarly impact upon follower perceptions. The literature suggests that employees expect individual heroic leadership behaviour which is male in character, which serves to 'reinforce such behaviour from the leader' (Cope, Kempster and Parry, 2011, p276).

Debates regarding the relationship between leadership and management; leadership as a function, or leadership as a task, occupy significant space within the literature. The focus on demarcation has resulted in the canonisation of leadership, as the solution to all problems, and the demonization of management as the derogatory 'other' (Gronn, 2003a; and Western, 2008). For some commentators, the size of the organisation is believed to impact upon the separation between management and leadership, (Leitch, McMullan and Harrison, 2009), as the ability to distinguish between them is significantly reduced within smaller organisations. In contrast, within the educational leadership literature, writers such as Gronn (2003a) believe that the size of the organisation is irrelevant, as 'leadership is in the eye of the beholder' (p274). Therefore, the perceptions of the people surrounding the leader/(s) or manager/(s) will determine whether leadership is considered to be present or not, irrespective of the formal/informal positions they hold. Such ideas mirror the notions of the romance of leadership and the discussions of the impact of implicit leadership theories contained within the leadership literature. Gronn's position would also suggest that there are limitless ways of defining and understanding leadership (Western, 2008). However, this does not consider the impact of the wider contexts (the relations of power) within which these experiences occur, which, I would suggest, limit peoples' abilities to define and understand leadership in ways other than those which dominate discourse. Given the tendency in leadership research to avoid the question of power (Gronn, 2015), this oversight is hardly surprising.

The dominant discursive construction of leadership (in the UK) evident in the literature presented thus far is of leadership as an individual heroic male pursuit. This, I argue, constrains as well as enables leadership identities, limiting peoples' capacity to think beyond, to be and do other. Yet as I previously contended, any discursive formation is incomplete, and full of contradictions and tensions, which create opportunities for other identities to emerge (Chapter 1).

45

Chreim (2015) and Gronn (2015) argue that the tendency to take-for-granted the individual leader as the unit of analysis restricts research because it fails to 'recognise fully the dynamics and interrelationships involved in the leadership process' (Gronn, 2015, p549). Resulting in an over-emphasis on the positivity of leadership at the expense of exploration of; the conflicts and tensions that arise 'doing leadership' or 'the distribution of leadership roles that gives expression to leadership as a collective phenomenon' (Chreim, 2015, p521).

In reaction to the emphasis of the literature on the individual heroic leader, interest in the notion of distributed leadership has arisen (Gronn, 2009; Chreim, 2015; and Gronn, 2015). 'Distributed leadership shifts the level of analysis from the individual to a group of individuals who enact leadership roles' (Chreim, 2015, p522). Gronn (2015) writes of the exponential growth over the last decade, in research interest and publications about distributed leadership, particularly in the education sector. I discuss the literature regarding distributed leadership in higher education later in the chapter. Chreim (2015) highlights a particular limitation of the distributed leadership literature, its assumption that plurality is harmonious, but why should this be so? As Denis, Langley and Sergi (2012) write:

> there has been surprisingly little explicit study of the rivalries that may emerge when different individuals claim leadership within the same domain (p269)

Gronn (2009) argues that distributed leadership (alone) cannot account for the range of leadership practices being documented in the literature, which evidence the importance of both individual (concentrated) and plural (dispersed) forms of leadership. He proposed 'leadership configuration' as a unit of analysis, to more accurately describe 'situational practice that includes both individual leaders and holistic leadership units working in tandem' (Gronn, 2009, p384).

> hybrid is not intended to define a new type of leader but is employed as a more advantageous means of characterizing situations (Gronn, 2009, p384).

Hence, the emergence or importance of individual leaders need not be marginalised. But alternative patterns are also given significance, such as dyads, triads, and so on, and considered alongside traditional notions, privileging neither. Whilst I have already stated that I am interested in identities,

my understanding of leadership arrangements is that a variety of practices may co-exist within any organisation, and for any individual. As individuals each Principal Lecturer has a multiplicity of identities, in terms of leadership, these may be single leader identities, or identities associated with dispersed forms of leadership. These identities and leadership relationships need not be harmonious, but might contradict and conflict with one another.

This study seeks to re-connect power and leadership, recognising that the leadership discourse enables or constrains people to; act, think, speak or write in certain ways, or in Foucauldian (1982) terms, brings power relations into being. This study shall attempt to consider how leadership relationships are produced, encouraged, sustained, or disrupted by asking: What leadership identities emerge at Acorn University? What configurations do they take? How do power relations encourage/hinder these identities and configurations?

Organisational performance

A theme which resonates strongly within the research and policy contexts is that the purpose and characteristic of leadership is successful organisational performance (Kempster and Cope, 2010; Gray, Densten and Sarros, 2003; Leitch, McMullan and Harrison, 2009; and Andersson and Tell, 2009). However, how performance is understood in relation to leadership and with what consequences is not a straight forward matter.

Leitch, McMullan and Harrison (2009) discuss performance in terms of the impact of leaders and leadership on the success or failure of businesses; whereas Cope, Kempster and Parry (2011) define leadership performance in terms of business growth. Whilst others, combine growth and success (Kempster and Cope, 2010; Gray, Densten and Sarros, 2003). Thus the notion of performance is inextricably linked with the notion of business growth (Gray, Densten and Sarros, 2003). Yet growth, like leadership, is defined in a variety of ways, with differing consequences for understanding and meaning (Anderson and Tell, 2009). Within small businesses the impact of leadership on organisational performance is claimed to be more pronounced, because of their informal structure, and the consequent involvement of owner-managers in most aspects of the business (Wang and Poutziouris, 2010; Leitch, McMullan and Harrison, 2009). The implication being that, leadership can be observed and

47

measured objectively, in terms which can be defined numerically, such as employment levels or sales/turnover figures. Such assumptions are based on an understanding of leaders as opposed to leadership, for it is the effects of the involvement of the owner-manager on performance which are considered important.

Yet the assumption, that leadership impacts upon performance, is contestable, Wang and Poutziouris (2010) discuss the lack of consistent research findings and Beaver and Jennings (2005) state that 'the relationship between enterprise performance and management action and inaction is extremely tenuous and very difficult, if not impossible, to demonstrate conclusively' (p21). Thus, raising the fundamental question: What has led to this focus on leadership and performance and what has been the consequences on the priorities for research?

A potential contributing factor to this focus on leadership and performance in businesses is the interests of government. Their interest in stimulating economic development through policy interventions designed to accelerate or facilitate business growth and create jobs has undoubtedly heightened research interest in this area and can be expected to continue to do so (Cope, Kempster and Parry, 2011). As significant influencers over research funding, their perspective has the potential to impact upon what is researched, when, by whom and for what purpose. As Cuthbert, Møller and Ozga (2013) note in their discussions of historical governmental influences on leadership research in education, the choices made by government, in commissioning particular types of research, enabled them 'to control what was known, what should be known, and why it was worth knowing' (p286).

Governmental policy indicates that the notion of the 'heroic individual leader' singlehandedly transforming organisational performance is still predominant. Such a notion resonates strongly with the trait approach to leadership, underpinned by the belief that certain individuals possess inherent qualities which make them exceptional and more suitable for running successful organisations (Bebbington, 2009). Cogliser and Brigham (2004) note a recent resurgence in interest in the trait approach 'with the assumption that a certain number of traits are central to one's being perceived as a leader' (p785). Is this

resurgence a consequence of political interests in leadership? The governmental understanding of leadership is demonstrated in the introduction to the Department for Business Innovation & Skills' (BIS) paper, Leadership & Management in the UK - The Key to Sustainable Growth (2012):

> There is a short list of people – the likes of Richard Branson, Terry Leahy, Anita Roddick – whose names alone have come to define what we most admire about business leadership. And it has long been the case that the British economy has been shaped and driven by the pioneers of business, like James Dyson and Alan Sugar, driving change and making the most of new technologies and opportunities (p 8)

> There is no question that the performance of leaders and managers can have a truly significant impact on organisational performance, both in the immediate and longer term (p8)

Contained within these statements are messages about how people should lead: 'pioneers', and the practices of leadership that meet approval: 'driving change'. These messages are value laden, demonstrating a hierarchical and gendered understanding of leadership. Such unacknowledged beliefs, dominating governmental policy, demonstrate how difficult it may be for those in business to comprehend and practice alternative understandings of leadership, given the emphasis placed by political thought. This understanding of leadership also has consequences for the nature of actions designed to improve the leadership of businesses. It results in identification of inadequacies of the individual leader and calls for improvements to their education, training and development (see Chapter 4, Great Britain, Department for Business Information & Skills 2012, or Mannion, 2009, for examples).

In order to avoid nationalist assumptions, common in leadership research (Cuthbert, Møller, and Ozga, 2013), consideration needs to be given to the United Kingdom's position within the wider global context and 'the global mobility of ideas' (Cuthbert, Møller, and Ozga, 2013, p293), that enables leadership to be deployed in particular ways. Consideration of economic globalisation illustrates that growth is the sign of success of a capitalist company (Bottery, 2004). Thus the focus on business growth is as much a consequence of international interests in capitalism as governmental.

The leadership literature is replete with references to the 'increasingly turbulent and competitive business environment' (Kempster and Cope, 2010, p5). Yet this

environment and its consequences are subject to no further exploration, than to comment, that leadership is consequently even more vital. However, exploration of these conditions enables us to understand the conceptions of leadership that are deployed, and the purposes that they serve. This is 'central to understanding the dynamic of relations between leaders and 'followers', and to analysis of the role of 'leadership" (Cuthbert, Møller, and Ozga, 2013, p293) and serves to highlight the constrainers and enablers of alternative understandings.

Globally, a number of demographic changes are impacting upon the workforce. Populations are ageing, fertility rates have reduced, women are having children later in life and there are increasing numbers of women participating in the workforce (Kirkwood, 2007; and Bottery, 2004). These changes are happening within organisations and the impact can perhaps be seen in the increased number of women starting their own business (Kirkwood, 2007). A changing workforce is likely to have different needs and desire 'other' kinds of relationships with their leaders. Perhaps alternative understandings of leadership will emerge as the impacts of these changes are felt within organisations?

A key function of leadership, often found in leadership research, is for it to create the right atmosphere in order for employees and the organisation to perform at its best. Thus approaches, such as charismatic and transformational leadership are underpinned by the conception of leaders as meaning makers, and an understanding of their particular role in articulating a vision and defining organisational reality (Parry and Bryman, 2006; and Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe, 2007). In the conclusion to their case study research which looked at the role of the small business owner-manager in the failure of their organisation, Beaver and Jennings (2005) articulate this viewpoint clearly: 'Perhaps the really successful leader of the "successful" small firm that is destined for sustained business development and superior performance is one that understands that leadership is not just about achieving managerial competence however defined, it is about creating and articulating the right values and cultural atmosphere' (p21). A particular type of cultural atmosphere, created by leadership, is believed to result in the highest levels of organisational performance, one which is distinguished by high employee engagement, and encompasses employees' 'involvement, commitment, and enthusiasm for their job and the organisation'

(Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe, 2007, p106). Such claims have been questioned by authors such as Gronn (2002) and Mintzberg (1999) who contest; the ability of an individual leader to influence, the behaviour of organisational members, and organisational performance so successfully and the conception of followers as passive recipients, moulded by leaders. Evidence to counter this passivity and suspend the notion of followers as dependent and conforming is demonstrated in the strategies people adopt to counter the 'greedy organisation', a topic I shall return to in the discussions of downshifting. The notion that culture can be reduced to a set of variables such as values, norms and stories which can be identified, managed and controlled is itself contested (Morgan, 1998). Such a position fails to recognise the complexity of culture as a socially constructed concept, born of the interactions and relationships between people and organisations.

The notion of culture shaping leaders, is also evident in the literature; 'The bottom line for leaders is that if they do not become conscious of the cultures in which they are embedded, those cultures will manage them. Cultural understanding is desirable for all of us, but it is essential to leaders if they are to lead' (Schein, 2010, p22). That culture can be manipulated and can manipulate highlights 'an ideological blindness in much of the writing about corporate culture' (Morgan, 1998, p144), which ignores the reactions of employees to such manipulation. It also ignores the possibility that what is done in the name of the organisational good, may not be in the interests of the employees. There is an underlying assumption that leaderships' cultural manipulation is legitimate and non-problematic. Such treatment illuminates similarities with the mainstream understandings of power by scholars, which consider that the power embedded in the organisational hierarchy is 'legitimate', non-problematic and devoid of issues of personal interest, whilst power exercised outside of this hierarchical structure is 'illegitimate', amounting to attempted or actual disruptions to the fulfilment of organisational/societal needs/desires (Hardy and Clegg, 1999).

The interwoven nature of leadership, power and culture is recognised by Close and Wainwright (2010) who state that 'to understand culture is to understand power and to better navigate issues of control and consent, of authority and accountability' (p436). Thus developing an understanding of power is central to

51

developing an understanding of leadership. Morgan, (1998), reminds researchers that observations of culture will only ever give a superficial understanding at a particular point in time and that aspects of culture will remain hidden. The embedded nature of power in organisations is similarly hidden and difficult to observe (Lukes, 2005; Scott 2001; Hardy and Clegg, 1999; Hardy and Clegg, 2006; and Gallagher, 2008).

The assumption of an inevitable hierarchy of leadership is implicit within the literature. Frequently, the literature refers to the centrality of the owner-manager or entrepreneur, their 'need for control' and involvement in all aspects of the business, their 'reluctance to let go' and delegate (Kets de Vries, 1985 and 1993; Durst and Wilhelm, 2012; Sorenson, 2000; and Bolden, 2001). Such issues, it is said, result in stifled business growth and inefficient and unprofessional operations. Wang and Poutziouris (2010) conducted a large-scale postal survey of SMEs in the United Kingdom, and found that 'owner-managed businesses characterised by delegation of authority appear to achieve higher growth in sales and operationalise in a more professional way' (p331). Such a conclusion serves to support the notion of the purpose of leadership as successful organisational performance, (defined in their paper in terms of growth in sales) and implicitly links performance with notions of professionalism. In addition, it supports the prevailing assumption that in order to grow, businesses must confront a 'crisis of leadership'. This is an issue that I focus on later. However, their analysis serves to provide an alternative vision of leadership, distributed leadership and entrepreneurial teams, the anti-thesis of the solo 'pioneer'. It also demonstrates that even when alternative definitions of leadership are used, they are imbued by prevailing assumptions, in this case, the notion that the purpose of leadership is successful organisational performance. 'Historical limits' (Foucault, 2007c) are exposed. Alternative leadership identities are enabled, but the expectations for associated behaviour are constrained. The heroic individual leader again emerges as dominant, suggesting that this leader identity will have traction with the Principal Lecturers in my study. As I discussed earlier, leadership performance is often associated with business growth (Cope, Kempster and Parry, 2011), it is to this topic I now turn.

52

Business growth

Contained within discussions of business growth is the assumption that growth necessitates a change in leadership (Wang and Poutziouris, 2010). This changing leadership is closely linked to an increased professionalism or formalisation of business practices (Kempster and Cope, 2010). Within the literature, this is discussed as a 'crisis of leadership' or a 'tipping point' and is illustrated by Perren and Grant (2001) in the analysis of their interviews with entrepreneurs and managers:

> Indeed, it appears that informal management and leadership practices are the most effective in emergent businesses. Clearly there is a need for more formal management and leadership practices as the business grows and it is at this stage that the entrepreneur's fear and problems with delegation may have a detrimental influence on development (Perren and Grant, 2001, p5).

These changes have been understood within the framework of life cycle models of organisational development. Consequently there has been an assumption of linear progression through stages of business growth (Kazanjian, 1988; and Storey, 1995). Despite the increasing criticisms of such models, their legacy has been the recognition, within the literature, of the importance of delegation and leadership to the growth of small businesses (Levie and Lichtenstein, 2010; and Cope, Kempster and Parry, 2011). Yet, is the importance of leadership recognised by the business community? Kempster's (2009) work suggests that owner-managers do not connect or identify with leadership: 'Until you mentioned this to me a while ago now, I have never actually applied my mind...its all rather woolly, to try and put that into everyday examples might be difficult' (p446). Similarly, Alimo-Metcalfe and Lawler (2001) found that 'the term "leader" is often used as rhetoric without any significant meaning' 'it has become a label that is fashionable and which suggests that the individual is somehow a very special person' (p393). Much of the literature which supports the notion of a 'crisis point' and the need for a formalisation of leadership, including Kempster's (2009) work, has been produced within discussions of training, development and 'intervention' provision for businesses, by both academic and governmental bodies (Gray, Densten and Sarros, 2003). Thus the 'crisis of leadership' or 'tipping point' which is illustrated clearly by Perren and Grant (2001) is also a 'call to action' for these training and development

service providers, providing them with evidence with which to encourage participation in their courses.

Acknowledgement of which, raises questions, about the identification of such a crisis situation. Is the evidence of the business community which is used to support this position, merely a replication of a known position? Is leadership relevant to businesses or are they told it should be? The changing economic circumstances of United Kingdom universities and the need for resilient universities with 'diversified income streams' is one motivation for universities to engage with businesses and find reasons to encourage engagement.

In addition, the wave of SME leadership research focused on the evaluation of development programmes such as Leitch, McMullan and Harrison (2009) continue to provide governments, both locally and nationally with ideas for seeking improvements in leadership, which can be used to frame policy. These opportunities, as discussed previously, are situated within a governmental desire for business growth, underpinned by an understanding of leadership, as an individual pursuit, the purpose of which is to achieve successful organisational performance.

Another way? Post-structuralist approaches to leadership

Those working from a post-structuralist perspective like Ford, Harding and Learmonth (2008), offer a theory of 'leadership as an identity or practice of self' (p18). Such work focuses on the idea that 'everything is a construction', thus we must understand how the terms 'leader' or 'follower' are constructed and how these labels create effects, 'bring into being that which is discussed' (p27). It acknowledges that taking for granted the notion of leader, imbibes that notion with 'an identity that makes it appear real' (p26). Such research recognises that the distinction between leaders and followers is meaningless and it emphasises the importance of reflexivity in the research process 'to know what has made possible the self who is doing the reflexive thinking' (Ford, Harding and Learmonth, 2008, p27). The emphasis on reflexivity is in keeping with the Foucauldian notion of ethical self-formation (Foucault, 1982) adopted in this research and discussed in Chapters 1 and 3, which compels us to explore and question our own subjectivity (Biesta, 2008; and Mayo, 2000). Ford, Harding and Learmonth's (2008) work demonstrates how the notions of leader and

leadership compel people to change, to be other than they are. But it also suggests that particular constructions underpin what is thought of as necessary, the idea of the 'heroic leader' again comes to the fore. Their work pertains to the desirability of leadership and possibilities of dissatisfaction that result from failing to meet its demands and demonstrates the identity conflicts which face those attempting to lead in organisations, as they negotiate the competing demands of different managerial and leadership identities. Given that Principal Lecturers are in roles which advocate both leadership and management (Introductory Chapter) this would suggest that identity conflicts may arise. These possibilities will be explored in this study.

Ford (2010) argues that post-structural studies of leadership explore 'the impact of contextual and social factors' (p157) and recognise both the partiality and complexity of leadership accounts and identities. Ford's (2010) study of the discourses of leadership used by managers in one council, suggested the contradictory, multiple and fragmentary nature of these discourses and their associated identities. She also noted how these discourses operate in relation to/with other 'discourses or identities, including life outside work, gendered differences and approaches and differing career patterns' (Ford, 2010, p172), creating 'a multiplicity of subject positions, both within one individual and across a number of individuals' (p173). She goes on to argue that:

> Greater awareness of the various discourses and subject positions that constitute leaders' subjectivities enables consideration of the multiple constraints that inhibit thoughts and actions and those oppressive discourses and subject positions that should be eradicated (Ford, 2010, p173).

Such an understanding highlights the multitude of both leadership discourses and others that Principal Lecturers might interact with and which have to potential to create and/or offer subject positions. Paying attention to this diversity and being aware of the potential for contradiction will be important in this study. Ford's (2010) desires for the eradication of 'discourses and subject positions' is in keeping with the interests of critical researchers (Deetz, 1996; Deetz, 1998; and Mumby, 2011). However, a Foucauldian approach would not seek to eradicate 'discourses', (or replace knowledge with 'better' knowledge (Biesta, 2008)), but would seek to recognise the possibilities and productivity of discourse, the spaces and opportunities for resistance that their fragmentary

nature creates, not only its constraining and oppressive nature (Foucault, 1986). Thus, my own study will not seek to eradicate discourses, but will try to explore and illuminate the multitude of discourses in operation and how they constrain and enable the possibilities for identities.

Uhl-Bien et al (2014) suggest that the contribution of post-structural analyses to the followership literature is to allow us to understand how individuals contribute to their own subordination. Indeed Collinson (2006) sought to demonstrate how structure and agency contribute to the formation of follower identities and to examine the connections between identity and power. This is clearly in keeping with Foucauldian ideas regarding subjectivity which emphasise agency, but also recognise agency as a site of struggle 'between strategies of power and resistance' (Mayo, 2000, p114) (Chapter 1). This highlights the importance of exploring both the Principal Lecturers' agency but also how their agency is constrained. Collinson's (2006) work like that of Ford, Harding and Learmonth (2008) reveals the contradictory nature of identities. Using Foucauldian ideas he explored the possibilities of resistance and the influence of followers on leaders' identities. For Collinson (2006) post-structural approaches represent a way to challenge 'the traditional dichotomous identities of leader and follower' and to recognise the complexities with which people 'consent, cope, and resist' all at the same time, to differing extents (p187) (or see Sinha, 2010). Such an approach will enable me to explore both the complementarity and contradictory nature of the Principal Lecturers' identities. It provides an opportunity to explore both that which enables and that which constrains identities, or in Foucauldian (1982) terms, brings power relations into being.

This analysis suggests that the post-structural orientation enables researchers to re-connect questions of leadership, power and identities which we have seen have been missing from other approaches. Precedents exist for the utilisation of Foucauldian ideas in this regard, (Ford, Harding and Learmonth, 2008; and Collinson, 2006), which suggests that it has the potential to be commensurate with Foucauldian ideas regarding power and identities, all of which recommend its suitability as an approach for this study. Where differences emerge these do so from the underlying assumptions regarding the purposes of study/research. In Ford's (2010) study for example, its critical orientation desires an outcome which contradicts Foucauldian assumptions regarding the nature and purpose

of research. How I have addressed these complexities in relation to this study are explored in detail in Chapter 3.

Conclusions

The examination of the research literature reveals a historical focus on the observation of and collection of data on individual leaders (Billing and Alvesson, 1989; and Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe, 2005). This focus has resulted in the identification of their inadequacies as leaders and calls for improvements to their education, training and development (see Great Britain, Department for Business Innovation & Skills, 2012, or Mannion, 2009, for examples). If, however, leadership is considered to be a social and relational influence process, which is neither a possession nor bound by formal designated roles, then the opportunity arises to consider a hybridity of leadership. This is not about replacing the individual view of leadership with a more pluralistic perspective, but allowing for any combinations or configurations of leadership to emerge, be they individual, co, or team arrangements (Gronn, 2009; and Gronn, 2015). This approach will guide my study.

Common-sense claims regarding the nature and purpose of leadership within businesses pervade both the research and policy contexts. Good leadership we are told is fundamental to the success of businesses, (Gray, Densten and Sarros, 2003; and Great Britain, Department for Business Innovation & Skills 2012), yet what constitutes 'good leadership' or even 'success' is contestable and is according to the literature, itself fluid, dependent upon the current stage in the businesses life-cycle. A fledgling business, due to its size and the scarcity of resources inevitably requires hierarchical leadership (Perren and Grant, 2001; and Kempster and Cope, 2010), yet to achieve business growth, a change in leadership is necessary, and a distributed model of leadership will prove most beneficial (Wang and Poutziouris, 2010).

The link between leadership and organisational performance is a strong and explicit theme within the literature. However, the evidence for this link is both contentious and problematic (Wang and Poutziouris, 2010; and Beaver and Jennings, 2005), as is the evidence for the ability of leaders to influence the behaviour of organisational members to create particular cultural atmospheres

(Gronn, 2002; and Mintzberg, 1999). Both positions are underpinned by a view of followers as dependent, obedient and conforming.

A central argument of this chapter is that the context within which leadership occurs impacts upon peoples' expectations of leadership, what it is considered to be, how it occurs and who can lead. Thus, Cope, Kempster and Parry (2011) argue employees' limited exposure to forms of leadership other than heroic individual leadership; inhibit their ability to associate leadership with other forms. The organisational context therefore has the ability to inhibit or enable the acceptance of particular understandings of leadership and leader identities. Like other authors I assert the influence of power to reinforce and maintain leadership positions and differentials and therefore argue that understanding power is central to developing an understanding of leadership (Gordon, 2002a; and Gordon, 2002b). It is also important to acknowledge the impact of the social, political and cultural environment of which the organisation is a part. This macro environment has an important role to play in enabling or inhibiting alternative understandings of leadership. An implication from the research literature is the influence of peoples' social, political and cultural environments on their expectations and perceptions of 'good leadership' (Kemavuthanon and Duberley, 2009). Thus the gendered and value laden statements of the United Kingdom media and government create expectations of individual heroic leadership behaviour, which perpetuates the practice of such behaviour and potentially limits the practice of alternative models of leadership (Cope, Kempster and Parry, 2011). That the purpose of leadership should be considered to be organisational growth is further supported by consideration of the global context (Bottery, 2004).

The analysis highlights the importance of context, to not only alter leadership effectiveness, as in contingency approaches to leadership (Parry and Bryman, 2006), but to create particular leadership practices. To both constrain and enable the possibilities for leadership identities, as Kemavuthanon and Duberley's (2009) work illustrates. This is a reminder of the need for this study to examine both the individual's subjectivity and the conditions within which they are situated (Chapter 1).

58

What emerges from this analysis is the consideration of leadership as mental mastery; this is achieved through the elimination of bodies from these accounts of leadership practice. Sinclair's (2005a) critique of the study of leadership is that bodies have been deliberately written out, as this exclusion strengthens the idea of leaders as superior to their followers, whose power is neither constrained nor hindered by their bodies (Sinclair, 2005b). Recognition of bodies, that we are 'made of the same stuff' (Sinclair, 2005a, p390) is problematic to such a position. Paying attention to bodies she argues is 'a political act with political consequences' (Sinclair, 2005a, p403) which enables us to know leadership in different ways. For Sinclair, leadership is more than mental mastery it is a bodily practice.

I believe that a particular body is constructed in these accounts of leadership, even if that body is not explicitly identified. A particular notion of maleness is at the apex of bodies in leadership (Sinclair, 2004). The man that is constructed as a leader is a master of both his mind and body which is illustrated by his physical fitness and prowess. The body that is then constructed as that of a leader is highly exclusionary.

A particular leader identity emerges from the literature, that of the hero/pioneer. This dominant discursive construction encourages people to think of themselves and others in relation to this identity, to consider leaders as 'special' and vital to the success of any organisation. Even where other possibilities were considered, the association between leadership and organisational performance remained. The dominance of this discursive construction suggests that it is likely to have traction with the Principal Lecturers in my study. Therefore, an important research task for the present study is to determine the relevance of the heroic leader identity to this particular group of Principal Lecturers within this specific higher education institution.

The review now turns to the literature on leadership in higher education.

Leadership: In Higher Education

Introduction

The focus of this research is a group of Principal Lecturers within one institution, for whom leadership is an express purpose of their role. This group represent an underexplored focus of leadership research which has historically been concerned with those in formal leadership positions either at the top or close to the top of higher education institutions (Bryman, 2007).

Leadership is an oft used term in higher education; the term leadership is therefore salient to the group. It is a notion which is both familiar and strange to them. As they engage with a dominant discursive construction of leadership and the specificity of their own experiences both as a leader and of being led.

I agree with Morley (2013b) that the discursive construction of leadership in higher education continues to embody heroic narratives which create expectations regarding leadership behaviours. However, the notion of the 'heroic leader' suggests a cohesive identity, which I believe is an oversimplification. At least two heroic leader identities emerge from the literature, which are associated with differing behaviours and if, as I argue, identities are created through interactions with discourse, then a number of hybrids and alternative identities are also likely to exist in practice.

Change

Many an article about leadership in higher education begins with a discussion of the changes occurring within the sector (see Bolden et al, 2009; Blackmore and Sachs, 2000; Yielder and Codling, 2004; Middlehurst and Elton, 1992; and Drew 2010). Bolden et al (2009) discuss the increasing often conflicting demands being placed upon institutions. As they are required to contribute to their country's global competitiveness (Garcia, 2009; Morley, 2013a, Morley 2013b; and Tomlinson, 2008), educate increasing numbers of students, attend to the needs of businesses and professions (Crowther and Savage, 2008) and produce world leading research (Bolden et al, 2009).

This changing context is used to justify the call for the importance of leadership and the necessity of changes to leadership and management (Drew, 2010; and Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2008). Leadership is understood to have become

more managerialist and hierarchical, which is positioned as a major change for universities (Askling and Stensaker, 2002; and Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009). However, as I shall argue, there has been less change than might first appear to be the case.

Particular conceptions of leadership and management are drawn on, in these writings, Middlehurst and Elton (1992) state that:

> management is about coping with complexity, while leadership is about coping with change. The functions of management are therefore to order and control.... it is the task of leadership to clarify the direction of change and to make the members of the organisation willing, even enthusiastic partners in the change process (p252).

The consequences of taking such a position include; the continued separation of leadership and management, as two distinct roles with associated activities, indeed, Middlehurst and Elton (1992) argue that it would be difficult for the two to 'be combined in the same person' (p255). Such a position reinforces the specialness, (essentialism), of leaders and leadership, so that the focus is on the personal characteristics and behaviours of leaders, which make them distinct (Middlehurst and Elton, 1992). It also inscribes a leader-follower relationship with a superior-inferior form, in which leaders are understood to be superior, else 'people wouldn't follow them' (Gordon, 2002a, p155; and Gronn, 2002).

In this vein, Drew (2010) for example, concludes that 'the ability to deal with change, is a critical challenge for university leaders' (p69), and goes on to discuss the individual behaviours and skills which need to be 'honed' in effective leaders. The behaviours and skills are thought to already exist then in the individual, but can be improved through appropriate development (Drew, 2010). The leader is special because of these innate abilities. When things go wrong, the problems lie with the individual, they lack something, education, training or development (Jones, 2011).

Yielder and Codling (2004) similarly conceive of leadership as a personal quality, and the identity of the heroic leader, clearly emerges from their description:

> Leadership is about creating a vision of what might be, and fostering a culture that supports and can achieve that vision (p319).

61

As is the case in the business and management leadership literature, the picture painted by Yielder and Codling (2004) is one in which leaders are understood to be meaning makers, able to define and create organisational reality (Parry and Bryman, 2006; and Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe, 2007). That leaders have such abilities has been contested by Gronn (2002) and Mintzberg (1999) who are particularly dissatisfied with the associated conception of followers as passive recipients.

Like Drew (2010) the individual leader and their development is an important conclusion for Yielder and Codling (2004). However, they also conclude that shared leadership offers a new approach, which will counter some of the 'dysfunctions' of individual leadership, through teamwork. These individual team members will be chosen on the basis of excellent performance (Yielder and Codling, 2004). The assumptions they make are; that there is a problem with leadership (as it is), and that shared leadership is simply a sum of individual leaders, striving towards a common goal. But as I noted earlier, why should plurality correspond with convergence and not conflict? (Chreim, 2015). Why should it be beneficial? (Denis, Langley and Sergi, 2012). This understanding of shared leadership is still leader-centric, a view of the leader as special, due to their personal characteristics underpins it.

In their report on collective leadership in UK higher education, Bolden, Petrov and Gosling (2008) found that:

> Despite overwhelming support for a collective leadership approach in higher education, a striking finding from our research concerned the expressed need for inspirational or visionary individuals, particularly in times of change or transition (or to bring about these) (p62).

In other words, change, necessitates heroic leaders. I do not wish to deny that the higher education sector is and has changed, but I want to highlight how change is being utilised in leadership writing. Dealing with change is seen as a vital aspect of the leadership role, whilst at the same time change itself, is the reason leadership is so important, (Middlehurst and Elton, 1992; Drew, 2010; and Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2008); there is a circulatory nature to the arguments made. Leadership is understood in these writings to exist within a chosen few, it is their uniqueness that sets them apart from others. The heroic leader is central to such understandings.

Arguably underpinning the changes occurring in higher education are neoliberal ideals regarding the supremacy of market forces which will operate to determine resource allocation and improve performance (Grey and Mitev, 1995; Lee, 2010; and Morley, 2001) within an impersonal economic democracy. Ball describes neoliberalism as "in here' as well as 'out there" (2012a, p18). In so doing he points to both the external economic and political drivers which contribute to the reformation of higher education and the pervasiveness of neoliberalism into our thoughts, practices and identities.

The 'in here' changes Ball (2012a) argues includes the reinvention of individuals as resources who require continuous performance monitoring and productivity auditing. He uses the term performativity to describe how individuals become responsible both for their own performance and that of others. A position underpinned by economic imperatives. These changes alter the way people talk, think, and act in their relationships (Ball, 2003). New possibilities and limitations for identities are created. Although, as I shall discuss, the notion of the heroic leader, emerges from both the traditional model of academic leadership and the newer, managerialist approaches, suggesting that leadership identities are highly constrictive and more constraining than might be expected.

The 'out there' changes discussed above, aren't merely imposed on the sector but are facilitated by universities and mission groups (Pirrie, Adamson and Humes, 2010; Bolden et al, 2012; and Filippakou and Tapper, 2015). One way in which these changes have been embraced by institutions, Bolden et al (2009) argue has been to move towards corporate and/or entrepreneurial approaches to management and leadership (Nikunen, 2012; and Lumby, 2012). Such approaches, founded on principles of individualism, competition and meritocracy (Nikunen, 2012) sit uncomfortably with traditional cultural 'expectations of collegiality, collaboration and participative decision making' (Bolden et al, 2009, p292).

Lumby (2012) suggests that the rise of corporate approaches to leadership in higher education has been driven by the view that the leadership of corporations is more challenging and prestigious, requiring greater skill than that of the leadership of education. Bryman (2007, p707) states that:

63

The call for leadership in universities and in public sector organizations generally can be read as a lack of faith in the underlying principles of the notion of professionalism as a substitute for leadership.

Bryman (2007) makes an interesting suggestion, that leadership is unnecessary and has always been so in higher education. Indeed, he argues that leadership in higher education might do more harm than good, but as Chreim (2015) also notes, there has been a lack of empirical studies which have explored the potential negative and descriptive aspects of leadership. The majority of the higher education leadership literature, tends to depict leadership as necessary, and frames the past, (and its models of leadership), in opposition to the present. The past is described by Rowley (1997):

> The traditional model of academic leadership is often characterized by personal academic achievement, as exemplified by, for example, publication in refereed journals, the presentation of papers at national and international conferences, authorship of significant scholarly works and, in some sense, responsibility for the academic development of others, such as research student supervision (p78).

Similarly, Askling and Stensaker (2002) refer to the 'distinguished professor' and Yielder and Codling (2004) describe academic leadership as 'vested in a person because of their expertise and knowledge' (p320). Such leadership is often seen as 'turn taking' as a form of duty, and not specifically sought out (Askling and Stensaker, 2002). This creates expectations with regards to what leaders should and shouldn't do (Askling and Stensaker, 2002), and essentializes leadership; 'locating it in the person (e.g. trait theories), the situation (e.g. situational theories), or person and situation combinations (e.g. contingency theories, such as when a strong leader and a crisis coincide) (Grint, 2000)' (Fairhurst, 2009, p1608). Such a leadership model, suggests that, for the Principal Lecturers their specialness as leaders arises from their academic expertise.

Collegiality

There is an assumed and often implicitly made link between the traditional view of academic leadership and collegiality (Bolden et al, 2009; Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009; Askling and Stensaker, 2002; and Yielder and Codling, 2004) which poses a number of problems for me. Firstly, whilst it is not explicitly stated, the implication is that this model of leadership and association with collegiality is irrelevant to post-1992 universities, as suggested by Bolden et al

(2009); 'managerial, corporate and entrepreneurial approaches to management and leadership do not sit well with certain parts of the sector' (p292). Are the authors proposing that the traditional model of leadership is/has only been found in non-post-1992 universities? Perhaps it is because of the focus of academic leaders on research, which counts out post-1992s in their view. Systems of differentiation (Foucault, 1982) are being drawn on to bring power relations into being; the discursive positioning of one group of universities as superior to the other and the status differential between teaching and research.

Are they also suggesting that collegiality is only associated with these 'other' types of institutions? This view might arise from a consideration of the structural differences between these types of institutions, specifically their governance. In post-1992 institutions academics have little input into a vice-chancellor controlled arrangement (introductory chapter). These 'other' institutions have traditionally been governed by senates, 'dominated by the academics' (Tapper and Palfreyman, 1998, p147), which is again different from the Oxford and Cambridge model, described as 'collegiate universities' (Tapper and Palfreyman, 2002, p49), made up of collegial colleges. Perhaps Bolden et al (2009) are associating governance with collegiality leading them to imply that the (non-collegial) governance of post-1992 institutions is such that managerial approaches to leadership are neither new nor problematic.

The traditional model of academic leadership seems to create an image of a male leader (singular), and individualises success. Are they suggesting that collegiality is implicated in the turn-taking? What do any of these authors mean when they use the term collegiality? Bolden et al (2009) link it to 'collaboration and participative decision making' (p292). So is collegiality being used to describe the context within which the leader exists, as Yielder and Codling (2004) do? In which case why should the two be so simply equated? Does one exist by virtue of the other? That is certainly the implication of Yielder and Codling's (2004) analysis. Bryman (2007) noted a link between effective university leadership and the presence of collegiality, when this was understood to refer to 'mutual supportiveness among staff' (p702). Although he also acknowledges the ambivalent use of the term collegiality, and found that it was also used to refer to a 'system of governance' (as Bolden et al, (2009), appear to use the term).

Given that others have suggested that collegiality is about maintaining the power of privileged groups within institutions, (Garratt and Hammersley-Fletcher, 2009; Spiller, 2010; and Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002), and have raised concerns about its association with gender bias and elitism (Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002; and Blackmore and Sachs, 2000), the 'deep seated desire for collegiality' (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009, p257) in higher education leadership, conceivably conceals power relations.

Rather than solely being about maintaining privilege within institutions, perhaps, collegiality is also about maintaining differentials between institutions, particularly between post-1992s and 'others'. The implied assertion by Bolden et al (2009) is that collegiality is a distinguishing feature of non-post-1992 universities; this 'deep-seated desire' then could also be about maintaining the power of privileged university groups or as Holligan (2011) describes 'networks of prestige'.

The yearning for collegiality expressed, is perhaps heightened by the perception of it being under threat from managerialism, as Spiller (2010), Bolden et al (2012), and Bryman and Lilley (2009), suggest. The past is being constructed in opposition to the present; managerialism versus collegiality (Tourish, 2012; and de Boer and Goedegebuure, 2009). Middlehurst (1999) however, suggested that collegiality will become more important 'an operational necessity', but its interpretation will change, 'to include a broader set of loyalties and professional expectations, crossing traditional boundaries' (p323). de Boer and Goedegebuure (2009) (who also appear to understand collegiality in terms of governance arrangements), argue that the 'death of collegialism' is overstated, that 'academics still play a substantial role in strategic decision making' (p351) and that dissatisfaction with changing governance arrangements is not universal, and to do with changing power relations.

The desire to protect collegiality, is also perhaps to do with 'higher education essentialism' (Middlehurst, Goreham and Woodfield, 2009, p321), the notion that leadership in higher education is unique, and collegiality makes it so (Bryman and Lilley, 2009). Similarly, Rowley (1997) suggests that the requirement for shared decision making makes higher education distinctive. The uniqueness of higher education is used to argue that leadership approaches

from other sectors cannot just be transplanted into higher education (Bryman and Lilley, 2009).

> Surely it is much better, for sustenance of a valued sense of self, to see the phenomenon which one strives to understand as complex, context-specific and not amenable to the application of simple checklists? Yet realizing that our findings might in part be due to self-serving motives on the parts of our informants does nothing to rob them of their power. Indeed, if anything such reflection merely reminds us of the robustness of the difficulties likely to be faced by those who seek to lead in higher education (Bryman and Lilley, 2009, p344)

Bryman and Lilley (2009) make an interesting suggestion about research participants, and the identity work which they take part in during the research process. Their participants were all 'leadership researchers located in the UK higher education sector' (p332). Constructing leadership in higher education as unique, they suggest, might have been important to the researchers' own identity. (The identity work of my own participants I discuss in Chapter 3).

It is argued that current corporate and/or entrepreneurial approaches to leadership are underpinned by the principles of new public management, and are committed in particular to the importance of 'top-down' leadership (Askling and Stensaker, 2002; and Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009). From this understanding the heroic academic leader emerges; 'determined, visible and strong when implementing their ideas' (Askling and Stensaker, 2002, p114).

I suggest that this image shares many similarities with that created by the traditional model of academic leadership. I find the assumption that 'the structure and nature of HE institutions' mean that they are 'not generally well suited to managerialism or 'top-down' leadership (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009, p257) problematic. The academic leader of the past was very much conceived of in the vein of a 'top-down' leader. Nikunen (2012) suggests that the principles of individualism, competition and meritocracy underpin present institutional and individual approaches and Bolden et al (2009) argue that these approaches conflict with traditional leadership, yet these principles appear to me, to be the same as those underpinning traditional academic leadership.

Perhaps what we are really confronted with is a dislike for the focus on leadership, which has been one of the consequences of managerialism, or new public management (Askling and Stensaker, 2002). Morley (2013b) identifies 'a

powerful cultural ideology of leadership' (p6) which suggests that leadership is necessary to the successful functioning of an institution. Lumby (2012, p11) similarly notes that leadership 'has become something of a mantra', 'essential to achieve', 'quality teaching and learning, excellent research, diversity and inclusion, and to turn around underperforming HEIs'. This discursive construction suggests that particular ways of being and doing leadership will positively transform universities (Morley, 2013b; and Lumby, 2012).

Perhaps it is the focus of the present day higher education leadership discourse on 'achieving organisational objectives' or instigating 'organisational change' (Askling and Stensaker, 2002, p113), that is making people uncomfortable? Whereas the traditional model of academic leadership is focused on personal achievement and the individual actor (Rowley, 1997; Askling and Stensaker, 2002; de Boer and Goedegebuure, 2009; and Yielder and Codling, 2004).

Perhaps it is a disdain for the translation of business practices/private sector ideas, associated with new public management, (de Boer and Goedegebuure, 2009; and Askling and Stensaker, 2002) into higher education. Certainly, there is contempt for the hierarchical model of leadership and control with which it is associated, as described by Bolden, Petrov and Gosling (2009), but the traditional model of leadership is also associated with its own hierarchies of excellence, Rowley (1997) for instance, notes its strong links with promotional opportunities. The similarities in the underpinning assumptions of the models are again exposed.

Advocates of managerial/entrepreneurial models of academic leadership are also troubled by the question of collegiality. Collegiality is positioned as a problem for leadership, as something which hinders decision making (Askling and Stensaker, 2002; de Boer and Goedegebuure, 2009; and Spiller, 2010). de Boer and Goedegebuure (2009) write; "democratic governance' is regularly seen as getting in the way of efficiency and effectiveness' (p350). As I have previously discussed democratic governance is one way of referring to collegiality. This view, is in clear contrast to Bryman's (2007) review of leadership effectiveness, although, he considered those studies where collegiality was understood as referring to 'mutual supportiveness amongst staff' (p702).

What is most oft proposed is a middle ground, between managerialism and collegiality, where the dynamic tensions between 'top-down' institutional obligations integrate with 'bottom-up' collegiality (Wooldridge, 2011; Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009; Drew, 2010; Askling and Stensaker, 2002; Yielder and Codling, 2004; Taylor and Machado, 2006; and Middlehurst, Goreham and Woodfield, 2009).

In this vein, Bacon (2014) proposes neo-collegiality, which recognises the necessity of changes introduced by new public management in response to a changing operational environment, whilst asserting the need for 'a restoration of more collegial decision making', 'to give voice to university staff' (p6). As Middlehurst (1999) suggested, the interpretation of collegiality has changed.

In the vision for neo-collegiality outlined in his paper, Bacon (2014) argues for; the inclusion of all university personnel; academics, non-academics and students in decision making structures. As with new public management, the focus is on 'institutional membership', elsewhere described as a focus on meeting institutional obligations, (Askling and Stensaker, 2002), in order to foster 'commitment' and 'engagement'.

Another middle way is offered by distributed leadership:

> Distributed leadership offers a persuasive discourse that embeds both concepts of collegiality and managerialism. It appears to give a framework for the integration of top-down and bottom-up decision making processes (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009, p273)

Distributed leadership is proposed as an alternative to individualistic, heroic leadership (Gronn, 2015), well suited to the complexities and changing nature of higher education (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009; and Gronn, 2009). However, in their study of 12 UK universities Bolden, Petrov and Gosling (2009) conclude that whilst distributed leadership promotes 'emergent' bottom-up influence, 'devolved' leadership associated with top-down influence' (p274) continues.

As Gronn (2009) also argues, individual leadership remains prominent, distributed leadership does not replace it in higher education (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009). Individual leaders 'do not leave the scene, but continue to exercise significant and disproportionate influence in comparison with other

individual colleagues. Moreover, the expectation that they do so persists in the perceptions and attributions colleagues have of their roles' (Gronn, 2009, p392). This supports the need for focusing on leadership configurations, as opposed to either individual or distributed patterns (Gronn, 2009; Gronn, 2015; and Chreim, 2015), in an attempt to open up rather than constrict the variety of leadership arrangements which might emerge from the data.

The association between collegiality and the traditional model of leadership emerges strongly from the literature. In leadership writing, collegiality is most often understood as a form of governance. As a consequence, institutions, particularly post-1992 universities, which have different governance arrangements, are understood to support the managerial model of leadership and lack collegial relations. However, if collegiality is conceptualised differently, as Tapper and Palfreyman (1998 and 2002) suggest, it can be understood to have permeated all types of institutions and is likely to play an important role in the identity formation of the Principal Lecturers. I will, therefore, need to be attentive to this.

Both the traditional and managerialist models of leadership construct heroic academic leaders. The traditional model, constructs leaders who are special because of their individual research achievements (Rowley, 1997). The managerialist model, constructs leaders who are special because they positively transform universities, through their focus on institutional objectives (Askling and Stensaker, 2002; Morley, 2013b; and Lumby, 2012). Bolden et al (2009) imply that the managerialist model will exist in Acorn University, because it is a post-1992 institution. I have suggested, that this is an assumption based on systems of differentiation (Foucault, 1982), which position post-1992 universities as inferior to others. I consider therefore, that it is possible that both models of leadership might exist within Acorn University and for the Principal Lecturers' identities to be affected by both. Given the differing expectations for leaders associated with each model, this would suggest that tensions may arise. These possibilities will be explored in this study.

The discursive construction of leadership
Morley (2013b) argues that the discursive construction of leadership within higher education continues to embody heroic narratives and pioneering

70

principles. I have already suggested a number of reasons why this might be the case; the commitments to individualism and competition underpinning the traditional academic leadership model; the similar principles underpinning corporate and/or entrepreneurial approaches to leadership (Nikunen, 2012). Bryman and Lilley (2009) write of the lack of research of leadership in higher education. As such the conception of the leader as hero and/or pioneer arguably extends from the dominant paradigm in corporate leadership research of leadership as an individual pursuit, performed by the special few, who through their 'natural ability or the possession of appropriate attributes' are 'superior to their followers' otherwise 'people would not follow them' (Gordon, 2002a, p155) (and see Gronn, 2002; and Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe, 2005). The limited promotional opportunities to Principal Lecturer level indicates an institutional view of Principal Lecturers as 'special' and chosen.

This paradigm has perhaps influenced the historical focus of leadership research within Higher Education in other ways. As with corporate leadership research (Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe, 2007) it has focused on those in formal leadership positions either at the top or close to the top, in the post of head of department or department chair, of the institution (Bryman, 2007). Furthermore, its bias towards reflecting the experience of a particular group of people 'white, middle-class men' (Lumby, 2012, p4) is reflected in corporate leadership research. Finally, the American character and origin of corporate leadership research (Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe, 2007) is also prevalent in studies of higher education leadership (Bryman, 2007).

Research undertaken from this perspective has been interested in the personal traits or characteristics of the leader, their motivations, behaviours and actions. It enables leadership success to be equated with the individuals' leadership qualities (Jones, 2011). As a result a deficit model of leadership has arisen in which the individual higher education leader is found lacking, in education, training or development (Jones, 2011). The emphasis is on the individual to transform themselves. As Bolden, Petrov and Gosling (2008) conclude leadership 'is an ongoing journey that requires adaptation, transformation and change' (p64). We are again seeing leadership essentialism (Fairhurst, 2009).

Such thinking and research, is often undertaken using a psychological lens, (Fairhurst, 2008), and is focused on answering 'cause and effect and 'why' questions' (Fairhurst, 2009, p1610). There is however, an alternative stance, one which 'is more social and cultural than individual and psychological', (Fairhurst, 2009, p1608), based on a consideration of leadership as discursively constructed (Haake, 2009), which is focused on answering different kinds of questions such as; how does leadership happen? Or, what is the discourse doing? (Fairhurst, 2009).

This shifts the focus from the individual to their context, moving beyond consideration of the ability of context to alter leadership effectiveness as in contingency approaches to leadership (Parry and Bryman, 2006) to consider context as essential to the creation of leadership practices (Middlehurst, Goreham, Woodfield, 2009).

Bolden et al (2009), like Morley (2013a) and Lumby (2012), note the dominance of the leadership discourse in higher education. As such academics are continuously exposed to the notion of leadership and for many, as with Principal Lecturers, it is a formal requirement of their role.

The discourse of academic leadership consists of 'general, naturalised and self-evident ways of expressing academic leadership but also specific and conflicting means of doing the same' (Haake, 2009, p294). Subjectivity is created through interactions with discourse and is multiple, complex, contradictory and historically and socially constituted. It is a political notion, the site of processes of power which produce subjects (Oksala, 1998; Mayo, 2000; and Foucault, 1982).

As such, I am suggesting that people do not simply pick and choose leadership identities, because they are shaped through discourse (Haake, 2009). The identities that are constructed, nurtured and resisted are not infinite in number but limited and constrained by power relations, which operate through discourse (Foucault, 1982; and Oksala 1998). Our identity is thus continuously produced, never fully formed, but fluid and relational, situated within and constrained by our historical and cultural context. Within the discourse of academic leadership, therefore, are various subject positions, which reflect different leader identities, some of which are considered unproblematic and natural whilst others differ

(Haake, 2009). I am interested in the power relations which operate through discourse and enable such identities to be assigned and legitimised as true (Foucault, 1982).

The discursive construction of leadership emerging from the literature is contradictory and complex. On the one-hand a traditional (historical) academic leadership model emerges, which is predicated on the importance of an individual leader, who is special, because of their knowledge and individual achievements, in terms of research outputs (Rowley, 1997). This is often positioned in conflict with present day managerial approaches to leadership, (variously referred to as entrepreneurial/corporate leadership), (Bolden et al, 2009). However, I have suggested that the principles underpinning the managerial approach to leadership, (individualism, meritocracy and competition), are much more similar to the founding principles of traditional leadership models than first appears.

Morley (2013b) argues that the discursive construction of leadership within higher education continues to embody heroic narratives and pioneering principles. Based on my understanding of the literature, I agree with this and suggest that both the traditional and managerial models of academic leadership construct heroic leaders. However, they differ in the behaviours which are deemed appropriate for leadership. The traditional academic leader is required to focus on personal achievement, particularly in terms of research (Rowley, 1997). The managerial leader should be focused on meeting institutional objectives, (Askling and Stensaker, 2002), which may or may not include research, but their leadership will positively transform universities (Morley, 2013b; and Lumby, 2012).

The focus on leadership behaviours points to the continuing understanding of leadership as located in the special few, an inherent ability/quality/characteristic, which can be developed, but which sets them apart from others. That the differing models of academic leadership advocate different and possibly competing expectations for leaders suggests that the heroic academic leader identity is itself complex. The traditional and managerial models of leadership co-exist within the literature, complimenting and contradicting each other. It is clear, in the research presented, that the managerial model of leadership hasn't

73

completely replaced the traditional model, despite the yearning expressed by some for a return to the traditional model (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009). As I have previously argued, the easy way in which these models are positioned as distinct, masks the underlying similarities between them. Yet there are differences, and if we consider, as I propose, that leadership identities are constructed through interactions with discourse, then individuals, including my group of Principal Lecturers, are likely to encounter both discourses of leadership and interact with them in differing ways to produce a multitude of heroic leader identities, which maybe those described above, some kind of hybrid of the two, or something completely different, a refusal. This I will explore in my research.

The contradictions inherent within the heroic leadership discourse also emerge from the literature. Whilst the importance of the individual leader is continuously reinforced, we are also told that leaders are caught in a paradox, between demands to facilitate change and be visionary, whilst experiencing little authority or control, nor space to think strategically (Askling and Stensaker, 2002; and Yielder and Codling, 2004).

To solve these dilemmas, Askling and Stensaker (2002), de Boer and Goedegebuure (2009), Fairhurst (2009), and Zoller and Fairhurst (2007), all suggest that leadership could be viewed as the process by which 'confusing and sometimes contradictory situations, events and incidents' (Askling and Stensaker, 2002, p119) are acknowledged and highlighted. There is an assumption, that this is an alternative view of leadership, however, it points to an understanding of leaders as meaning makers, (Parry and Bryman, 2006; Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe, 2007), in which leaders are necessary to 'show the way'. Such understandings have a tendency to overplay the role of leaders and are still underpinned by a view of leadership as the preserve of the few, in this case those who 'are able to provide an 'intelligible formulation' of what for others may be 'a chaotic welter of impressions'' (Zoller and Fairhurst, 2007, p1337). This echoes Yielder and Codling's conception of leadership as a personal quality, focused on 'creating a vision' (2004, p319) and Bolden, Petrov and Gosling's (2008) conclusion of the 'need for inspirational or visionary individuals' (p62). The heroic leader is still pivotal but the expectations placed

74

upon them are again different, to those suggested by the other versions of heroic leadership previously discussed.

As I highlighted earlier, discourses of leadership are also intimately linked with discourses of change. Thus, leadership is frequently discussed in relation to; global competitiveness, marketisation, massification, the influence of businesses and professions, performative audit, austerity, work intensification, professionalisation, accountability and quality (Morley, 2013a; Morley, 2013b; Blackmore and Sachs, 2000; de Boer and Goedegebuure, 2009; and Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2008).

Askling and Stensaker (2002) in their discussions of quality, describe how it encourages 'new kinds of reactions and responses' (p115). They also indicate the incoherence of the quality agenda, as it pulls in different, competing directions, and produces 'inconsistent expectations'. I wish to use the notion of quality to illustrate the multiple discourses that academics, and in particular Principal Lecturers, interact with and which have the potential to produce/encourage identity effects. I want to highlight the tensions which exist within these discourses. Quality is not a simple marker, but is a contested and ambivalent discursive construction, and it is through interactions with these socially and historically located discourses (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000) that our identities are formed. As I discuss in Chapter 3, the functions of discourses are not stable, and as Foucault reminds us, various elements can 'come into play in various strategies' (1976, p100), to produce an array of identities. This also reminds us that we play an active role in the production of our identities, though we are constrained by our 'historical, political and economic contextual factors' (Ball and Olmedo, 2013, p87). Thus these other discourses, interplay with discourses of leadership, to produce particular identities, yet the contradictions and tensions which exist within these discourses, produce space to be and do in ways which might be different to the dominant discursive constructions of leadership. It is these possibilities that I wish to also be attentive to in my own study.

Conclusions

Leadership in higher education is often considered to be changing due to 'external pressures' (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2008; and Lumby 2012). This frequently, in leadership writing, creates a lament for higher education, a longing and nostalgia for 'the old days' (Bacon, 2014, p5). But as I have argued, this masks and conceals power relations. For example, the call for collegiality in leadership can also be understood as a desire to maintain the power of privileged groups both within and between institutions. It also downplays the role that universities, mission groups, and the people within the sector, have had in creating change/maintaining privilege (Pirrie, Adamson and Humes, 2010).

Whilst many leadership writers, describe how much leadership in higher education has changed, to become more managerialist in orientation (Askling and Stensaker, 2002; and Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009). I have reasoned that there has been far less change than is suggested, and that the traditional models of leadership described and longed for by these authors, share many of the founding principles of these 'newer' models. Perhaps the understanding of differences between models is designed to sustain differentiations between types of universities?

The association between the traditional leadership model and a view of collegiality as 'a system of governance' (Bryman, 2007), encourages the conclusion that the model is irrelevant to post-1992 universities. However, if other conceptualisations of collegiality are considered, such as Tapper and Palfreyman's (2002) notion of intellectual collegiality, then this particular assumption can be challenged. This encourages me to consider, unlike Bolden, et al (2009) the potential significance of both leadership models within Acorn University, and I will attempt to explore the relevance of both to the Principal Lecturers' identities.

I propose that leadership identities are constructed through interactions with discourse. Such an understanding acknowledges the relationality of leadership, its situatedness and variability (Zoller and Fairhurst, 2007), and therefore includes an understanding of the activities of leaders in constructing themselves, the situation and context, in ways which 'legitimate a particular form

of action and constitutes the world in the process' (Grint, 2005, p1471). This illustrates the important role that leaders themselves play in influencing, through discursively constructing, what can be thought and practiced, what is legitimate or illegitimate in terms of leadership. It acknowledges that leaders themselves are implicated in what discourse does, what it 'constrains or *enables*' (Ball, 2013, p19).

As I have argued, the discursive construction of the leader in higher education continues to embody that of the hero. Both the traditional and managerial models of leadership construct heroic academic leaders. The specialness and importance of the individual leader emerges throughout the literature, even in research which has examined other forms of leadership, such as Bolden, Petrov and Gosling's (2009) study of distributed leadership. I have suggested that the changing context is used to justify the importance of the individual leader, who can articulate a vision and make it happen, can see a way through the messiness (Yielder and Codling, 2004; Askling and Stensaker, 2002; de Boer and Goedegebuure, 2009; Fairhurst, 2009; and Zoller and Fairhurst, 2007). Underpinning all such understandings is a conception of leadership as a personal quality/characteristic, which can be improved through appropriate development (Drew, 2010), but is ultimately innate.

However, I have also suggested, that the identity of the heroic leader is itself complex and contradictory, creating differing expectations for higher education leaders, influenced by the leadership models from which they are discursively constructed. Thus, the heroic leader identity is likely to be both familiar and strange to the Principal Lecturers, as it provides at best, a partial account of the dynamic identities created through interaction with discourses which are socially and historically located. I suggest that the incoherence in the heroic leadership discourse offers possibilities for spaces to emerge in which alternative identities might arise.

Gronn (2009) proposes that we consider leadership 'as hybrid' (p392), to enable us to account for the range of configurations of leadership, (discussed by Gronn, 2009; and Bolden et al, 2009), which co-exist in higher education, neither privileging solo nor distributed/collective forms. The literature suggests that there is no getting away from the importance of individual leaders in higher

education. Indeed Bolden, Petrov and Gosling (2008) conclude that individuals 'such as professors, 'research stars' or previous holders of rotating posts may well have a disproportionately large influence within the organisation' (p62). But leader-centric notions are insufficient to explain the totality of what occurs in practice. Gronn (2009) and Bolden, Petrov and Gosling (2008) are clear that collective forms of leadership co-exist alongside individual leaders. As such this study will be guided by the notion of leadership configuration, which is open to the possibility of both individual and distributed/collective forms of leadership occurring in practice (Gronn, 2009; and Gronn, 2015).

Downshifting

Introduction

In the previous chapters I have reasoned that discourse constrains or enables identities. In this study of the identities of the Principal Lecturers I have focused on the discourses of leadership and downshifting. Laabs (1996) defines downshifting as the act of slowing down at work in order to improve other areas of life. In terms of its connections with the leadership literature, it offers an antidote to the valorisation of leadership as a desirable and glorious state of being and doing. It also enables exploration of the interconnections between the personal and professional, to stretch my understandings of their identities.

Unlike leadership, around which a whole industry has developed (Jackson and Parry, 2009), the phenomenon of downshifting is an under-explored topic. Whilst steadfastly remaining in the public domain, the academic appetite for empirical research has been underwhelming. As the following review demonstrates the concept of downshifting is closely linked with a number of other terms including; voluntary simplifiers, holistic simplifiers, (Etzioni, 1998), sea-changers (Hamilton and Mail, 2003) and cultural creatives (Hamilton, 2010). Whilst there are various classifications of downshifting a common characteristic is an understanding of its voluntary nature as an individual choice designed 'to change aspects of their lives' (Hamilton and Mail, 2003, p6).

Downshifting is often associated with the issue of consumption but it has also come to be interlinked with the notion of work-life balance. It is in this manner that Laabs (1996) described downshifting and it is this description that has guided my study. The association of downshifting with work-life balance has consequences for its interpretation and application and particular identities emerge as natural, desirable and appropriate for employees. This creates implicit rules regarding who can downshift and the objectives that a downshifter seeks to achieve. Thus the notion of downshifting brings power relations into being in both a productive and limiting way. My analysis suggests that downshifting, unlike work-life balance initiatives in general offers greater possibilities for constructing a broader range of people, i.e. identities, for whom work-life balance is important.

My initial idea that downshifting represented a personal refusal and a re-assertion of other priorities now appears naïve. Whilst downshifting may/may not be understood as a personal refusal, it is also likely to generate employer benefits as other work-life balance initiatives are reported to do, regarding competitiveness, staff retention, productivity, morale and absence (Wise et al, 2007). Such benefits are particularly relevant to academia if leadership positions, such as those of Principal Lecturers are experienced as all-consuming and undesirable as Morley (2013b) and Fullan (2003) suggest. Downshifting then, also offers employers a way to individualise responsibility for the damaging effects of work. To encourage the Principal Lecturers to make changes to their own lives, whilst the conditions, (which precipitate a desire to downshift), occurring within the institution continue.

The review that follows begins with an exploration of the literature regarding downshifting. It then moves on to consider work-life balance in general, before examining work-life balance within the context of higher education. The interconnections between downshifting and work-life balance are also discussed. The review concludes with a number of questions arising from the analysis which are the focus of this study.

What is downshifting?

The term downshifting can be found in both media and academic domains. Articles in the press, report on high profile figures who are said to have downshifted to spend more time with their families, specifically their children e.g. Max Shireson, CEO of an American software company as reported in the Huffington Post (Behson, 2014). Or closer to home, MP Tom Harris made headlines when he stood down from Labour's frontbench, as reported in the Scottish Herald and elsewhere (Devlin, 2013), as did Tory MP Louise Mensch when she resigned her position as an MP (McSmith, 2012).

The term downshifting, therefore, intersects with discourses regarding families, parenting and work-life balance. There are various ways downshifting might be characterised, but what is advocated as common to them all, is 'a voluntary choice by individuals to change aspects of their lives' (Hamilton and Mail, 2003, p6).

Etzioni (1998) offered a distinct typology. He suggested that there are three types of voluntary simplicity practitioners, the first and most moderate being downshifters. Downshifters he proposed were those economically well off people who voluntarily give up some aspects of their consumption, which they could afford, but continue to live their 'consumption-oriented lifestyle' (p622). This style of downshifting creates the appearance of living a simpler life, but the costs of that lifestyle have not changed (Hamilton and Mail, 2003). The moderate nature of downshifting enables a spectrum of earners to engage in this process.

The second type of voluntary simplicity practitioners Etzioni (1998) labelled strong simplifiers. These he determined were people in high level, high stress positions who give up their jobs to live on less. Whilst that may be the assumption in the above media examples, there is no evidence that this is the case, Tom Harris continues to work as an MP and Louise Mench continues working as a successful author.

Etzioni (1998) also includes those who voluntarily retire early, in order to enjoy more leisure time. Those who choose to work part-time in order to spend more time with their children, and 'people who switch to new careers that are more personally meaningful but less lucrative' (p624). Central to Etzioni's (1998) understanding of voluntary strong simplifiers is the significant reduction of income.

The third type of voluntary simplicity practitioners are holistic simplifiers (Etzioni, 1998). This group make significant changes often in both where and how they live. Unlike the other two, this group are 'motivated by a coherently articulated philosophy' (p626), influenced by religious and anti-consumerist ideals to live a simple life.

Key to any of these simplifications is its voluntary nature. They are changes that are chosen by the simplifier as opposed to imposed on them through for example redundancy or imprisonment.

A particularly problematic assumption within Etzioni's classification is the assumption of wealth which suggests that voluntary simplification is the preserve of a certain group of people, those who are earning/have earned a

81

sufficient level of income and are in a 'strong position to reduce their levels of consumption' (Hamilton and Mail, 2003, p7). Voluntary simplicity in any of its forms, according to this way of thinking is therefore not an option for everyone, an assumption that Hamilton and Mail (2003) contest; 'downshifting, however defined, occurs across the income spectrum and includes low-income and blue-collar households' (p7).

Etzioni's typology is clearly linked with the notion of consumption; he positions voluntary simplicity as an alternative to consumerism and the goal of capitalism, to 'achieve ever higher levels of consumption of products and services' (1998, p619). Voluntary simplicity offers the opportunity for the cultivation of 'non-materialistic sources of satisfaction and meaning' (p620).

Other typologies exist. For instance Hamilton and Mail (2003) suggest that there are downshifters, sea-changers and voluntary simplifiers. Again, common to these is the voluntary nature of the changes made. Downshifters, according to Hamilton and Mail (2003) make long-term changes to their lifestyle which significantly reduces their income and consumption. Sea-changers, are 'a sub-group of downshifters, whose life change involves leaving a career and moving house in pursuit of a simpler life. 'Voluntary simplifiers' may be thought of as those sea-changers who make a more radical change for reasons of principle as well as for personal reasons' (p8). Unlike Etzioni's classification, each of these involves both a significant reduction in income as well as consumption.

Tan (2000) argued for a distinction between career and consumer downshifting. He defined career downshifting as changing careers 'to work that involved less income, status and responsibility' (p10), although he recognised the possibility of overlap between the two.

What is often implicit in understandings of downshifting is the centrality of work-life balance. Hamilton (2010) who considers downshifting as 'the voluntary decision to reduce one's income and consumption' went on to write that downshifters are motivated 'by a desire to attain more 'balance' in their lives, typically indicating they prefer to devote more time to their families, health or hobbies' (p575). Similarly, Laabs (1996) described downshifters as people who want to slow down at work so that they can enjoy their lives 'at home and in the community' (p62). According to Laabs (1996) downshifters employ an array of

strategies to achieve their desired balance, including but not limited to; declining promotions or not seeking them, reducing working hours, changing careers or withdrawing from the workforce.

Rather than cultivating the appearance of living simpler lives, as Etzioni's (1998) classification of downshifters suggests, these descriptions are more in keeping with Etzioni's strong simplifiers, the key difference being the centrality of work-life balance as opposed to consumption. Whilst some of the strategies described are long-term and would result in a reduced level of income, such as reducing working hours, and therefore might be considered to be a downshift according to Hamilton and Mail (2003). Some of them such as declining promotions or not seeking them would not. As such these descriptions of downshifting represent a break from both Etzioni (1998) and Hamilton and Mail's (2003) ideas.

Acknowledging the centrality of the concept of work-life balance to the idea of downshifting represents an opportunity to explore both theoretically and empirically something which is missing from our current understandings.

What is work-life balance?

> How can something be utterly simple and amazingly complex at the same time? Things are simple or complex according to how much attention is paid to them (Mac Laverty, 1998, p270).

The above quotation is apt when we consider work-life balance, a term with which most of us in the UK will be familiar. Yet work-life balance is used as an umbrella for a wide range of competing and sometimes conflicting constructs including; family-friendly, collision, articulation, integration, harmony and disharmony.

Dex and Smith (2002) trace the development of the work-life balance concept. They suggest that family-friendly preceded work-life balance. Family-friendly approaches were developed by private sector organisations in the UK, USA and Australia in response to changing demographics in the workforce, in particular the involvement of greater numbers of women and declining birth-rates. Organisations began to adopt strategic approaches to tackle these issues underpinned by equal opportunity ideology. Designed from a social justice

perspective, where particular groups are identified as needing to overcome disadvantage, family-friendly approaches helped women overcome problems experienced from their dual-role, as carer and worker (Doherty and Manfredi, 2006). Family-friendly approaches were therefore, focused on attending to the needs of women in their roles as mothers and workers.

Work-life balance developed from recognition of the needs of other workers (Dex and Smith, 2002). Underpinned by ideas of diversity management, work-life balance approaches are predicated on the values of the business case, stressing the organisational benefits of diversity (Doherty and Manfredi, 2006). A shift in the discourse suggests both an assumption of inclusivity, as 'work-life balance has a much wider focus on all employees' (Dex and Smith, 2002, p3), and an alternative interpretation of life outside work. Family commitments are seen as only one aspect of the personal interests that might be pursued (Doherty and Manfredi, 2006). Family-friendly has thus evolved into work-life balance discourses, which on the surface are understood to be more inclusive, in that they encompass the entire workforce as opposed to only mothers, and recognise the importance of lives outside work, which may or may not include children.

As McDonald, Townsend and Wharton (2013) explain, work-life balance discourses arise from a variety of sources, including, governmental and organisational policies, and the media. Therefore, what happens within an individual organisation, how work-life balance is interpreted and understood is influenced and informed by these external dialogues (McDonald, Townsend and Wharton, 2013).

McDonald, Townsend and Wharton (2013) identify three dominant work-life balance discourses; flexible working, gender neutrality and right to request, which influence organisational understandings of work-life balance. To these I would add the ideal worker (Ellem, 2005; and Fujimoto, Azmat and Hartel, 2013).

The provision of flexible working arrangements are seen as a means of achieving work-life balance, particularly for those with familial responsibilities (Doherty and Manfredi, 2006; and McDonald, Townsend and Wharton, 2013). This interpretation has been actively promoted by successive UK governments

and supported by both legislation and work-life balance campaigns. The recent Great Britain, Department for Business Innovation & Skills (2014) publication demonstrates the government's continued positioning of work-life balance as making business sense. The document focuses on identifying and explaining the business benefits of introducing flexible working and family-friendly policies. These include; productivity gains, reduced absence, and recruitment and retention benefits (Great Britain, Department for Business Innovation & Skills, 2014). The discourses associated with flexible working are focused on the 'profit ethic' (Doherty and Manfredi, 2006), and are particularly concerned with the work-life balance of those with families.

Yet, as Fleetwood (2007) points out, the assumption that flexible working arrangements automatically result in work-life balance is a flawed one. Whilst this may sometimes be the case as employees seek and benefit from employee friendly practices, many flexible arrangements are employer led and business friendly, rarely sought by employees and constrain rather than enable work-life balance. Fleetwood (2007) goes on to argue that the rise in work-life balance discourses can be attributed to their usefulness 'in legitimizing the employee unfriendly working practices' (p396).

In the past, solutions to the troubling effects of work came in the form of job redesign and improved management. Despite the continued claims regarding the deleterious effects of work, changes to 'workplace practices feature remarkably little in current work-life balance debate' (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007, p326). Instead, what is offered is choice and flexibility (Ford, and Collinson, 2011); the 'rolling back' of work so that employees have time to recover (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007). Thus structural changes to conditions, such as reduced working hours are not on offer, but flexibility of working hours is. A clear example of this are the Flexible Working Regulations 2014, which extended the right to apply for flexible working from parents and carers to the rest of the workforce.

Employer interests in flexible working hours, include the potential for improvements to competitiveness, productivity, staff morale, retention and absence (Wise et al, 2007). Thus business needs are met by implementing these policies, whilst more costly provisions such as childcare facilities are less

85

prevalent (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007). As Ford and Collinson (2011) point out there is a mismatch between employer aims and employee experiences, in which the employer generates the most benefit (Wise et al, 2007). Conflicts of interest are masked by seemingly benevolent employee-friendly policies (Ford and Collinson, 2011).

Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild (2007) suggest that the term work-life balance creates a false impression that the objective is to achieve fulfilled, holistically balanced lives, but that this is neither the case for employers or governments. Governments, as Foucault (1976) describes, are in the business of population survival. Population survival necessitates birth-rates which maintain the labour force. 'Put succinctly, the problem for government is to find measures that enable parents to both work and spend time at home with their (hoped for) children' (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007, p328).

Employers, on the other hand, are faced with employees who have children, and a shrinking labour force, due to declining birth-rates and increasing numbers of pensioners, which means that measures have to be taken to address this recruitment and retention problem (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007). It is this objective therefore, that underpins employer work-life balance policies.

Both employers and governments desire the separation of work and life to accommodate familial responsibilities. The discourse of work-life balance constructs an image/identity of a perfectly balanced human being as desirable. Under which circumstances individuals might experience pressure to conform to this identity. In their study Ford and Collinson (2011) found that the discourse of work-life balance was experienced as a form of surveillance. Individuals, monitored and judged themselves 'on their ability to balance multiple, competing and contradictory pressures at work, at home, and in their leisure and pleasure pursuits' (p265). This suggests that work-life balance initiatives are designed to seduce employees into believing that the impossible (balance) is possible (Ford and Collinson, 2011).

The desire for work-life balance policies to be gender neutral is evident in the government's use of terms such as parental leave (Great Britain, Department for Business Innovation & Skills, 2014). Yet the take-up of flexible working

arrangements is significantly higher for women than men, and greatest for those with dependent children (Great Britain, Department for Business Innovation & Skills, 2014). Therefore, the implementation of work-life balance policies is highly gendered (McDonald, Townsend and Wharton, 2013).

The right to request discourse is particularly associated with legislation, primarily the right to request flexible working. In the UK, The Flexible Working Regulations 2014 extended the right to apply for flexible working to the entire workforce. The legislative right to request, Fleetwood (2007) suggests, conceals asymmetrical power relations, in which the needs of the business are recognised legally as more important than the needs of the person. If employees do not understand that this asymmetry exists and come to see this rights based discourse as fair, there is the potential for a reciprocity to arise, whereby individuals feel obliged and organisations are asking that they do something in return for an accepted request (Fleetwood, 2007). Despite the rhetoric of legally recognising the needs of employees, the legislation further promotes the needs of business.

The discourse of the ideal worker offers a theoretical insight into the problematic experiences of employees' engagement with work-life balance issues. The ideal worker, understood to be male, is fully committed to his pursuit of paid work. This simultaneously constructs a female spousal role, to which all other non-work responsibilities fall (Ellem, 2005; and Fujimoto, Azmat and Hartel, 2013). 'The work world is perceived in such a way that the ideal worker is one who is unencumbered by family responsibilities' (Aluko, 2009, p2100). The ideal worker and the care giver/familial role are clearly gendered constructs, which creates challenges for both men and women who are subjected to them. Co-workers and managers construct caregiving and familial commitments as more relevant to women and therefore also less acceptable for men (Fujimoto, Azmat and Hartel, 2013). This societal discourse is reflected in the continued responsibility of women for the majority of housework and childcare (Aluko, 2009; and Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra, 2013) as is demonstrated by Great Britain, Department for Business Innovation & Skills (2014) flexible working take-up figures. The discourse of the ideal worker is constraining for both women and men, legitimising certain actions and practices whilst excluding the possibility of others.

For example, Fujimoto, Azmat and Hartel (2013) suggest that the most common reasons stated for working fewer than 35 hours amongst men, study, and women, childcare, in Australia demonstrates 'the prevalence of gendered motherhood norms' (p150). A similar suggestion could be made, given the Great Britain, Department for Business Innovation & Skills (2014) figures, for the UK. However, given the notion of the ideal worker, these individuals might be using the only accepted and legitimated reasoning allowable, within the gendered discourses of work. Thus, their reasons for working less hours might be different and more complex, but the construction of the norm, of a fully committed worker is perhaps so powerful, that to be identified as anything other than this, is more problematic than accepting and using the gendered discourses of work.

Bias avoidance behaviours practiced by men and women and discussed by Aluko (2009) and Fujimoto, Azmat and Hartel (2013) involve attempts by individuals to hide their family commitments, perhaps in pursuit of an image of the ideal worker. These strategies might involve delaying marriage or children, having fewer children, or declining to use available work-life balance options amongst others (Aluko, 2009; and Fujimoto, Azmat and Hartel, 2013). Whilst I do not wish to dispute the occurrence of these behaviours, I would suggest that the assumption once again creeping into these understandings is a particular view of family, one involving dependent children, which constructs a particular worker as one for whom issues of work-life balance are relevant, to the exclusion of other possibilities. Bias avoidance behaviours are potentially far broader than those depicted in the literature. For example, the study option pursued by men in Australia, (Fujimoto, Azmat and Hartel, 2013), might be chosen because it allows them greater time to be at home, to be with their partners and/or children or pursuing other interests, without these reasons needing to be identified. Being seen to be a fully committed worker is likely to be of importance to all manner of employees, as are behaviours which attempt to ensure that any perceptions that this is not the case are avoided.

Generally, the work-life balance debate is premised on the assumption that employees have families and children and work-life balance provisions are focused on allowing employees to reconcile these particular responsibilities only (Ford and Collinson, 2011; and Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007). Thus

the conception of life outside of work is limiting. As is the notion of employees for whom work-life balance is considered important. It still tends to be women who have these care responsibilities and whose working conditions are facilitated by these policies (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007). A particular worker identity that of a mother, is then constructed as needing a healthy work-life balance and accepted as appropriate for the attention of initiatives and policies. I do not wish to suggest that their needs should not be met, but that understandings of who work-life balance is important to need to be broadened.

The understanding of employee attitudes to work is also limiting; work for those with familial caring responsibilities can give immense satisfaction and relief from the stresses of home (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007).

Whilst the tendency of work-life balance research and debates has been to focus on work-family issues, I wish to focus on work and non-work lives. Therefore, I will attempt to acknowledge the array of activities and interests that my participants are/wish to engage in as well as the familial responsibilities they may have. Given the broader societal and organisational discourses within which they are situated, I suggest that my participants may find it difficult to acknowledge their wider desires regarding non-working lives, as they wrestle with their understandings and their own situatedness.

Academics and work-life balance

Doherty and Manfredi (2006) argue that the higher education sector has been slower to tackle work-life balance issues than other public sector employers. Small et al (2011) rue the limited research which has explored work-life balance in academia. One piece of work which did begin to examine work-life balance in academia was undertaken by HEFCE in 2003. The Flexible Employment Options project, piloted a range of flexible working options and their effects within four higher education institutions.

They found that access to flexibility in higher education was haphazard, informal and reliant on the goodwill of individual managers (HEFCE, 2003). What is clear from the report is that an assumption of flexibility resulting in work-life balance has been made. Thus no distinction is made between employer and employee led initiatives (as discussed by Fleetwood, 2007). However, their own data

89

challenges this oft held assumption, as they found that amongst academic staff, existing workloads and long hours limited the applicability of flexible working options and the achievement of work-life balance (HEFCE, 2003).

This point is also supported by Doherty and Manfredi (2006) whose case study of work-life balance policies and practice at Oxford Brookes University, found that whilst academics experienced some flexibility with regards to organising and managing their own time, a culture of long hours detrimentally impacts on work-life balance objectives. In particular, they discussed a failure to use annual leave entitlements, and the use of leave to undertake research.

Similarly, Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra's (2013) study of academic work-family life in Iceland, found that the practice of long hours and failing to take holidays was almost a badge of honour; 'it's prestigious in this institution not to take a summer vacation or not to know when you are going to take it' (p290). Flexibility amongst the academics in their study, resulted in longer working days, brought 'work into their homes' (Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra, 2013, p294) and created a feeling of always being on call, with work always on their minds. Anaporte (1993) describes being an academic as your whole life, and the participants in Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra's (2013, p293), study described academia 'as a lifestyle rather than work'. The notion of the ideal worker, discussed previously, is evident in these descriptions. A powerful identity is being constructed of an ideal academic, who is so dedicated to work that there is no time for life beyond the academy. The gendered implications are apparent in each of these studies. For example, Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra (2013) note that 'the interviewed men do not express the need to justify their work to their wives or their families' (p291), and none expressed remorse in relation to their family and their long working hours, in contrast to the accountability that the women were required to give their partners and the guilt expressed.

Bias avoidance behaviours are also discussed in the studies of work-life balance in higher education (Aluko, 2009; and Rosenfield, 2004). These are also associated with masking family commitments involving children. Waumsley, Houston and Marks (2010, p4) challenge the notion that only those who live within such structures 'experience conflict between work and life outside work' and suggest that those who wish to work flexibly for reasons other

than child care commitments are viewed less favourably and constructed as 'less committed and more likely to leave'. This suggests that within higher education work-life balance is considered to be an acceptable issue for particular individuals, parents, and that the identity of the ideal academic, precludes others from legitimately identifying with these discourses.

Doherty and Manfredi (2006) propose that dedication to work associated with the construct of the ideal academic, is linked to the demands of career progression, which operates to silence dissent. Within these debates, women are constructed as most needing work-life balance and also surprisingly silent with regards to raising concerns. Doherty and Manfredi (2006) suggest that this link between long hours and career progression is one possible reason that 'women academics do not speak up about the tension between their home and work lives' (p254). Small et al (2011) suggest that women academics feel a sense of privilege with regard to their employment and the opportunities it provides and thus there is a collective silencing, a sense that they should 'keep quiet because we're the lucky ones'. Consequently, work-life balance issues are experienced as a personal problem and the solutions are individually based, with women making changes to their own lives, in order that they do not draw attention to themselves and the issues they face (Aluko, 2009). Thus the work-life balance discourses operate to individualise the troubling effects of work, so that changes and challenges to organisational policies and practices are not considered appropriate or needed.

The construction of work-life balance as a female problem also helps to undermine the status of these issues within higher education. Despite the increased participation of women in the academy, it remains a 'chilly place', in which they 'are disadvantaged and feminised in terms of professional advancement, and in their day-to-day interaction' (Small et al, 2011, p25). In the UK, female academics are 'concentrated in less senior roles', 'often in unpopular and precarious management areas' (Morley, 2013b, p5). A similar picture also emerges throughout the European Union, Australia and the USA (Morley, 2013b; and Small et al, 2011). Their underrepresentation at all decision-making levels within the sector is suggestive of another reason that women may choose not to draw attention to issues of work-life balance. They are less likely to find support for change in a climate in which they already face

significant challenges. Furthermore, the issue may not be that they are silent, but that no-one is listening and that their comments are being dismissed.

Doherty and Manfredi (2006) also discuss the consequences of changes to work in higher education and specifically work intensification, arising from an increase in the diversity of competing and conflicting demands on time. These demands include increased student numbers and expectations, increased requirement for teaching at unsociable times including evening and weekends, 'pressure to do good quality research and the tension between teaching and research and a plethora of new initiatives' (Doherty and Manfredi, 2006, p251). These institutional and sectoral pressures, they argue, undermine the possibilities of work-life balance for academics. These tensions are compounded for female academics who find, as with society more broadly, that they still carry the major responsibility for housework and childcare (Aluko, 2009; and Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra, 2013). They must simultaneously wrestle with discourses of motherhood and women, which conflict with the long hours that they are working, (Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra, 2013), creating a sense of failure, as they struggle to meet the demands of conforming with either identity, that of the academic or that of the mother/woman.

The result of individualising work-life balance issues is likely to be a reduced propensity for collective bargaining/action. As individuals struggle to challenge the dominant perspectives of work-life balance and collectively raise concerns. These power dynamics, between individuals and organisations, influence the achievement of work-life balance. Doherty and Manfredi (2006) suggest that the weak position of academics in the job market, in light of continuing redundancies, such as those being planned at the University of Warwick (Grove, 2014), and the limited willingness to move jobs evident amongst academics, tips the balance in favour of employers, who are unlikely to make changes to improve work-life balance unprompted.

HEFCE's (2003) report drew a number of other conclusions, including the need for commitment from managers at all levels, clear communication and training of line managers in understanding, implementing and monitoring flexible working options. The report also concluded that flexible working was of interest to a range of employees including those without caring commitments. This

finding challenges the dominant understanding of work-life balance as a parental need. There is some evidence that the reciprocity Fleetwood (2007) warned of does occur, as employees are expected to put in more hours, at inconvenient/unsociable times in exchange for 'some degree of flexibility' (HEFCE, 2003, p49).

Whilst critiques of the work-life balance debate recognise its shortcomings, the experiences of academics have typically been omitted from these critical considerations. There is an assumption of flexibility associated with the role of academic. Given that flexibility is so often associated with achieving a good work-life balance, one might expect academics to benefit from a good work-life balance. However, the literature suggests that academics face particular challenges because of the informal expectation of long hours associated with the job. Thus the experiences of academics are particularly relevant to work-life balance debates.

As a group Principal Lecturers are engaged not only in the management and control of themselves and their identities, but they manage other academics and report to those more senior to themselves. Therefore, work-life balance issues are relevant to Principal Lecturers, both personally and in their role of responsibility for others. Engaging with the discourses of work-life balance creates different expectations about how employees should control their lives and construct their identities. The emphasis of these discourses is on the individual taking responsibility to achieve what might be a mythical ideal.

The literature suggests that work-life balance is an issue for Principal Lecturers. If that is the case a number of questions arise: How do Principal Lecturers cope? What are the strategies adopted? Are these individual responses or organisationally supported?

Downshifting and work-life balance
Critiques of work-life balance debates challenge the limited conception of work that is imagined within these debates. Firstly, the lack of attention paid to both the damaging effects of work and the enjoyment and satisfaction that engaging in work can offer (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007). This reductionist assumption regarding work is evident in both Hamilton (2010) and Laabs's (1996) descriptions of downshifting. Generally, the premise of the work-life

93

balance debate is that individuals are doing too much work and that work therefore needs to be contained (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007). Downshifting then can be framed as a necessary form of containment.

In Laabs's (1996) description downshifting is described as slowing down at work in order to improve other areas of life. Work is constructed as the problem, and considered in a reductionist way, the potential enjoyment and satisfaction that work can give people is lost. Contained within this definition is also an assumption that the motivation is to improve and enjoy life outside of work. There isn't any acknowledgement that downshifting might also improve life within work. This is perhaps due to the discourses of work-life balance being remarkably silent on the need to change workplace practices. Thus, the workplace needn't change, but the individuals' approach to it should. This also enables the many employer benefits of employees engaging in downshifting (discussed below) to remain less obvious.

Unlike the majority of work-life balance initiatives, downshifting does have the potential to offer a broader perspective on who work-life balance is important to. There is scope for those other than parents, particularly mothers, to be constructed and identified as appropriate downshifters. As with other work-life balance initiatives, workplace practices remain unchanged and unchallenged by the actions of a downshifter. Downshifting is a personal act, an individual's response to their life, which may or may not be a response to the damaging effects of work. The critique of work-life balance initiatives in general suggests that downshifting might not only benefit the individual employee. In fact the employer benefits might well be at least as significant if not more so, as they gain from having employees who are more productive, have improved morale, are less likely to leave, and importantly workplace conditions continue unabated.

Current understandings of downshifting are inherently individualistic. Downshifting is constructed as an individual's choice. Like the work-life balance discourses with which it is associated, the problems which downshifting are designed to address are an individual's. However, this individualisation masks the situational conditions, be they organisational, sectoral or societal, which produce collective, (as well as individual), experiences, such as long hours and

94

demanding workloads, that detrimentally impact upon the achievement of work-life balance. Thus work-life balance issues in higher education are inseparable from the power relations which produce them, and as such, are not only an issue for individuals but for universities and the sector as a whole.

The suggested strategies that downshifters might engage in to achieve their desired balance; declining promotions or not seeking them, reducing working hours, changing careers or withdrawing from the workforce (Laabs, 1996) may all result in a measure of personal sacrifice, whether that is in a reduction in current or future income, pension entitlements or other benefits. Current work-life balance discourses exhort individuals to 'resist the demands of paid work to make more time for family and leisure' (Ford and Collinson, 2011, p258), downshifting, as defined by Laabs (1996) is clearly conceptualised in this vein. The individual is the one who is responsible for creating the balance and the discourse of work-life balance urges them to take what might be extreme measures (when downshifting) in order to take control of their lives.

When downshifting is considered in light of the strategies offered by Laabs (1996) similarly to Etzioni (1998) there is an assumption that a certain level of wealth has been achieved. Indeed particular types of employment would appear to provide greater opportunities for downshifting; the possibility for reduced hours, the development of interchangeable skills which make a career change possible, the pensions/savings which enable withdrawal from the workforce. Downshifting, in light of this definition, is therefore, a response not available to everyone in employment.

Very little empirical research has been undertaken into the subject of downshifting. In Australia, Hamilton and Mail's (2003), Chhetri et al's (2009), quantitative analyses and Tan's (2000) qualitative accounts are exceptions. Thus much of the discussions regarding downshifting are anecdotal. Indeed the academic appetite for exploring this phenomenon seems to be minimal, as is demonstrated by the fast demise of Downshifting Downunder an initiative which began after a downshifting conference in 2005, and six months later was barely functioning (Jackson, 2008).

Downshifting has yet to be explored empirically within academia. The notion of downshifting and its interconnection with the discourses of work-life balance,

suggests that expectations regarding identities are implicitly created, the identity of the mother and the perfectly balanced individual just two. These expectations may be experienced as crippling for those who struggle to meet the associated demands of a perfectly balanced life. If leadership roles in higher education are as demanding as Morley (2013b) and Fullan (2003) suggest, and work-life balance is understood to be a problem for academics, then the notion of downshifting is likely to be pertinent to the Principal Lecturers.

Why do people downshift?

Hamilton and Mail (2003) suggest that there are a range of reasons that might prompt people to become downshifters, sea-changers or voluntary simplifiers, which they divide into personal and principle. Major life events such as ill health, the death of a family member, or a marriage breakup (amongst others) might contribute to a desire to downshift, as might matters of principle including economic and environmental concerns (Hamilton and Mail, 2003).

Personal reasons centre on a lack of fulfilment. This they argue is a response to the increasing dominance of work over other aspects of life, and creates in particular a desire to spend more time with their children (Hamilton and Mail, 2003). This reasoning demonstrates the close association with the discourses of work-life balance and the construction of the suitable downshifter identity of the parent.

Bottery's (2004) notion of the greedy organisation, describes growing concerns regarding the influence and effects of work on employees. The greedy organisation seeks to extract the maximum value in terms of 'physical and emotional labour and commitment' (Bottery, 2004, p46), from its employees in order to improve productivity and efficiency. Gronn (2003b) argues that this has resulted in the blurring of the boundaries between personal and work lives as people come to embrace the demands and embody their work: 'greedy work consumes one's life, so that work becomes the measure of what one is and not just what one does' (p153). This suggests that organisations are exerting power over individuals' identities, shaping their understandings of themselves and others.

Within higher education Morley (2013b) describes leadership positions as all-consuming and undesirable. 'The system is in deep trouble. There is a huge

need for new leaders, and at the same time there is a set of conditions that makes the job unattractive' (Fullan, 2003, p24). Although for some, the critiques of the work-life balance debate suggests, the all-consuming nature of work might be a source of support and satisfaction.

When I began considering the notion of downshifting, it struck me that perhaps downshifting represented an opportunity for refusal of particular identities and ways of being within organisations. For employees to reassert control of their own lives and establish/re-establish other priorities. The analysis that has so far been presented suggests another interpretation. Downshifting, which may/may not be understood as a personal refusal, is also an act which is bound up with the notion of work-life balance. This notion enables organisations, to lay the responsibility for achieving this balance at the employees' feet. Thus from an employers' perspective, downshifting is potentially a way for them to address the challenges of recruitment and retention, particularly in organisations and situations where positions are sometimes seen as undesirable, as in higher education leadership. Considered in this way downshifting provides employers with a mechanism for the retention of staff in particularly challenging roles who might otherwise leave.

A main assumption contained within all current understandings of downshifting is its voluntariness (see for example, Hamilton and Mail, 2003). Downshifting is understood as an individual's choice. Yet, 'choice is bounded within existing cultures and structures' (Small et al, 2011, p24). In other words, everything is not possible or allowable, as we are constrained by the discursive and non-discursive mechanisms of power within which we are all embedded (Ball, Maguire and Braun, 2012; and Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). The work-life balance discourses operating in higher education suggest that particular identities make downshifting legitimate, i.e. for parents, whilst others, are constructed unfavourably and downshifting is seen as illegitimate. The limited challenges being made by academics to organisational policies and practices regarding the troubling effects of work is indicative of the operation of power relations and the positioning of academics within them.

Hamilton (2010) describes the process of deciding on and actually doing downshifting as a long one, in which the would-be downshifters 'distance

themselves from prior life narrative and become accustomed to the idea of (a) new one' (p575). This might be considered as a comparative project (Benson and O'Reilly, 2009) a process as opposed to a single event, in which downshifters justify their choices in terms of their lives before. This suggests that any study of downshifting needs to use a methodology which enables the researcher to explore the lives of the participants over time; their immediate existence, as well as their past and their potential futures.

Conclusions

Recognising the centrality of the concept of work-life balance to understandings of downshifting highlights how the deleterious effects of work can come to be experienced and understood as personal as opposed to organisational problems. This individualisation serves to minimise dissent and create acceptance of employer-friendly, (as opposed to employee-friendly), working practices (Fleetwood, 2007).

The current emphasis of work-life balance discourses is the provision of flexible working arrangements which are understood to achieve work-life balance (Doherty and Manfredi, 2006; and McDonald, Townsend and Wharton, 2013). This 'rolling back' of work, is generally in the interests of organisations, not employees, and the business benefits, which are central to the business case approach to work-life balance, adopted and encouraged by the UK government, are masked by seemingly benevolent employee-friendly policies (Ford and Collinson, 2011; and Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007).

The notion of work-life balance is itself seductive, it creates a desirable state/way of being, which when adopted by employees operates in a self-governing manner, as they monitor their attempts to meet the demands of the discourse and the identity of the perfectly balanced human being (Ford and Collinson, 2011). At first glance work-life balance is suggestive of inclusivity, both in terms of who these issues are considered important to as well as why. However, what becomes apparent is the construction of work-life balance as a parental and particularly mothering need. This is a throwback both to its founding construct, family-friendly, as well as continuing societal discourses regarding families, motherhood and ideal workers. Within higher education, this feminisation further delegitimises work-life balance concerns.

98

The literature suggests that work-life balance will be a problematic issue for Principal Lecturers. On the one-hand, wider external dialogues and debates suggest that achieving a good work-life balance is desirable and do-able. On the other, the discourses surrounding academia, construct the academic as a fully-committed (male) individual who has no time for life beyond the academy, unless that is taken care of by a (female) spouse. Experiences of long hours and challenging and demanding working conditions conflict with, and limit the practicality of, achieving work-life balance.

The discourses of work-life balance suggest that downshifting can be understood as a form of containment of work, the premise being that individuals are working too much. In light of the concerns raised about a culture of long hours in academia, downshifting would appear highly relevant to Principal Lecturers. However, in contrast to understandings based upon the work-life balance literature, which propose that downshifting is a way of improving life outside of work, I also propose that downshifting may be about improving experiences of work, making it more manageable and enjoyable. In other words, downshifting might be considered as an individual's response to the troubling effects of work. Enabling employers to address the challenges of recruitment and retention, particularly in organisations and situations where roles are seen as undesirable, such as leadership positions in higher education (Morley, 2013b; and Fullan, 2003). Considered in this way downshifting provides universities with a mechanism for the retention of staff, such as Principal Lecturers, who, the literature suggests, are in particularly challenging roles and might otherwise leave.

Exploring the notion of downshifting and its implications for this group of Principal Lecturers represents an opportunity to contribute to an expanded understanding of downshifting and leadership in higher education. The literature suggests that current understandings of downshifting, influenced by the discourses of work-life balance, are focused on highlighting the benefits of individual's other lives, outside of work. This focus averts our gaze, from the problematical aspects of work and its impacts upon individuals. In higher education understandings of being an academic, create expectations regarding working conditions which serve to legitimate the demands placed upon

99

individuals. A number of challenging questions arise from this analysis and are the focus of this study:

- Given societal and organisational discourses of work-life balance, how do Principal Lecturers respond to the concept of downshifting?
- What identities emerge as legitimate downshifters?
- Who are precluded from downshifting?
- What are the discourses which are drawn on to legitimate/undermine downshifting?
- How are these understandings influenced by discourses of work-life balance and being an academic?

Chapter 3: Research Approach

Introduction

In Chapter 2 I explored the theoretical underpinnings of my approach to this study. Guided by a Foucauldian interpretation of power, I came to understand that Foucault was interested, not in the exploration of power for its own sake, but, to understand how individuals come to be subjects and how in this production they are constrained and enabled (Foucault, 1982). His desire was that we might explore the taken-for-granted nature of subject positions and identities and in questioning this, open up opportunities for alternative 'ways of being and doing' (Biesta, 2008). Biesta (2008) labelled these alternatives as 'counter-practices', which are to be considered different rather than better.

My own agenda then, as I reflected on this understanding, came to involve exploring the power relations occurring in higher education, not to provide insights into power, but to examine how individuals are made subjects through the operation of power relations and, something of the field of limitations placed upon individuals in relation to their identities, which conversely open up fields of possibility. To do this I focused on a particular group of designated formal leaders, Principal Lecturers, within one institution. In the chapter that follows I will explain how my engagement with the literature and interest in Foucault, influenced what I studied and how I did it. This chapter is organised into two parts, the first explores theoretical issues with the approach taken, and the second is a more descriptive account of the practicalities of data collection and analysis.

Ontological and epistemological commitments

Researchers today are asked to be explicit about 'where we stand', to describe our epistemological and ontological assumptions and how these are implicated in our thinking and undertaking of empirical work and analysis (Cunliffe, 2011). I have struggled with this, not because I cannot recognise the value of challenging taken-for-grantedness in our thinking and doing of research (a notion in keeping with Foucauldian ideas) but because I also recognise that such labelling and boundary-making has the potential to run counter to Foucault's intent; his 'intellectual project' 'rested on seeking to find a space beyond traditional disciplinary or theoretical positions, from which he could

subject those positions to analysis and critique, and trouble the 'inscription of progress' within modern politics and scholarship' (Ball, 2015, p823-824). It is also troubling because of the recognition that this is a question of 'allegiance, a sense of identity', it is asking 'what kind of something' am I? (Ball, 2015, p821). In the coming paragraphs I describe how I have come to reconcile these misgivings in relation to my own work. I explore the tensions that arise when working with Foucault and how he and others have worked with these, before outlining my own response.

Ball (2015) writes of his own discomfort with the struggle to be 'a something'; of the various ontological positions he has 'tried out' and the 'elision between hermeneutics and post structuralism', 'which is, I accept deeply paradoxical' (p827) in nature which has been his (eventual) particular intellectual response. Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982) describe how Foucault's own understanding, evident in his works, evolved to both criticise and utilise hermeneutics and structuralism. My point is, that we each have the capacity for changing our epistemological and ontological orientation, and that Foucault came to work both within and beyond the boundaries of differing epistemological and ontological commitments, in spite of the difficulties this presents.

But the question remains: Who is the Rachel who writes this text? This is not a question of uncovering a truer-version of Rachel, but it is an endless struggle to be (Ball, 2013), it is an 'epistemological practice' (Ball, 2015). Thus, it demands a continuous process of questioning, so that I might be able to refuse what I am as Foucault (1982) encourages us to do.

In the doing of this research I have worked with the business and management literature, and increasingly that described as critical management, alongside that of the sociology of education. I have thrived in the tensions and problematics this brings. But it has always been to Foucault that I have returned. He explains my reticence to claim any kind of allegiance:

> Do not ask who I am and do not ask me to remain the same: leave it to our bureaucrats and our police to see that our papers are in order. At least spare us their morality when we write (Foucault, 1986, p17)

Deetz (1996) however argued that this is not about policing 'the lines', but about acknowledging 'the social resources from which researchers draw [and develop] an understanding of the stock arguments used by those who do police the lines', thus freeing 'research activities and justifications before they are merely captured by the category named and become part of the commerce of research' (p199).

Thus, I must claim my ontological and epistemological position, and I do so, on the understanding that this is a temporary and tentative allegiance, based as it must be on my own limitations in knowledge and understanding (which, following Foucault, are always themselves implicated in power relations).

In the doing of this research, what is it that has concerned me? Or as Biesta (2008) would ask, what was my normative agenda? It has always been about emancipation. I identified with Foucault's (1982) notion of imagining possibilities for subjectivities and identities and the potential opportunities this might provide for the participants in this study to see how they were being produced and limited. In this way I aligned myself implicitly with the interests of the critical researchers Deetz (1996) and Mumby (2011) describe. For I am interested in demonstrating and critiquing 'forms of domination' and 'asymmetry' and 'showing how social constructions of reality can favour certain interests and alternative constructions can be obscured and misrecognized' (Deetz, 1996, p202). (Although, working from a Foucauldian conception of power, I must reject the idea of pre-determined dominant groups (Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2011)).

One of my commitments was to provide interpretation focus groups for the Principal Lecturers, or, as Deetz (1996) might have called them, 'forums for discussion' and to consider what it was that 'produce partial interests and keep people from genuinely understanding, expressing, or acting on their own interests' (Deetz, 1996, p202). As Deetz (1996) writes, I have engaged in this critical discourse, adopting 'a suspicious and therapeutic tone, but also a theory of agency which provides an additional activist tone. People can and should act on these conditions through improved understanding as well as access to communication forums' (p202).

This has indeed been one of the struggles I have found working with my studied group, why can they not be/do different/ly? But a Foucauldian understanding of power reminds me that, we can never be free from power, but are always implicated within it. Power both 'generates consent on the one hand and 'resistance and discontinuity' on the other (Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2011, p1265). Thus working through his ideas I have come to a different understanding of emancipation, to the one offered by critical theory (Johnson and Duberley, 2000), and like Deetz (1996) himself I also draw on conceptions from dialogic studies.

I have a political agenda, a desire for active change, the creation of a different world, (in keeping with critical research), whilst at the same time I am committed to a Foucauldian understanding of power, subjectivities and identities, which recognises the partiality of discourse and the fluidity of power, power relations and identities (in keeping with Deetz's (1996) dialogic research which works without 'an active political agenda' (p203)).

I have utilised a post-structuralist orientation, working 'from underlying assumptions of disjunctured, fragmented, and discursively constructed realities and subjectivities. Such discourses, realities, and subjectivities are treated as objects and products rather than subjective human accomplishments but also as contested, mutable, and contextualized—situated within macro historical, social, and institutional discourses (Deetz, 1992)' (Cunliffe, 2011, p656).

Such an orientation is objectivist in its ontology, you will note later, that I refer to 'the body', and to discourses as things/objects which 'can mobilize action' (Cunliffe, 2011, p662). But the epistemology is subjectivist, recognising the nature of research/er as embedded, hence the importance of reflexivity in the research process. This approach influenced what I considered to be important in the research process, the questions that I was interested in, what I considered data, and how I collected and analysed that data.

Questions of knowledge

Lomer (2014) states that the task of Foucault is 'one of primarily intellectual understanding' (p275), she says, therefore, that to enact social action we must move beyond Foucault in order to confront discourse with reality.

Lomer writes about 'enacting positive change in the discourse' (2014, p275), but to do so she assumes that the unveiling of the workings of power frees us from it. It has an emancipatory outcome. This is predicated on a belief that it is possible to achieve a level of knowledge which moves us beyond power relations; that as researchers we are able to attain complete understanding of 'our historical limits' (Foucault, 2007c, p115) and are then able to offer that knowledge to others. It is underpinned by the assumption that there is the possibility for a disentanglement of power from knowledge. This understanding of knowledge, Biesta (2008) argues, is based in the Enlightenment tradition which assumes 'that knowledge is 'outside' of or 'beyond power'' (p199). Such an understanding leads to the critique suggested by Lomer (2014) that Foucauldian analysis cannot offer opportunities for action.

Foucault, however is quite clear that 'knowledge and power are integrated with one another' (1980b, p52) and states that 'it is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power' (Foucault, 1980b, p52). Therefore, the kind of emancipatory ideal that Lomer (2014) imagines is an impossibility and the privileging of particular knowledge, designed to free, itself relies 'on the operation of power' (Biesta, 2008, p202).

This does not mean however, that Foucauldian analysis cannot result in emancipatory effects, but that emancipation needs to be considered differently (Biesta, 2008). Rather than freedom from power, Foucauldian analysis offers us the opportunity to illuminate possibilities as well as limitations, to bring to peoples' attention the taken-for-granted, in order to demonstrate that other subjectivities and identities are possible (Biesta, 2008; and Ball, 2013). This is done so, not to replace knowledge with 'better' knowledge or to offer instruction, but, 'to make possible different ways of being and doing' (Biesta, 2008, p202). Through the promotion of new forms of subjectivity (Foucault, 1982), such an approach can help us 'to refuse what we are' and 'to imagine and to build up

what we could be' (Foucault, 1982, p216). This insight encouraged me to consider the potential emancipatory effects of my research. I wanted to provide participants with opportunities for them to see how their identities are being produced and limited, to help them 'to imagine and to build up what' they 'could be' (Foucault, 1982, p216). Such a desire has had implications for my engagement with my study group, which I will come to later.

This methodological distinction Biesta (2008) argues, avoids the privileging of researcher accounts (as Lomer, 2014, wishes to do), which fail to reflexively consider the basis of new knowledge and the power relations within which it is has been constructed. Such an analysis is an important aspect of a Foucauldian inspired methodology and as such I attempt to tackle this later in the chapter.

Critique in Foucauldian analysis takes on an alternative meaning, to the one Johnson and Duberley (2000) describe as attempting to adjudicate 'between different realities' using 'independent criteria' (p112). Foucault (2007d) refers to this as a critical attitude 'akin to virtue' (p43), concerned with 'the art of not being governed quite so much' (p45). This attitude he argues stems from the premise of this critique being the problem of knowledge:

> What false idea has knowledge gotten of itself and what excessive use has it exposed itself to, to what domination is it therefore linked? (Foucault, 2007d, p58-59)

He proposes instead critique based on the problem of power and an 'examination of "eventualization"' (Foucault, 2007d, p59). This process involves finding the connections between 'mechanisms of coercion and elements of knowledge' (Foucault, 2007d, p59). This is about specifics, identifying particular elements of knowledge and those of power, in an attempt to demonstrate the multiple explanations of an event as opposed to causes or to developing a 'deeper understanding' (Biesta, 2008). This is based on a desire not to develop action plans but to help subjects, who are struggling to be, think and do differently.

> it is not a matter of describing what knowledge is and what power is and how one would repress the other or how the other would abuse the one, but rather, a nexus of knowledge-power has to be described so that we can grasp what constitutes the acceptability of a system (Foucault, 2007d, p61)

The analysis of this nexus will enable me to explore how power relations influence the manifestations of identities to take particular forms. This is integral if I am to achieve the emancipatory effects that I hope, to challenge taken-for-granted exercises of power and illuminate possibilities of being differently (Foucault, 1982; Ball, 2013; and Biesta, 2008). Such an analysis can never reach closure, nor is it about determining cause and effect, but instead attempts to demonstrate plurality and embrace uncertainty.

Biesta (2008) argues that Foucauldian inspired research accounts must reflexively consider both the basis of new knowledge and the power relations within which it has been constructed. The chapter now turns to a discussion of reflexivity.

Reflexivity

The call to 'be reflexive' (as Biesta, 2008, demands) is prevalent in the social sciences (Webster, 2008). Yet what this involves is far from straightforward. Lynch (2000) provides an 'inventory of reflexivities' to 'demonstrate the plurality of meanings and uses of the concept' (p27), which range from Holland's, (1999), treatment of reflexivity as an essential 'human capacity which defines our existence' (p482), to 'a critical, or self-critical, act' (Lynch, 2000, p27) as described by Nadin and Cassell (2006) or Cunliffe (2002).

Lynch (2000) argues that the radicality of reflexivity is often overstated and that the objectivist critique that it reportedly offers (see Nadin and Cassell, 2006) is far from fundamental to its use. When we consider Foucault's (2007d) notion of the power-knowledge nexus, we understand that being reflexive cannot occur outside power relations, it occurs within disciplinary, historical and social constraints, which validate it as an appropriate practice and determine what is acceptable. The call to be reflexive is a product of our time (Webster, 2008) and as such it is a result of strategies of power-knowledge.

This doesn't mean that it should be abandoned, but that we should recognise its limitations. Indeed, reflexivity forms an important aspect of Foucault's notion of ethical self-formation, (discussed in Chapter 2), which asks that we investigate ourselves, question our own subjectivity; how have we come to understand ourselves? How has discourse protected us from, and, created the needs which

we have presumed to have originated in ourselves? (Foucault, 1982; and Mayo, 2000).

This investigation of self, is not, as Ball (2014) writes, aimed at knowing oneself, (uncovering a true-self, (Foucault, 2007a)), as essentialist understandings of identity propose, (Chapter 2), but is 'a form of self revelation' (p12), a ceaseless struggle to be (Ball, 2013). It is then, a lifelong project extending beyond the boundaries of this study, a process of becoming (Ball and Olmedo, 2013).

Two reflexive tasks have been at work in this study; the first is a self-revelatory project. How am I being constructed? What are the power-knowledge relations within which I am constructed? How am I implicated in the production of the knowledge (Coffey, 1999; and Bryman and Cassell, 2006) I present within this thesis? What are the power relations within which this knowledge has been constructed? Such a task involves exploring the complex and changing relationships that I have had with the fieldwork, the setting, and the participants. Questioning the limitations I impose on myself and others (Cunliffe, 2003). This differs in purpose from the reflexive tasks of much management and organisational research, which Nadin and Cassell (2006) identify as; quality enhancement, intellectualization, improved trustworthiness, empowerment, or the recognition of influences on interpretations. It is not done in an attempt to strengthen the claims that I make, but to bring to my attention the possibilities for becoming. As such it is much more than a reflective exploration of research practice, although that forms part of the process. It is a method for exploring the power-knowledge nexus, the contextual factors, within which I am actively constituting myself and others' identities, and determining their acceptability (Ball and Olmedo, 2013). It is a way in which I can begin to care for myself, taking a more active role in my own self-definition (Ball and Olmedo, 2013, p86). Ball and Olmedo (2013) write that;

> such care also rests upon and is realised through practices, practices of
> critique, vigilance, reflexivity, and of writing (p86).

These practices I have attempted to implement, in relation to my ethical self-formation, in particular through the keeping of a research diary, I shall return to this later in the chapter.

The second reflexive task at work in this study, has involved the research participants. I have been driven by a desire for the research to have an emancipatory effect (Biesta, 2008). Specifically, I wanted to provide participants with opportunities for them to see how their identities are being produced and limited, to help them 'to imagine and to build up what' they 'could be' (Foucault, 1982, p216).

The importance of discourse

Discourses are central to Foucauldian understandings of power and identities. A Foucauldian interpretation of power, (as discussed in Chapter 2), acknowledges both the repressive and constructive workings of power (Foucault, 1976). Butler (1997a) uses Foucault, to demonstrate how the workings of power form the subject, creating our desires, to have, to be, to do, to claim or to refuse particular identities. Who we understand ourselves to be, is a result of processes of power which produce subjects (Oksala, 1998; Mayo, 2000; and Foucault, 1982). An important Foucauldian distinction, which is opposed to any idea of an essential self, (as discussed in Chapter 2), is that these identity struggles do not occur 'in the self-consciousness of the subject' (Mayo, 2000, p114), but through interactions with discourses. We are then active in the production of our identities, though constrained by our 'historical, political and economic contextual factors' (Ball and Olmedo, 2013, p87). It is not through continual introspection that we find ourselves, for we are not hidden from ourselves, but our identities are formed and reformed through the workings of power, identities are an effect of power and vehicle for power (Foucault, 1980a):

> The individual is not to be conceived as a sort of elementary nucleus, a primitive atom, a multiple and inert material on which power comes to fasten or against which it happens to strike, and in so doing subdues or crushes individuals. In fact, it is already one of the prime effects of power that certain bodies, certain gestures, certain discourses, certain desires, come to be identified and constituted as individuals. The individual, that is, is not the vis-a-vis of power; it is, I believe, one of its prime effects. The individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent to which it is that effect, it is the element of its articulation. The individual which power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle (Foucault, 1980a, p98)

Foucault (1976) writes that in discourse, power and knowledge are conjoined. Discourses are socially and historically located (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000) and they are not a projection of power, but are a result of processes of power which are used to effect different outcomes (Foucault, 1976). Discourses of leadership or downshifting have thus been determined by power relations.

> Discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it, any more than silences are. We must make allowance for the complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy.

110

> Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it (Foucault, 1976, p100-101)

Analysing discourse, therefore, offers an opportunity to explore the productivity of power, in terms of its ability to both strengthen and destabilise, to restrain and legitimise different identities. Constituted as they are from the results of power relations, discourses are fluid and fragmented in nature, and their functions are not stable, 'thus we must not imagine a world of discourse divided between accepted discourse and excluded discourse' but as a 'multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies' (Foucault, 1976, p100). An analysis of discourse is consequently, concerned with the strategies being employed, which requires attention to specifics, as within any strategy there can be competing and contradictory discourses.

If we consider leadership then, this analysis suggests that there are multiple discourses of leadership, themselves shaped through power relations, which influence what we know, the way we think, talk and act leadership. Ball writes that 'discourse is that which constrains *or enables*, writing, speaking and thinking' (2013, p19). Discourse is not the same as language and so a Foucauldian discourse analysis is not concerned with identifying particular words or phrases and counting the number of times they occur, or the intention of the user in speaking those words. But in analysing what hasn't been said, what becomes unthinkable, unsayable, and undoable as a result of discourse. As well as what is natural, unquestioned and desirable (Ball, 2013). Such an analysis is concerned with 'the structures and rules that constitute a discourse rather than the texts and utterances produced within it' (Ball, 2013, p19).

Written as it is here, it seems simple to distinguish between discourse and language, yet as I have considered my own data, I have found it easy to slip into a language analysis of sorts and a focus on intentions. I have caught myself doing this and then had to review and rethink.

Identities are formed through the workings of power, specifically through interactions with discourses. Discourses which are themselves the result of power relations and which limit the possibilities of our thinking and how we might consider ourselves and others, the identities we might hold or value. Discourse thus became central to my ideas regarding my research approach.

111

My commitment to a Foucauldian exploration of power, seeking to understand how individuals become subjects through processes of production in which we are all implicated, has had a profound influence on the methodological choices I have made. I have tried to think through Foucault's ideas and their consequences for the data collection process. My previous experience of using methods came into consideration as did concerns for the potential participants' likely availability and commitment. As I read the research methods literature I became interested in the potential of focus groups and interviews for exploring discourse.

Justification for the discursive approach taken

Conceptions of domination and inequalities (from critical studies), how they occur, are sustained, and can be disrupted, are of central interest to me. I have been concerned with exploring the 'new and more subtle forms of domination' (Deetz, 1996, p151), (whatever they might be), that occur within the particular workplace that is Acorn University. In understanding 'the relations among power, discursive practices and conflict suppression as they relate to the production of individual' identities (Deetz, 2003, p23). I was committed to exploring this empirically, to show how particular identities become important whilst others become marginalised, in practice. (Something Alvesson and Kärreman (2011) suggest has been lacking in discursive studies). Opening up new possibilities and spaces for the imagining Foucault (1982) encourages us to pursue.

Foucauldian concepts, in particular disciplinary power (Foucault, 1978) and technologies of the self (Foucault, 2007a) provided the analytical framework for this. Foucauldian analyses must be tentative in their claims (Biesta, 2008; and Ball, 2015), so that they don't fall into the Enlightenment tradition of substituting one form of knowledge with another (Biesta, 2008; and Foucault, 2007c). Rather than claiming to develop 'deeper understandings' I must confine myself to illuminating possibilities. As Fejes and Nicoll (2008, pxiii) write;

> poststructuralist analyses drawing upon various resources from Foucault's work do allow for the production of alternative meanings. These are not by any means meant as replacements for others. They are just other kinds of meanings.

The claims that I can make on the basis of the analysis that is to come, also need to be considered in light of the methodological choices made. A Foucauldian understanding of discourse has underpinned this study, in which discourse itself is understood to be formed as a result of power relations (Foucault, 1976).

I chose, as Deetz (1998) and Alvesson and Kärreman (2011) suggest, to explore how discourses are enacted within a particular organisational site. My primary means of data collection were focus groups and interviews (a discussion of these methods comes later). Mumby (2011) offers a cautionary note for 'interview-based discourse studies' that inflate the insights offered by organisational members into their constructions of identities and sense making to 'larger claims about the organizing processes being studied' (p1150). He goes on to critique the lack of awareness in analyses of the complexities associated with the embeddedness of organisational members in discourses. The attention to Foucauldian concepts and analytical framing can help me to be aware of this and to consider and unpack these complexities and their 'often contradictory and indeterminate' nature (Mumby, 2011, p1150).

In using the word discourse let me first outline some of the differing approaches to, and understanding of, this term, which is sometimes (though not always) distinguished by the use of small d discourse and big D Discourse. For example, Fairhurst and Putnum (2004) define discourse as 'the study of talk and text in social practices and Discourses as general and enduring systems of thought' (p7). Alvesson and Kärreman (2011) wish discursive researchers would distinguish between small d discourse analysis, which they label text-focused studies (TFS) and big D discourse analysis, which they call Paradigm-type Discourse Studies (PDS). Determining the difference, is according to them dependent upon the context (Mumby, 2011). TFS are important 'where materiality and extra-discursive practices plays a significant role, like in cooking and assembling a car or a bridge', here 'the proper place for communication analysis in these cases is about the structure and content of the conversations that occur around these objects and performances' (p1140). 'PDS, on the other hand, is suitable for the analysis of ideational phenomena on an abstract level' (p1140). PDS they particularly associate with works that have relied on Foucauldian ideas. Indeed they state that given the focus of his own 'historical

113

studies of mainly texts and plans aiming to find broader patterns' is there any distinct or specific connection' to TFS 'apart from the use of the signifier 'discourse'?' (p1130). In the discussion that follows I shall outline why I have rejected these distinctions in my own work and argue for a different approach to discourse and discursive analysis, based on Foucauldian principles and an understanding of Alvesson and Kärreman's (2000) earlier work.

I find Alvesson and Kärreman's (2011) suggestion of the irrelevance of Foucault to TFS problematic. Firstly, because I do not believe that the focus of Foucault's own work should necessarily preclude others from pursuing TFS as described by Alvesson and Kärreman (2011). Indeed I believe as Ball (2015) states, that Foucault's intent was 'for the readers and users of his work to be creative and to be adventurous' (p824). This isn't a matter of anything goes, but of sustained and exhausting engagement with his ideas and the principles of those in their application. Given that he wrote that his objective 'has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects' (Foucault, 1982, p208) and that he always insisted that his work could neither be considered a theory or methodology (Foucault, 1982) it seems that to disregard its potential for exploration in relation to TFS is too quickly done. Conversely, given that TFS is defined in terms of language use (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2011) we are confronted with a potential conflict for Foucauldian inspired work. Ball (2013) distinguishes Foucauldian discourse analysis from analysis in which 'the object of study is text and language' (p39). For Foucault, to focus on language was to reduce discourse and the potential of its analysis:

> Of course, discourses are composed of signs; but what they do is more than use these signs to designate things. It is this more that renders them irreducible to the language (langue) and to speech. It is this 'more' that we must reveal and describe (Foucault, 1986, p49).

Thus, to undertake TFS in a Foucauldian inspired manner, would require focusing on text and language (discourses) with the intention of exploring and examining the Discourses of which they are a part and how they are constituted. This then, is to explore something more/other than Alvesson and Kärreman (2011) suggest is appropriate, and is perhaps in accordance with their earlier distinction of a 'meso-discourse approach' (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000, p1133). In my own analyses it is this approach that I shall use, as it is in keeping with the Foucauldian principles that have guided this study.

Mumby (2011) argues that the distinction between TFS and PDS is problematic because it reasserts a view of discourse as merely 'representational of a world' that is understood to be 'material and existing independently from the discourses about it' (p1153).

> 'Reducing the question of discourse as constitutive to an empirical issue (is discourse constitutive of organization or merely facilitative?), Alvesson and Kärreman place themselves in the position of arguing for either a transmission or a constitutive view of communication, depending on their' 'assessment of the particular context at hand' (Mumby, 2011, p1155-6).

He goes on to challenge the examples Alvesson and Kärreman (2011) offer for each type of analysis, carefully demonstrating how their desire for distinction predetermines what is important in discursive analysis, separating the material and discursive, as opposed to exploring 'the dialectical relationship of the discursive and the material' (Mumby, 2011, p1153).

Unlike Alvesson and Kärreman (2011) I like Ball (2013; and 2014) think that Foucauldian inspired analysis can tell us something about how discourses influence people, through consideration of the processes (the power relations) by which discourses constrain and enable people to be/think/act. Assuming that discourses are implicated in the material, in subjectivities, is not to suggest that nothing else matters, as Alvesson and Kärreman (2011) charge discursive researchers with, but it is to understand that discourse doesn't just 'represent and facilitate the material, but enacts and constitutes it in important ways'(Mumby, 2011, p1159). In relation to my own work, I do not want to confine my analysis within the TFS, PDS distinctions and the representational view of discourse this recreates. However, Alvesson and Kärreman's (2000) earlier work had a different agenda (Mumby, 2011). In this they were focused on the methodological distinctions it is possible to make in discourse studies, based on two core dimensions. The first being the relationship between discourse and meaning. According to which, Foucauldian inspired discursive studies such as mine are positioned as 'discourse determination' (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000, p1133).

The second dimension concerns 'assumptions on the scope and scale of discourse' (p1133). In relation to the discourse determination position, Alvesson and Kärreman (2000) suggest that at 'the micro-discursive level: we read the

account as a text (a story, not a truthful testimony of a personal conviction) and look at the claims and logic that it expresses' (p1143). If one emphasizes 'the subjectivity and expression of meaning in connection to the account', then we are operating 'within the close-range approach to discourse' (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000, p1143). At the meso-level the focus would be 'temporary subjectivity-constituting and meaning-expressing qualities of discourses' (p1144). A Grand Discourse approach would concentrate on 'an assembly of discourses, ordered and presented as an integrated frame. A Grand Discourse may refer to/constitute organizational reality' (p1133). At the mega-Discourse level we look for 'more or less standardized ways of referring to/constituting a certain type of phenomena' (p1134).

Alvesson and Kärreman (2000) suggest that researchers might use empirical material 'to move up on this 'discursive ladder' (micro to mega) and build a case for the Discourse(s)' (p1146). But this they suggest is difficult, with texts 'typically seen as exhibiting one Discourse', 'in which the language use forming the empirical material may be 'plugged into' (p1146). Such work will require 'continuous reflection' and the 'grandiosation and muscularization of discourse should be grounded and shown – rather than, 'be postulated' (p1147). I understand this to be a way for researchers to carefully work with their empirical material, asking what insights it might suggest, and thoughtfully building their claims with regards to organizational (Grand) Discourses. It offers those of us working with Foucauldian inspired methodologies an opportunity to examine levels of discourses, to be more delicate in our discursive claims, in a way that we are usually charged with not doing (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000). As such it is an approach that I will use as I consider my own data. Asking as I explore the material what insights are offered by considering the different scales of discourse. My practical approach to this is discussed later in the chapter.

The understanding of discourse which underpins this study is fundamentally different to that used in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in which 'a discourse is just the language' 'element' (Fairclough, 2013, p181). But there are commonalities in the approaches taken. Both, for example, recognise the discursive character of the social field, and are 'antipositivist and interpretative' (Fairclough, 2013). The critical interests which underpin my work are also commensurate with the 'general objects of' CDA research described by

116

Chouliaraki and Fairclough (2010) and its focus on the endurance and acceptance of some (dominant) discourses (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 2010).

In terms of Fairhurst and Putnum's distinctions (2004), the organisation, from my perspective, is both an object, for example, I privilege the 'preexisting group' (p11) of Principal Lecturers as producers of discourse/discursive practices, as well as in a state of becoming, for I am interested in 'how discourses produce organizing through legitimating' actions and shape organisational contexts (p13). This isn't sloppy theorising it is the consequence of engaging in Foucauldian work, which insists on 'structuring and structured characteristics, as well as objective and subjective characteristics of social reality' (Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2011, p1253) (or see Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982). At the heart of such work is the concept of power, this shifts the locus of observation 'to social, political and economic contexts and to the hegemonic and material constraints that often lie beyond an actor's awareness' (Fairhurst and Putnum, 2004, p12). The critical angle to my work is reflected in this. Such an aim also sits within Fairhurst and Putnum's (2004) object orientation. Yet equally I am interested in the 'contexts and constraints that actors recognise and use in organizing' (Fairhurst and Putnum, 2004, p15), which sits within the becoming orientation. As Fairhurst and Putnum (2004) suggest Foucauldian analyses like Leclercq-Vandelannoitte's (2011) reject the micro-macro, agency-structure dualisms, yet, one of the key criticisms of such analyses is that the agency-structure dualism remains unresolved because 'they repress the subject and minimize agency relative to disciplinary power' (Fairhurst and Putnum, 2004, p15), similarly to Alvesson and Kärreman (2011) and Mumby (2011) there is a desire for researchers to carefully explore empirically how people wrestle with disciplinary power and its consequences. Again, we are to refrain from assuming too much, and need to show, what Discourse does.

Intentions

I initially intended to use a life history approach; to begin with focus groups and then use follow up interviews to develop life histories. However, as I gathered the data, this approach changed, for a number of reasons. The first was due to the number of Principal Lecturers wanting and committing to being involved, in the end I had nine, all of whom agreed to follow-up interviews, detailed life-histories of this number was unachievable given the limitations on my own time

due to funding arrangements. Secondly, the time commitments involved for participants would have been much greater, involving further interviews and potentially the collection of additional data, such as diaries, story-boards, pictures, and diagrams. It was clear from the numbers of people who initially demonstrated an interest in participating, twenty seven, the number who signed up for focus groups, eleven, and then the number who actually turned up, nine, that their time was short and my use of it needed to be, I dread to use the word, efficient.

I decided instead to do focus groups, follow up interviews and then interpretation focus groups. These interpretation focus groups were designed to disrupt the subject-object dualism and achieve the emancipatory effects I hoped for.

Why focus groups and interviews?

The discussion that follows explores theoretical issues with regards to these particular research methods. How these played out in the actual data collection process is discussed later in the chapter.

These methods of data collection privilege verbal behaviour. This is often seen as a limitation of the focus group method (Morgan, 1997). But in a research study such as this which aims to explore discursive phenomenon, privileging this behaviour enables the discourses which are drawn upon in talk to be explored. In particular the data enabled me to examine: which discourses are used by Principal Lecturers, how they are used and with what consequences; the relative power of the discourses; the identities that are created and the power and outcomes that they might result in.

The distinguishing feature of focus groups is their explicit use of participant interaction (Liamputtong, 2011). This interaction is said to offer a number of advantages compared to individual interviews, the primary one being its ability to provide evidence of levels of agreement between opinions and experiences. The social nature of the groups is also said to: 'elicit talk that may be difficult to prompt in an individual interview' (Farnsworth and Boon, 2010, p607), create opportunities for a broader range of perspectives to be voiced, and enable ideas to be modified and developed through discussion. Pragmatically the method also enables the researcher to access a number of participants and gather large amounts of data on a topic in a relatively short space of time (Belzile and Oberg, 2012).

Despite participant interaction being the distinguishing feature of focus groups, Belzile and Oberg (2012) draw attention to the lack of focus group research which has reported on or discussed interaction. This they believe has resulted from the positivistic tradition of focus group research, which places the rationality of the individual at the centre of analysis. The purpose of focus group research in this tradition, is to access the individual's pre-existing ideas and perspectives which may be enhanced or suppressed by group interaction. Therefore the interactions themselves are unimportant in analysis, as they occur only to illuminate an individual's pre-determined thoughts.

Such a perspective has consequences for the role of the researcher in focus group research. The researcher is removed from the field, to a position of objective observer. Such a role involves the researcher in management of the group, to either open up or close down discussions. A key concern being the supervision of group interaction to ensure that any behaviours, such as 'censoring, conforming, sabotaging or overly directing' (Farnsworth and Boon, 2010, p609) which might suppress particular viewpoints and impede the full range of opinions from emerging are closely controlled.

However, researchers who view focus groups and interviews as dynamic social processes, consider that opinions and ideas are formed through social interaction within particular contexts (Belzile and Oberg, 2012). Thus an individual's viewpoint is created dialogically, drawing on available discourses and is in a state of continual flux. Taken to the extreme, these methods enable a researcher insight into the perspectives of the participants at a particular moment in time and are confined to that specific setting, as they are a result of processes of social interaction. These processes are thus integral to the analysis of data from this perspective.

As such, Allen (2005) treats occurrences designed to suppress or impede the full range of opinions from emerging, which would be carefully controlled in traditional positivistic focus group research, rather differently. These actions are sources of data, which provide insights into the way identities are performed within focus group settings, through the use of 'repetitive acts which give the impression it is something constant which individuals possess' (p37).

Attending to processes of suppression, does not necessarily mean that the researcher must renege their control of the focus group. Agar and MacDonald's (1995) attempts to minimize control were found to be unrealistic and unproductive. This is perhaps a consequence of the aims of the research. If the aim of the focus groups is to collect data on a particular topic and the time and availability of both participants and researchers is finite, then a measure of control needs to be used to enable this aim to be fulfilled. In addition both researcher and participant have expectations of their involvement in research, which will influence their engagement with the process.

Viewing focus groups and interviews as social processes has consequences for the role of the researcher. They can no longer be considered to exist outside of the empirical field, but are implicated within it. The interactions which the researcher has with the participants are intricately connected with their contributions (Belzile and Oberg, 2012). Therefore these interactions also need to be considered in the analysis of the data.

Feminist researchers have drawn attention to issues of power imbalances between researchers and participants in individual interviews; the potential for researchers who control conversations and limit personal disclosure to exploit their position; as well as the potential for interviewees, particularly 'those in positions of institutional power' to seize control (Wilkinson, 1998, p114).

Focus groups it is argued, offer the opportunity for the redistribution of power in favour of the participants. In so doing they are said to empower participants and raise their consciousness of particular issues (Wilkinson, 1998). Kvalem and Strandbu (2013) however, argue that the redistribution of power is uneven resulting in some group members dominating discussions. This domination can also be seen in forms of intimidation, bullying and harassment, of members by members or of researchers by members (Kitzinger, 1994; and Wilkinson, 1998).

A Foucauldian understanding of power recognises that the existence of power within a focus group setting or interview is inevitable, but how this power is exercised is not. Power will flow between all parties in a continuously changing and emerging manner. Foucault would challenge the notion that focus groups can empower participants, firstly because this suggests that power is being appropriated by participants and if power is fluid and relational then this is impossible. Secondly, because it suggests an emancipatory ideal that with knowledge comes freedom, yet knowledge is itself a product of power relations (Foucault, 1980b; and Hardy and Clegg, 1999).

Viewing focus groups and interviews as social processes highlights the importance of understanding them as connected to the rest of the lives of the participants and researcher. Thus pre-existing social relations such as 'gender, ethnicity, age and social status' (Farnsworth and Boon, 2010, p609) will influence interactions. How we perceive each other will influence the power dynamics. How I am constructed by the participants, and 'othered', may have

interesting consequences for the data gathered (Smithson, 2000). This is all about the examination of how I am implicated in the production of knowledge (Coffey, 1999; and Bryman and Cassell, 2006).

Within the focus group and interview setting, participants and researchers exercise their power and engage in the process of othering, through the use of discourse. Discourse produces particular forms of knowledge and figures who personify it. In other words discourses produce subject positions from which individuals make sense of themselves and act (Tuori and Vilen, 2011; and Butler, 1997a). Discourses are interwoven within each other to reflect and reproduce ways of thinking (Juntrasook et al, 2013). These discourses are not fixed and complete entities, they reflect a moment in time, their power exercised through the rules of behaviour, practice or views that they create and legitimise (Foucault, 1986). Which is precisely why these research methods, provide an appropriate approach to exploring how individuals are made subjects through the operation of power relations.

In participating in this research, Allen (2005) would argue that the Principal Lecturers are engaged in identity work, the creation and management of particular images of themselves. Such work reveals the interconnection between discourse and subjectivity as individuals draw on discourse to produce subject positions. The participants do have agency, and they can 'actively' and 'purposively' 'deploy discursive constructions which afford positionings that help them meet objectives within a particular social context' (Willig, 1999, p114).

Positioning involves differentiating oneself from others. Foucault discusses practices of self-governance and surveillance which continuously divide and sub-divide people, as 'in' or 'out' (Danahar, Schirato, and Webb, 2000). Through these processes the other is constructed in opposition to oneself as less desirable and powerful (Garcia and Hardy, 2007). The exclusion and differentiation from the other constructs identities. The identities that emerge offer individuals different power and result in particular outcomes (Garcia and Hardy, 2007). It is this that I explore in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 the multiple identities that emerged and their consequences.

The identity work that took place within the data collection process highlights the fluidity of identity and its negotiated character (Ylijoki and Ursin, 2013). As

individuals sought to legitimise, challenge or modify identity claims. Exploring how the participants talk enables their identity work to be investigated. Are they talking as a group of Principal Lecturers, as individuals, as academics, or as focus group participants? (Farnsworth and Boon, 2010). How does this change with the discussion? This contextualisation is necessary when focus groups and interviews are viewed as dynamic social processes, in which opinions and ideas are formed, altered, challenged and justified through interaction (Belzile and Oberg, 2012).

Foucault (1976) posits that the one who listens, in this case I as researcher, is in a position of domination over the one who speaks. For I question, but am 'not supposed to know' (Foucault, 1976, p62). The conventional research interview process Foucault would argue, can be considered to be rooted in the scientification of the Christian tradition of confession, and the search for truth through the verbalisation of our thoughts; 'this discourse of truth finally takes effect, not in the one who receives it, but in the one from whom it is wrested' (Foucault, 1976, p62). This truth must pass through the interviewer-interviewee relationship. Through the confession the partial truth emerges, but it is the interviewer who interprets what was said, who is 'the master of truth' (Foucault, 1976, p67).

If we extend Foucault's notion that texts should not be considered 'as the reflection of a situation', to focus groups and interviews and the resulting audio files and transcriptions, then these should also be understood as forming 'part of reality' (Foucault, 1984b, p80). The research process is then a formative one, rather than reflecting the truths of experience, multiple explanations of experience can be examined, but these explanations are informed and influenced by the research process itself. In the doing of the focus group or interview, it must account for itself, demonstrate its worthwhileness. The explanations are not outside the research process, reflecting an objective truth; they are constructed through power-knowledge relations, which reminds us again of the importance of reflexivity in the research process. A topic I return to later.

Recruiting Principal Lecturers

Using the staff intranet and the contact detail listings I created a list of 247 Principal Lecturers and 3 casual Principal Researchers drawn from across the university. I contacted these people directly via email to request their participation in my study. 27 people responded to say they would be willing to participate. These 27 were then sent an email asking them to choose their preferred focus group session time, four options were initially provided. These dates and times were dependent upon room availability and were spread out over a seven week period taking into account preferences that had been raised in initial email responses. By offering a number of options I hoped to enable as many people as possible to attend. I am aware of the significant instructional material available within the research methodology literature which outlines recommendations for focus group size, composition, structure, facilitation, timing and incentives (for example Peek and Fothergill, 2009). In my case I left it to participants to choose their preferred focus group, which meant that there was the potential for the focus groups to vary in size and composition, and I made no attempt to manufacture groups dependent upon factors such as gender or faculty representation. I hoped that the commonalities of their roles would be enough to create focus group environments which enabled discussions (Kitzinger, 1994; and Holbrook and Jackson, 1996).

In organising and facilitating these initial focus groups I had three aims in mind. First, I wanted to explore leadership experiences. Second, I wanted to explore the concept of downshifting and its relevance to Principal Lecturers. Third, I wanted to use the sessions to establish whether any participants would be interested in taking part in further stages of data collection. This third aim was intended to maximise the availability of data, to allow those who were not interested or able to commit to leave the project whilst enabling me to still use the data collected in this initial process.

The Principal Lecturers who took part in the study are shown in Table 1. As it happened I ran three focus groups with 2, 3 and 3, people respectively and interviewed Grayson as he was the only person to turn up for his focus group session. I subsequently interviewed each of the focus group participants.

Table 1: Research participants

Name	Faculty	Session
Louise	Social Science	Focus group 1
Nina	Health	Focus group 1
Grayson	Business	Interview
Iris	Social Science	Focus group 2
Daphne	Health	Focus group 2
Kate	Business	Focus group 2
Pete	Business	Focus group 3
Sally	Health	Focus group 3
Alan	Engineering	Focus group 3

The doing of data collection

With the participants' consent I audio recorded each data collection activity. I then transcribed each audio recording. Due to the nature of the intended discourse analysis, which as I explained previously is not focused on language (Ball, 2013), I transcribed the audio without paying attention to lengths of pauses, or overlap between speakers, (Dick, 2004), and also took the ethical approach to the data described later in the chapter.

Ethical issues

This research was conducted in accordance with the Sheffield Business School Research Ethics Policy and Procedures. Ethical approval was sought and granted by the Sheffield Business School Research Ethics Committee before potential participants were approached. Renold et al (2008) wrote "informed consent' is one of the central regulatory norms that all research ethics review boards or committees demand researchers seek out and gain or prove' (p441) and indeed that was the case for this research. But as they go on to propose,

this approach often conceptualises the research-researched relationship in a very particular, static way, which does nothing to recognise the unexpected and unforeseen nature of ethical issues. Thus they suggest that researchers apply reflexivity to the notion of ethics, 'to respond to the complexities of the iterative and uncertain character of consent' (Renold et al, 2008, p443). My own efforts in this regard are demonstrated by my ethical approach to data discussed later in the chapter.

Initial contact with potential participants was via email. This outlined the details of the research purpose, the proposed data collection process, the voluntary nature of their involvement and my commitments to protecting their anonymity. For those that went on to attend focus group sessions, each session started with an introduction to the project and I established whether they were happy to be audio recorded, their consent to this was recorded on the audio files and at each of the subsequent interviews. At their first focus group session I asked each participant to sign a consent form. At the end of the sessions I also asked them to complete a short registration form which captured basic details about their role as a Principal Lecturer and whether they would like to participate in future stages of the data collection process. A similar process of obtaining and recording consent was also followed with Bobby in HR.

I outlined my commitments to them, both in the initial email and at each subsequent data collection point. Whyte's (1984) discussions of ethics in field research were particularly influential in helping me to prepare appropriately and to be careful in honouring the commitments that I made to the participants. For example, Whyte (1984) discusses the need to carefully consider what we offer participants in terms of protecting them from harm (which is linked, but not exclusively, to issues of confidentiality), and providing opportunities for feedback on our research, and the potential for negative consequences, not only for ourselves, but for future researchers, of not meeting our obligations. The process of engaging with Foucault's latter work and the doing of this research also came to demonstrate to me the importance of this in relation to the microphysics of power (Ball, 2013), the need to be attentive to the small things in our relationships and the potential these provide for being differently. I committed to providing the participants with summaries of each session they were involved in, these were no more than two sides of A4 in length and were

sent to them individually via email. I also kept them informed, via email, of progress as key events such as the completion of the initial focus group stage occurred. Although, because of the nature of the research process, many of the participants came to know who else was involved, I was careful to ensure that I never shared email addresses, or made other participants' names available when using, for example, meeting organisation software.

Focus groups

I opened the focus groups with a brief introduction to my work and the purpose of the sessions. I used two prompts to stimulate discussions around which the groups were structured (the specific prompts can be found in the relevant data chapters). The first quotation, concerning leadership in higher education, was used to recruit participants; therefore I hoped it would be familiar, providing a level of comfort and engaging the participants in conversation quickly. This text also introduced some of the more familiar discourses; competition, performance, austerity and work intensification, from the higher education literature. The purpose of this was to enable me to explore how the participants engaged with the discourses offered to them and whether others were drawn upon in discussions. Are participants engaged in self-governance? Are particular discourses internalised? What are the consequences of this internalisation? How are they constructing the other? This enabled me to examine the differing levels of power that the discourses offer, and the subject positions which emerge from their use, as well as 'the interplay between personal stories and public/master-narratives, which have rarely been examined in mainstream studies of leadership, especially in the higher education context' (Juntrasook et al, 2013, p204).

The second prompt was based on Laabs's (1996) definition of downshifting. The purpose of this section was to explore the relevance of downshifting to the Principal Lecturers. Does the concept resonate with them or their experiences of others? How do they understand the concept and the consequences of engaging with downshifting? What are the identities of downshifters which emerge? Who is constructed as a suitable downshifter? What are the discourses which are drawn on to legitimate a decision to downshift?

127

The focus groups were thus divided into two sections, the first exploring leadership and the second downshifting. I envisaged that the time allocated for the groups (60 minutes) would be roughly split equally between the two. This was the case for all apart from the third and final focus group, in this session the group spent two thirds of their time discussing the leadership quotation and the remaining time discussing downshifting. I closed each session by thanking them for their time and asking them to fill in a short data capture form, which included a question about their willingness to participate in further data collection.

Consideration of participant withdrawal brings the emotionality of research to the fore. I found it very disappointing, irrespective of the manner of the withdrawal; whether they let me know in advance, contacted me during the time they were supposed to be present, signed up for groups but then neither showed nor contacted me, or indicated an interest and then disappeared. On the one-hand as researchers we are expected to facilitate withdrawal, to allow people to withdraw during the course of the study, without repercussions. But that is mixed with the importance of the study to me, this has been a significant part of my life for a sustained period of time, I have so much vested in it that it is difficult to accept that others should not feel a sense of obligation! Certainly I had an expectation that people would show if they'd agreed to participate, an assumption shared with Grayson who was sure that the others who'd agreed to attend his focus group session, given their positions as Principal Lecturers, understood the importance of research and the difficulties of doing it and would turn up if we waited, an expectation that was mistaken. Participant withdrawal is an interesting example of 'bringing power relations into being' (Foucault, 1982), in the researcher-researched relationship. In this particular study, it may also have been an example of individual responses to their experiences of the institutionalisation of long hours (Chapters 4, 5 and 6), as participating in the study will have only added to workloads.

Interviews

The first interview with Grayson was performed out of necessity, and I used the same structure as the focus groups, with the quotations as stimulus material. The follow-up interviews with the other focus group participants were different. Each one was tailored to the individual and their contributions during the focus

128

groups. The interviews were used to explore further the topics of leadership and downshifting.

The interviews were organised by email. I invited each participant to a one hour interview, and explained my proposal for subsequently holding a one hour interpretations focus group. Each participant was offered at least four possible interview dates and I offered to meet wherever was convenient for them. This meant that seven of the interviews took place in various meeting rooms across the campus and one (with Sally) took place in a café.

The recorded interviews lasted between 44 (Louise) and 56 minutes (Iris). In my research diary I reflected on the differences in opinions expressed in the interviews compared to the focus groups. For example, Louise talked at length in the focus group about the National Student Survey (NSS) and how it constructs students as consumers:

> 'the kind of constant having to check with students. Are they happy with this? Are they happy with that? What can we do to improve this? What can we do to improve that? I'm not saying that one wouldn't want to do that (Louise, Focus Group).

In the interview, when I asked her to tell me more about how she thinks this construction happens, within her reply she stated:

> Perhaps I mean maybe I over exaggerated it to a certain extent cause I think people will still do teach in the way that they kind of think is most appropriate and I guess that the NSS does raise issues that lead us to think about, to you know, to maybe think about what the university experience is like from a student perspective and sometimes does provide us with useful kind of almost data and ammunition to justify making changes (Louise, Interview).

I was also struck by how much change had occurred for each of them within a relatively short period of time, (there was no more than three months between the focus groups and interviews). Pete, for example, had gone through what can be considered to be a process of psychic disengagement (Archer, 2008a), which had had a profound personal impact on the way he was thinking about work (Chapter 5).

I include these examples to illustrate the dynamic nature of the research methods and the fluidity of identities. The incoherence of Louise's account

129

might reflect the changing social interaction, perhaps when another Principal Lecturer was present the topic of the NSS took on more significance. Perhaps the timing of the data collection was an influence, as it was for Pete. My point is that whatever the reasons, my aim is not to try and dismiss/hide these inconsistencies, but to acknowledge them. This I do in the following data analysis chapters. In doing so I am reminding you that as individuals whilst we might strive for a coherent account of ourselves by which we might be recognised by others, (Butler, 2001), we produce these accounts through interactions with competing and contradictory discourses. As our identities are formed through these interactions, and in relation to others, the identities that I suggest in my analysis, provide at best a partial understanding. I can never hope or aim to 'capture' a complete account, but can offer glimpses of possibilities. Yet this is a vital step, if I am to achieve the emancipatory effects I hope for, and illuminate both the possibilities and limitations of subjectivities.

Butler (2001) reminds us, that when we account for ourselves, as my participants were asked to do as interviewees, these accounts take place within 'the structure of address' (p26). The Principal Lecturers were addressing their accounts in particular ways to me as researcher. Alvesson (2002) writes that respondents 'might very well tell the (partial) truth as they know it, but in ways that are favourable to them, and not disclose truths unfavourable to them and their group' (p114). This is an important reminder of the partiality of the data and the power relations operating within the interview process. The Principal Lecturers' exercised their power both through the withholding of information (Ballamingie and Johnson, 2011) and the presentation of particular favourable accounts.

HR interview

After the completion of the first two stages of data collection, the focus groups and interviews with the Principal Lecturers, I decided to try and interview university Human Resource (HR) personnel. The purpose of these interviews was to explore the power relations operating to create the Principal Lecturers' identities from an alternative viewpoint. HR personnel were of interest because they were referred to during the focus groups and interviews, particularly when talking about downshifting, and it appeared that they had an important role to

play in legitimising/delegitimising downshifting and downshifters through their practices, policies and procedures.

I approached Bobby, a gatekeeper within the department and asked if he would be willing to be interviewed. He agreed and offered to try and 'enlist a few more colleagues', which he attempted via email. Another colleague agreed to be interviewed and interview dates were arranged, however, this other colleague later withdrew and was never interviewed.

The interview with Bobby, took place in a private meeting room on campus, over his lunch break. The recorded interview lasted 47 minutes. It became apparent during the interview that Bobby was very interested, because of his role in HR, in the Principal Lecturer role. He was very knowledgeable about the role and in the course of his work had informally interviewed a large number of Principal Lecturers, Heads of Department and faculty executive from across the university.

His interest no doubt contributed to his willingness to take part in this research. It has also been the reason for an on-going relationship, both via email and in person, in which we have shared research papers and ideas, and he has 'picked my brains' in the course of his work. In this relationship more than any other, I have been positioned as expert. Although, this has occurred outside of the interview process rather than during it, in the interview Bobby didn't appear to engage in impression management, or make reference to my expertise, in the way that Bryman and Cassell (2006) describe, which suggests that this did not impact on his presentation of self in the same way. Perhaps because of his understanding of us working in different fields, he in HR and me in academia?

Interpretation focus groups

Despite my (sometimes) implicit assumption of Principal Lecturer as research object, (discussed below), I have attempted to disrupt this subject as object dualism. This has involved a commitment to offer the Principal Lecturers the opportunity to explore my initial analysis in 'interpretation' focus groups.

These focus groups were also designed with my emancipatory effects agenda in mind. I hoped to provide the participants with an opportunity to explore their identities, and develop an understanding of how power relations both constrain

131

and constitute them and their relationships with others. So that they might imagine what they could be (Foucault, 1982).

I used an online scheduling tool to identify suitable times and dates, in order to accommodate everyone I set up and ran two focus groups. Whilst everyone agreed to attend one of the sessions, in the end, the first group included; Louise, Alan, Iris and Sally. The second session involved Pete and Grayson. Sadly, the other three had to cancel at the last minute.

I began each session with a short (10 minute) presentation outlining my initial ideas, including the identities of the; leader without authority, third space leader, managerial leader, entrepreneurial leader and privileged leader (see Chapter 4). I also introduced some of the systems of differentiation I had identified including; traditional superiority, teaching competencies, REF and ideal academic. The remaining time was used by the participants to discuss the contents of my presentation, with very little input or questioning from me.

The groups lasted 72 minutes and 76 minutes respectively. The discussions of the data, led to musings over ownership of statements:

> Alan: I find my workload is relentless it never, never really stops apart from when I do, there was a thing there about going away from the country, I was thinking was that something I said? It's probably something I could have
>
> Louise: that was actually me I think
>
> Alan: but I could have said you know because that's almost what you have to do

Alan is also considering whether he agrees with my interpretation (Bryman and Cassell, 2006). In the main, the discussions in these focus groups were about levels of agreement over interpretations, as opposed to explorations of alternative understandings of themselves. A discussion of the emancipatory effects of the research can be found later in the chapter.

All of the Principal Lecturers identified themselves as a leader without authority (Chapter 4), which might be connected to their desire for achieving a coherent account of oneself, (Butler, 2001), or/as well as to their purposes for participating in the research. Sally was the only one who verbalised an effort to think plurality:

The leader identities is really interesting I resonate a lot with that leader without authority, I think they break down quite well. I could see myself as a privileged leader as well (Sally, interpretations focus group 1)

The dialogic nature of focus groups is highlighted by the differences in content and nature of discussions between the groups. For example, in the second focus group, the notion of the ideal academic proved to be of particular interest, prompting a lengthy discussion (approximately 13 minutes) of the concept, possible meanings and alternatives. Yet in the first focus group it didn't even get a mention. Does their failure to discuss the notion mean that they accepted it as an accurate descriptor? Was it just not interesting to them? Would discussing it have meant that they couldn't pursue their particular purposes for participating in the focus groups? I cannot know.

I was surprised in the first group by how long it took for Iris to make her initial contribution to the discussion, more than 30 minutes into the recording. I wondered in my diary whether this was 'in reaction to the presentation/analysis?' (Cockman, 17/06/14). I also noted that she arrived early and 'was very stressed'. Perhaps our discussions about her workload, worries about her children and impending office move made her feel like she didn't need to contribute to the discussions of work pressure and negative experiences of being led, which were characteristic of the talk for that first part of the session.

For myself, I found remaining quiet challenging in these focus groups, as the participants raised questions to each other and discussed the data and the forms in which it was presented, 'and I had to think to myself - no I don't need to explain I just need to listen' (Cockman, 17/06/14). But perhaps, if I had viewed these focus groups differently, and been more actively engaged in the dialogue, we could have constructed different knowledge? I continue this discussion later in the chapter.

Ethical data?

In the course of this research I have found that participants have willingly shared painful details of their lives and certainly details which would usually remain private. This aspect of the emotionality of research has required me to develop a particular approach to the data. Duncombe and Jessop (2002) raise the ethical question of how far can we assume informed consent, in relation to

disclosures that result from rapport. I have been concerned with this and believe that in an age when researchers are increasingly asked to abide by data management policies which often demand or at least encourage open access to archived data, this issue is even more important. My group of Principal Lecturers agreed to participate in my research, but in sharing more than they might usually do, have they really agreed to others reading this data and using it in other ways? Goodson and Sikes (2001) suggest that 'one answer to ethical difficulties arising out of sensitive topics is simply to leave to the informant the decision about whether to talk about a particular issue' (p98). But this leaves no space for regret, and neither does it acknowledge that in speaking to someone 'who just listens', (although as I discuss later, this is far from as simplistic as it sounds), we might reveal more than we'd like others to know. I made choices as I transcribed, I removed references to specific university faculties, departments, centres and other particularly identifying features, such as names of children, or the particular circumstances of a family members illness, inserting instead 'x', or a generic comment such as *'family illness'*. I took the view that this could be done without changing the overall nature of their remarks. I also did this in response to concerns raised about confidentiality by my participants; these were mainly aired after sessions when we were no longer recording, but occasionally these were captured in the transcripts:

> But it's still a big secret. But you anonymise everything anyway so it's not going to be an issue (Nina, interview)
>
> Alan: So yes it's therapeutic yeah I think it's fair to say
>
> Sally, Iris and Louise: Yeah
>
> Alan: It's nice to be able to
>
> Sally: have a rant to somebody who will just listen
>
> Interviewer: And make notes
>
> Alan: Relatively anonymously yeah

Nina talked about a particular centre, and whilst she knew she would not be 'named' she would have, in my view, been identifiable by any interested party who had access to the university's telephone directory, or even the external website. My interference with the data is an example of an exercise of my power as a researcher. Yet the stated and implied assumption of confidentiality between the participants and I suggests that my approach was appropriate.

134

Interaction

Within the context of this study, I expected the participants to have an understanding of the methods and some of the issues and challenges of engaging in this type of research. I anticipated that many of them would have conducted research interviews and focus groups themselves.

> Interesting to be on the other side of research to see what someone does with the data about them, rather than helping others, supervising them, guiding them, it gives you a different perspective (Alan)

Alan's reflection on being part of the research process illustrates the expertise of my participants, they generally, although not all, were knowledgeable of the research process. For one participant in particular, this provoked suggestions of readings, additional questions, and the use of other research tools. In doing this, during each of the data collection stages, it is possible that the participant was reaffirming his understanding of himself as expert and I as novice. As Ballamingie and Johnson (2011) discuss, he was exercising his power to transgress 'the implicit cues about how research relationships should proceed' (p713). Perhaps his was also a gendered response? In contrast, others were almost apologetic, 'I'm not a standard PL not sure how useful I can be'.

I used the same materials and structure for each of the focus groups, yet my experiences of them were very different, which reinforces the dialogic nature of this type of research and the importance of the interactions between the researcher-researched and researched-researched.

The identity work of the participants, (Allen, 2005), was apparent during both the focus groups and interviews, as they discursively positioned themselves, each other and I. For example, early on in the first focus group, Louise attempted to differentiate herself from Nina, before they came to a mutual understanding of Principal Lectureship:

> Louise: Our roles sound quite different. Because I am a Principal Lecturer so I've got PL roles around managing a programme and also managing staff.....

> Nina: That's the thing in this university that the term Principle Lecturer means many different things. It probably does in other universities as well I don't know. In that my Principle lectureship if you like isn't about leading teaching or programmes or courses and up until quite recently I

135

didn't even manage anybody. I do now but I didn't for quite a long time. It was more about being outward facing and working with external bodies; I'm a [x] by background so working with NHS trusts and managers and leaders and consultants and what have you is a lot of what I do so I think that was the PL bit if you like......

Nina: And so when people say I'm a Principle Lecturer it means

Louise: It means different things

The Principal Lecturers made numerous comments which indicated how they viewed being part of the research process and constructed themselves, and me, in relation to it.

It's like therapy I always feel great after these sessions (Daphne)

The therapeutic effect of participating in the research was frequently mentioned by a number of the Principal Lecturers. This is not uncommon in qualitative research, DeMarrais and Tisdale (2002) for instance, discuss this in relation to their own work (see also Dickson-Swift et al, 2006). Yet it was not my intention to create a therapeutic relationship, nor did I offer the participants interpretations designed to ameliorate their distress. But their repeated articulation of 'these sessions' within such a framework perhaps denotes an association that they were making between the reconnection to the emotionality of their lives, including recognition of their bodies, that their participation resulted in. The talk of bodies was central to discussions of downshifting (Chapter 5) which was perhaps facilitated by this reconnection to their emotions. Within a therapeutic relationship these connections are encouraged and this framing of the researcher-researched relationship might therefore have made this more acceptable to them.

A sense of comfort from unburdening themselves, with someone who 'will just listen' (Sally) was a common sentiment expressed. Yet it was also clear, that they recognised I wasn't 'just listening'. After my interview with Sally I noted that 'she talked about wanting to be positive, trying to be positive about work' and I wondered about how this effected what she said and the performance of the interview, her identity work in action. Similarly, during Alan's interview I was aware of a change in the way he talked, (compared to the focus group), he was preparing for a job interview and I could feel a difference in the way he responded to questions, there was a formality to his approach, like that of an

applicant, he also acknowledged that this 'is probably why I am giving you this, giving you this stuff now'. In answer to Cassell's (2005) question: 'Can we make sense of those (identity work) processes while we are located within them?' (p177). These examples suggest that we can and that there can be awareness for both parties, the researched and the researcher.

The investigation of self

The first reflexive task at work in this study has been the investigation of myself. One aspect of which has involved the (irregular) keeping of a research diary, a practice that I have been encouraged to do, by friends, colleagues and my supervisors throughout the course of this doctorate. Yet undertaking this practice is not a straightforward process and it raises a number of questions: What do I write? Why do I write? Who is this for? Armstrong and Moore (2007) suggest that you:

> use a research notebook, or 'diary' from the outset, in which you write down ideas, quotations, questions and observations (p7)

The majority of my diaries are taken up with quotations, interspersed with ideas, questions, supervision meeting notes, thoughts on these meetings, records of particular conversations, observations of focus groups and interviews, lists of tasks, and notes from attended conference presentations. But I have also made endless notes on bits of paper, all of which still clutter my office.

Alaszewski (2006) like Day and Thatcher (2009) understands diaries as reflections of experiences, providing access to 'deeper' meanings. Charting the use of diaries as personal record keeping since the sixteenth century, he notes the religious imperative in the seventeenth century to use diaries as a form of self-examination. For Protestants, the diary replaced the catholic tradition of confession (Alaszewski, 2006). As society became increasingly secular, the purpose of this form of self-surveillance became a search for understanding of oneself, the diary in effect became a technology of self (Foucault, 2007b) allowing a person to manage and change themselves (Chapter 2). Similarly, Güven, Sülün and Çam (2014) describe the use of diaries by students as reflective tools, for personal development and learning.

Alaszewski (2006) writes of the pressure for diarists to provide truthful accounts, for religious reasons and latterly for diagnostic purposes. For him, they offer

access to authentic accounts of experiences, which benefit from the immediacy of writing 'soon after important events' (Day and Thatcher, 2009) thereby improving their accuracy (Alaszewski, 2006; Day and Thatcher, 2009; and Johnson and Bytheway, 2001).

Foucault, as I have already outlined above, wouldn't be looking for 'deeper understandings', levels of meaning, or causes, prevalent in the approaches to diaries described by Alaszewski (2006) and Day and Thatcher (2009). Indeed he writes that texts 'should be taken not as the reflection of a situation, but as the formulation of an exigency, and it is precisely on this account that they form part of reality' (Foucault, 1984b, p80). Thus, diaries are not 'some aspect of social reality that is external to the text', (Alaszewski, 2006, p44), they form reality, creating the writer. A Foucauldian approach challenges me to use my diaries to examine my taken-for-granted assumptions and the limitations these pose for my subjectivity as well as the multiple possibilities that arise. To ask; how have I come to understand myself?

Have I always managed this? No. Is this how I have consistently viewed my diary and the process of writing within it? No. However, there are times when my diary entries show me questioning myself, my understanding of higher education and my place within it. In including the extracts that follow, I am trying to avoid being overly self-indulgent (Cassell et al, 2009), and attempting to explore how I am implicated in the production of knowledge (Coffey, 1999; and Bryman and Cassell, 2006) through consideration of power relations.

> 'for me it's (the data collection) like a career development workshop', 'thought I had a good understanding of the uni, actually only piecemeal, just done my job, concerned with those things and asked less questions about other areas, roles I would be expected to take in the future, module leadership, course leadership etc' (Cockman, 22/04/14)

This extract provides an insight into the relationships I had with the participants, and was written as I reflected on the interviewing process, as well as in response to a comment made by one of the participants after their interview. In this extract I am positioning the Principal Lecturers as experts and myself as novice. As Bryman and Cassell (2006) describe I have constructed the Principal Lecturers as research object.

As the data collection process continued, the diary extracts illustrate a changing relationship with the setting, and the participants.

> Depressing in many ways the lives they (the Principal Lecturers) lead at work, the overwhelming nature of their jobs, the thanklessness of it. Sounds pretty awful is it something I really want to pursue? Is it just this institution? Doesn't really seem to be given the connections I can see with the literature (Cockman, 17/06/14)

> Becoming more and more political as I become more and more aware of changes and challenges facing Higher Education and society more generally - (it's about) finding outlets for that, developing arguments and understanding opposing perspectives (Cockman, 13/07/14)

In these extracts, I am exploring a changing understanding of the participants, the institution, Higher Education and myself. I am also writing myself into being someone else, a 'more political' me. The importance of feelings and the physicality of research are apparent in my diary entries. I have moved through an emotional spectrum in the course of this work and as Coffey (1999) suggests have found the whole research process, as opposed to distinct parts, emotional.

Coffey (1999) writes that if we deny the presence of emotions in research we deny their 'impact on the knowledge we produce' (p95). Yet to embrace emotions in research is incredibly challenging, even writers who call for an awareness of the epistemological potential of emotions are at the same time caught within a perspective which is focused on managing emotions, by acknowledging and dealing with them through the implementation of procedures and processes for the protection of the researcher and the researched (as with Hubbard, Backett-Milburn and Kemmer, 2001; and DeMarrais and Tisdale, 2002). Such emotion management is representative of a desire for distance in the research process, for creating objects of study, 'emotions', which denies the complexity, messiness and contradictory nature of engaging with the social world (Game, 1997).

If we consider emotion as a way of knowing the world, (Holland, 2007), then we disrupt both the subject-object and mind-body dualisms, to know 'means to participate', (Game, 1997, p393), to connect with others; feelings remind 'us of our intercorporeality' (Game, 1997, p394). A key aspect of the reflexive project of investigating myself, has involved acknowledgement and acceptance of the emotionality of research. For me, this feminist recasting of research practice

139

enhances Foucault's notion of ethical self-formation. It provides a way to acknowledge the importance of the body, to our processes of knowing. Attending to bodies, exploring how they are disciplined, transformed, and governed, was a central facet of Foucault's work (1977, 1980, 1984a and 1984b). He writes 'it is always the body that is at issue – the body and its forces, their utility and their docility, their distribution and their submission' (1977, p25). The persistent denial of the body and its separation from the mind has been a means to achieve power over, (Foucault, 1980c), to dehumanize our analysis (Bell and Sinclair, 2014).

The knowledge-power nexus within which I research suggests that work which attempts to attend to bodies has the potential to be seen as risky and not quite acceptable to mainstream literature (Nadin and Cassell, 2006). Bell and Sinclair, (2014), suggest that it can be 'translated into another means of reducing women to their sexual value' (p269). The gendering of emotions is apparent in this warning, Cassell (1996) describes the perception of emotions as irrational and organisationally unacceptable. The gendered discourses of work and organisational life (Chapter 2) seek to maintain the mind-body dualism, dehumanizing organisations. It is against this backdrop that I have wrestled with the emotionality of this research. I have found some experiences too much to write about, even in my diary, for fear of the potential personal and professional risks involved should it be read by another.

I have found my emotions productive, energising and sustaining as well as destructive, debilitating and exhausting. In the extracts above, I write about my own feelings with regards to my participants' jobs, as 'depressing'. But this doesn't capture the joys of work that they also express. Perhaps I am also articulating an authoritative view of knowledge, I know their jobs 'better' than they do? To allow you to explore the data for yourself before hearing more about my own responses I continue these discussions in the final chapter.

Insider research

As a temporary staff member within the institution in which I was researching, I considered myself at the beginning of this research to be an insider. I had worked within the institution prior to beginning my doctorate and had an understanding of its systems, processes and people. Having taught at both

undergraduate and postgraduate level prior to beginning my doctorate and continuing to do so during my studies, I also felt that this made me an insider, a colleague of those that I would be studying. This, however, as I discuss below was a naïve understanding of my position.

Debates on insider research often propose that its strengths lie in the weaknesses of outsider research and vice versa (Bilecen, 2014). However, post-structural research such as mine, recognises that insider-outsider positions are complex and unstable and thus should be thought of 'in terms of a continuum rather than a dichotomy' (Bilecen, 2014, p53). Cunliffe and Karunanayake (2013) propose that we consider insiderness-outsiderness as a 'hyphen-space' 'a way of emphasizing not the boundaries, *but the spaces of possibility*, between researchers and respondents' (p365). Given the nature of my own research interests, my focus is on the power relations which shape these positions and spaces. This recognises that my own understanding of my positioning must be considered alongside the understandings suggested by my participants. Which is to allow for both tensions and contradictions as well as complementarity and coherence.

I described earlier in this chapter, the various ways that participants exercised their power during the data collection process, for example, through suggesting; readings, methodologies (Pete), or, as Bilecen (2014) describes, that particular questions 'didn't need asking' (Louise). Such talk I often interpreted as the Principal Lecturers reaffirming themselves as expert and I as novice, or themselves as knowledgeable insider and I as junior-not-quite-insider, perhaps as 'external insider' as Cunliffe and Karunanayake (2013) describe. These occasions served as reminders for me to question how I am implicated in the production of knowledge (Coffey, 1999; and Bryman and Cassell, 2006). Perhaps this positioning facilitated the sharing of the painful aspects of their lives, which frequently occurred. For those that had them, or were doing them, references to their own doctorates were frequent and comparisons made between me and them or themselves and me. For those that didn't there was a sense that by doing my PhD I was doing something 'luxurious' (Nina), and I was understood to be an outsider. Yet, in other relationships I was an acknowledged 'indigenous insider', my positioning understood to be that of someone who 'would know of course' (Grayson). Or as someone on their way to being an

'indigenous insider', who could use the data to think about my future career development (Louise), akin to Bilecen's (2014) discussions of attempts at mentoring by her participants. However, above all else, I was a confidante, a counsellor, a therapist. Yet, as I described earlier this type of relationship is something I never sought to create. Such a positioning suggests that of an outsider, of someone who knows about the context, but who remains separate from it. Perhaps this is a consequence of using the particular methods of data collection that I did, in which I was set apart, probing, questioning and so on, in a position of power which enabled me to ask, and in which they understood themselves as powerful for they knew, but did not necessarily tell.

Like Geetha, (Cunliffe and Karunanayake, 2013), my insider-outsiderness was always subject to change and was dependent upon the differing relationships I had with the Principal Lecturers, as well as their relationships with each other, as their positioning of myself changed with the setting; focus groups, interviews, interpretation focus groups, emails, unintended encounters in meetings or in corridors. I recorded these experiences in my research diary and have there and earlier in this chapter explored them as examples of the identity work of the participants (Allen, 2005; and Cassell, 2005), who in participating in this research were forced to account for themselves and for me (Butler, 2001).

Inherent in research which takes place within one's own professional setting is the issue of on-going relationships (as discussed by Tietze, 2012; and Drake and Heath, 2008). Whilst I had few encounters with most of the participants outside of the research process, there were some who I did see. In these situations, in order to protect their confidentiality I was careful never to discuss my research or the nature of our relationship, unless this was something that they instigated. As Tietze (2012) found, I was also aware of the temporal nature of these relationships and their capacity to evolve as I progressed along the doctoral process.

Whilst, as I have described my positioning changed, my over-riding sense, was that the Principal Lecturers understood me to be an outsider. Despite this, being employed by the same institution gave me easy access to documentation, email addresses, intranet sites, meetings and so on, reaffirming my insider status, if only to myself! Thus I experienced contradictions and tensions in terms of my

positioning as insider-outsider, and was variously located along this continuum (Bilecen, 2014) during the research process. As Cunliffe and Karunanayake (2013) propose, positioning yourself as a researcher is 'not a one-off activity' (p374) but a continuous process, 'requiring a sensitivity and responsiveness' (p374) to participants. I developed my sensitivity through the use of my research diary, noting down particular experiences as they occurred (if within the research setting of an interview or focus group) or at a later point, and then exploring these experiences; what does this suggest about how the Principal Lecturers understand me? My role? Themselves? How might this have effected what was being said/not said? How do I/did I feel? How did I respond? What are we taking for granted? This requires alertness in the moment, but also a commitment to not only a reflective exploration of research practice, but to a reflexive investigation of, and care for, myself (Ball, 2013; and Ball and Olmedo, 2013). For in the doing of this I am, (as I have already described in this chapter), forming reality, creating myself (Foucault, 1984b).

Emancipatory effects?

Despite my (sometimes) implicit assumption of Principal Lecturer as research object, (discussed above), I have attempted, clearly not always successfully, to disrupt this subject as object dualism. Recognising the interconnection between the subjects, myself, and the knowledge we have produced. This has involved a commitment on my part to share summaries of the data at each stage of the research process and the opportunity to explore my initial analysis in 'interpretation' focus groups. It has also involved the participants in decision making, asking them for example, if they want pseudonyms, and if so who they'd like to be.

As I explained at the beginning of this chapter, I have been driven by an emancipatory effect agenda. I have wanted to enable my participants to explore the limitations and possibilities for their identities, to develop an understanding of how power relations both constrain and constitute them and their relationships with others, to explore the discourses that they draw on to claim as well as contest particular identities. In wanting this I can now see that I positioned myself in the traditional role of researcher as knowledge producer, someone who can enlighten the researched. In many ways I have operated within this framework, I captured their data, analysed it and then offered it to

them for consideration. My attempts at subverting the traditional researcher role, in particular, through the exploration of data together, could be seen as little more than a validatory exercise, a way to strengthen my claims (Whyte, 1984). Although this stage of the process did provide additional data which both supported and extended my analysis in sometimes surprising ways, that was not its purpose.

How far did I succeed in achieving an emancipatory effect? I'm not sure. There were moments of realisation, as some of the participants recognised the ways in which they were constructing themselves and others and the possibility for alternative ways of being, for example, Pete and Alan, acknowledged that there are other possible ways of framing the manager-managed relationship, which they had not previously considered (Chapter 4). But really I am reminded of Coffey's (1999) humbling words; 'the impact of fieldwork is usually greatest for us and not for our hosts' (p37). For my group of Principal Lecturers taking part in the research was a 'comfort', 'to hear it's not just one department, one faculty' (Iris). Perhaps the research provided them with opportunities to build networks of support, to recognise the collective aspects of their struggles, and resist the university's individualising agenda? But perhaps in providing an opportunity for the participants 'to have a rant to somebody who will just listen' (Sally), it merely served to support existing power relations, precisely because it provided an outlet for their frustration and anger which did not involve challenging the status quo. Disappointingly for me, I suspect that this second proposition is more likely. Perhaps if I had constructed these sessions differently, if I had incorporated 'reflexive dialogical practices' (Cunliffe, 2002, p39) by engaging in the discussions rather than presenting my ideas and then sitting back, there might have been more opportunities for the Principal Lecturers to engage in self-reflexivity? To question the way they relate with others? (Cunliffe, 2002). Possibly if I had covered less? Or run a series of sessions? But this changes the nature of the researcher-researched relationship, unsettling these relations in ways that might have been too uncomfortable, both for me, and for (at least some of) the participants, who positioned themselves as expert and I as novice.

I have struggled to write and think tentatively, to allow for plurality of interpretations and perspectives in the doing of, and accounting for, my PhD. An on-going learning process which has involved sustained engagement over three

years. This suggests that I was expecting too much of such relatively limited (in time given) interactions.

And yet, this is not the end. Writing is a way to care for yourself and for others (Ball and Olmedo, 2013). This thesis may help to alert others to the possibilities of becoming, it might I hope, extend the possible emancipatory effects. I explore writing as method in the next section.

Writing as method

When we write, we do so in relation to a reader. This reader may never be explicitly identified, but we write within this structure nevertheless (Butler, 2001). Didion (1976) describes writing as 'a hostile act', 'of imposing oneself upon other people, of saying listen to me, see it my way, change your mind' (p1). In writing for herself, she acknowledges that she is then; 'very possibly' 'committing an aggressive and hostile act toward myself' (Didion, 1978). As I discussed in the investigation of myself, diary writing can be understood to be a technology of the self (Foucault, 2007b) allowing a person to manage and change themselves. Similarly, Nicoll (2008) describes writing as an intensification of the subject's discipline, when we exercise 'the power of observation' over ourselves (p172).

I am aware that this suggests only a negative outcome of power relations, yet as I described earlier, writing as a technology of the self, can open up opportunities for exploring other ways of being and doing differently, in positive emancipatory effect ways. It is a way to care for yourself, taking an active role in your own self-definition (Ball and Olmedo, 2013). Writing is a way of knowing, 'the way I write is who I am, or have become' (Didion, 2005, p3). Writing is essential to 'the knowing project of the researcher' (Alvesson, 2002, p137).

The research text is a 'source of power' (Alvesson, 2002, p140). I decide what to include/exclude, I attempt to persuade you the reader to my point of view. Yet, if as I have stated previously, I am committed to recognising the interconnection between the subjects, myself and the knowledge we have produced. I also have to be committed to recognising the interconnection between this text and you the reader; to an understanding of you as an active subject, and to your reading of this text as 'a partner in dialogue' (Alvesson, 2002, p141).

145

To enable you to be a partner requires a particular approach to writing, one which attempts to engage and challenge you (Alvesson, 2002) to question yourself and others. This is my effort to care for you, to extend the ethics of the care for myself. Writing can be more than a hostile act. When we consider writing as something other than a transmission of information, or research findings, we create an opportunity to explore possibilities between us. I am not compelled to resolve everything in my writing, or 'master reality' (Usher, 2000). I can offer you some 'good shots' (Alvesson, 2002) and you can explore these in relation to yourself and your relationships with others.

I, as author, am deliberately present throughout this thesis. The academic power-knowledge nexus, frequently eradicates the author, so that, 'at least in appearance' they remain outside the text (Foucault, 1984c, p101). However, if as I have argued, I am implicated in the production of knowledge (Foucault, 1980b; Coffey, 1999; and Bryman and Cassell, 2006) then it would be a contradiction for me to remain absent.

Analysis

As I wrote previously, (Chapter 2), Foucault (1982) was interested in analysing power relations, in order to understand how these produced and limited the possibilities of subjectivities and identities. Writing after the publication of The Will to Knowledge, Foucault (1982) offered a framework for the analysis of power relations consisting of five points: The system of differentiations; the types of objectives being pursued; the way in which power is enacted; forms of institutionalisation; and the degrees of rationalisation. I came across this framework early on in my PhD as I explored the work of Foucault and have struggled with understanding and applying it since. My interpretation is as follows: If, as I explained earlier, discourses are understood to be formed as a result of power relations, which operate to achieve particular, but changing outcomes, (Foucault, 1976), then this framework offers one way of analysing discourse, through the analysis of the power relations which operate within it, thereby enabling the identification of its 'structures and rules' (Ball, 2013, p19). By utilising this framework then, I might come to understand something of the subjects which are formed and the field of limitations that are placed upon individuals in the formation of their identities. In the discussion that follows I explore how I worked with the data and utilised the framework in practice.

146

I considered the participants' talk as examples of discourses (whatever the range of discourse, close-long). These discourses are understood 'to have effects', which is to understand them to be something more than "pure talk' (without the determining power of discourse)' (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000, p1138). Whilst Foucauldian inspired research is most often interested in Grand Discourses or long range analysis (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000), a Foucauldian understanding of discourse and power recognises that these discourses are always incomplete (Foucault, 1986) and that they are used in different strategies (Foucault, 1976) and so might constrain or enable a range of outcomes, hence the need for tentative claims, with regards to their 'muscularity' (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000).

In working with the empirical material I used an abductive approach moving between theory/concepts and the participant accounts 'each informing the other' (Cunliffe, 2011, p664). Consequently, I listened to the audio of the focus groups and interviews repeatedly, transcribing them as previously described and read and re-read the transcripts, moving between Foucault's framework and considering my material in relation to this. Thus, exploring the insights it might offer, trying to build up to a picture of the organisational discourses (Grand Discourses) operating and how they function, attempting to examine the tensions in their accounts as well as their consistency and to be alert to their 'complexity and variation' (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000, p1143).

Thus, at the close range I examined the 'claims and logic' of the accounts (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000, p1143). For example, I explored how the notion of teams was utilised by my participants (Chapter 4) in at least two different ways and how this then influenced the practice of 'taking one for the team' (Daphne). At a meso-level I explored their understandings of the system of differentiation between Lecturers/Senior Lecturers and themselves. But I also highlight the inconsistency and contradictions of their desires to lead and be led in different ways and how this creates desires to not seek promotion (Chapters 4 and 5).

At the long range I interpret their accounts as part of organisational discourses (Grand Discourses) or normalisations, such as the discourses of research, professionalism, or collegiality, or the norm of the ideal academic (Chapters 4, 5

and 6). Foucault's (1982) framework provided the means by which I could explore the rules and functions of the variety of discourses being utilised, the specifics, their complexities and tensions, and the relations between these discourses. This was an attempt to build from the empirical material an understanding of organisational discourses (Grand Discourses), rather than test out pre-formed ideas, although 'hunches' did inform my analysis. The next section explores the framework specifically, my initial ideas with regards to this and the ideas that arose from the data.

Foucault described each of the steps of this framework, point one, the system of differentiations, he defined as that 'which permits one to act upon the actions of others' (1982, p223). These differentiations might be determined by:

> the law or by traditions of status and privilege; economic differences in the appropriation of riches and goods, shifts in the processes of production, linguistic or cultural differences, differences in know-how and competence, and so forth. Every relationship of power puts into operation differentiations which are at the same time its conditions and its results (Foucault, 1982, p223)

As I considered this in the context of higher education, I immediately listed what I thought were examples:

> admin/academic, research active/not, supervisor/student, Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Principal Lecturer (Cockman, 14/02/14)

Considering this now, I offer additional differentiations, (though these are by no means exhaustive): pre-1992 university and post-1992 university; the superior status attached to the operation of the business world compared with academia, (as discussed in Chapter 4); teaching competencies (again discussed in Chapter 4); and the status differential between teaching and research (Chapters 4 and 6).

The second point of this framework Foucault describes as follows:

> The types of objectives pursued by those who act upon the actions of others: the maintenance of privileges, the accumulation of profits, the bringing into operation of statutory authority, the exercise of a function or of a trade (1982, p223)

Within this study I have found a range of objectives are being pursued including: the maintenance of hierarchies (Chapters 4 and 5); performance monitoring

(Chapter 4); and achievement of greater hierarchical distinctions (Chapter 4 and 7).

Point three of the framework is described as follows:

> The means of bringing power relations into being: according to whether power is exercised by the threat of arms, by the effects of the word, by means of economic disparities, by more or less complex means of control, by systems of surveillance, with or without archives, according to rules which are or are not explicit, fixed or modifiable, with or without the technological means to put all these things into action (Foucault, 1982, p223)

Numerous 'means of bringing power relations into being' were identified in this study including: the notion of teams (Chapter 4); the utilisation of space (Chapter 4); consultations (Chapter 4); surveillance (Chapters 4 and 7); reporting, appraisals, line management and selection (Chapter 4); self-governance, choice, seduction, and the intensification of work (Chapter 5); the ideal academic life (Chapter 6); and university strategies and faculty operating plans (Chapters 6 and 7).

Point four of the framework is concerned with 'forms of institutionalisation':

> these may mix traditional predispositions, legal structures, phenomena relating to custom or to fashion (such as one sees in the institution of the family); they can also take the form of an apparatus closed in upon itself, with its specific loci, its own regulations, its hierarchical structures which are carefully defined, a relative autonomy in its functioning (such as scholastic or military institutions); they can also form very complex systems endowed with multiple apparatuses, as in the case of the state (Foucault, 1982, p223)

The drive to use data (Chapter 4); the hierarchical structures (Chapters 4 and 7); long hours (Chapters 5, 6 and 7); the ideal academic life (Chapter 6); and the psychologising of employee grievances (Chapter 5) are all examples of institutionalisations identified in the course of this study.

The final point of the framework refers to 'the degrees of rationalization':

> the bringing into play of power relations as action in a field of possibilities may be more or less elaborate in relation to the effectiveness of the instruments and the certainty of the results (greater or lesser technological refinements employed in the exercise of power) or again in proportion to the possible cost (be it the economic cost of the means brought into operation, or the cost in terms of reaction constituted by the resistance which is encountered). The exercise of power is not a naked

fact, an institutional right, nor is it a structure which holds out or is smashed: it is elaborated, transformed, organized; it endows itself with processes which are more or less adjusted to the situation (Foucault, 1982, p223-224)

Processes of consultation (Chapter 4); the institutionalisation of long hours (Chapter 5); and the norm of progression (Chapter 7); were all identified as having a high level of rationalisation within this institution.

In addition to this framework I also drew in particular on Foucauldian notions of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1978) and technologies of the self (Foucault, 2007a). These enter my analysis in particular in Chapters 6 and 7 as I explore in detail the specifics of the organisational discourses and norms identified and developed in earlier chapters (which is possible through the use of the framework) and their disciplining and governing effects.

In the data chapters that follow I will not be using small d's or big D's to distinguish between the differing levels of discourse being discussed. Even though, as I have outlined here, I have questioned the material at close, meso and organisational levels (which if following Alvesson and Kärreman (2000) would be thought of as small d, small d and big D discourses), because my interest in looking close range is to understand what this might tell us about the long range discourses of which they are a part. Thus I will adopt the Foucauldian approach and that of many Foucauldian inspired researchers (see for example, Ball, 2013; Ball and Olmedo, 2013; Graham, 2011; or Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2011) before me and refer only to discourses.

In the coming chapters I talk about the 'subjective experience of individuals, their contextualized perceptions and actions (relationality, histriocity)'. (Cunliffe, 2011, p664). Generally I as author in these chapters, remain outside the analysis, as the unacknowledged interpreter of the participants' experiences, conforming to a role as researcher as the 'master of truth' (Foucault, 1976, p67). Sometimes I make an appearance (referencing my own experiences, my reflections on the research process (Chapter 5) and so on) but the 'implicitly knowledgeable' me is generally confined to the concluding comments, where I reassert my voice, and draw the reader in through the use of I and we. These choices were made as I struggled to reconcile, the objectivist-subjectivist problematic (Cunliffe, 2011) and I chose to work with this by recognising my

embeddedness as researcher (mainly) within the confines of this 'Research Approach' Chapter. This approach also, I think, aids the sense-making of the reader, creating a more 'readable' text.

Conclusions

The doing of this research, and attempting to maintain a sustained relationship with Foucault's ideas has been profoundly challenging. It is hard not to sound flippant, and it is common for people to say that the doctoral experience changed them, but it has certainly changed me. I have been aware of the frequent times when I have struggled to challenge my own taken-for-granted assumptions and others when my feelings have been debilitating. But Foucault's work as well as that of others who have been significantly influenced by him, has helped me to be attentive to the ways in which I can be and do differently. It has helped me to keep reminding myself, that my practices and actions do matter, and it has encouraged me to try things out, to seek out others, critical friends and colleagues, with whom I can struggle.

There have certainly been tensions between what I have wanted to do and write and what is acceptable within the limits of the doctoral system. I have attempted to push boundaries where I can, to take seriously and extend Foucault's (1984b) notion of caring for the self, to caring for my participants. Further analysis of these power relations within which I as a doctoral student am made subject and how these have influenced the knowledge that I have produced, would certainly be fruitful ground for greater thought and the development of understanding.

My engagement with the literature led me to consider the possible emancipatory effects of this research. Initially, my consideration was only for the participants. I hoped to help them to understand how they were being made subjects, through the operation of power relations, and to illuminate both the ways in which they were being constrained as well as the opportunities and possibilities to be other (Biesta, 2008; and Foucault, 1982).

This I set out to achieve in particular, through the use of interpretation focus groups in which I shared my initial analysis. However, I have come to realise that this thesis and the possibilities of other future publications, can be used to alert a wider audience to the site of struggle of power, their bodies and identities (Ball, 2014).

Chapter 4: Leadership identities

Introduction

In analysing my transcripts, Foucault would not be interested in categorizing individual identities as much of the academic identity literature does (see Barry, Berg and Chandler, 2006; Garcia and Hardy, 2007; or Ylijoki and Ursin, 2013). But rather in the regimes of discourse or power/knowledge which enable such identities to be assigned and legitimised as true. However, it is my view that categories provide a useful way to illuminate the regimes of discourse which are used in the creation of these identities.

Thus the analysis that follows acknowledges both the individual leadership identities which arise from the data and how these identities are discursively constructed by the participants. Foucault (1982) offers a framework for the analysis of power/knowledge consisting of five points: The system of differentiations; the types of objectives being pursued; the way in which power is enacted; forms of institutionalisation; and the degrees of rationalisation. This framework has guided the analysis which follows.

Leader identities

The quotation that I used both to recruit participants and prompt initial discussions in the focus groups introduced the notion of leadership alongside some of the more familiar discourses from the higher education literature; competition, performance, austerity and work intensification:

> 'Global competitive pressure and performative audit and austerity cultures have intensified academic working hours generally and leadership is experienced as an all-consuming activity' (Morley, 2013b, p9).

I recognise that this immediately positions leadership as problematic, but it also avoids acknowledging either model of academic leadership, or privileging solo or collective configurations. Enabling the participants to express their own ideas regarding the presence or otherwise of leadership. Given that these other discourses are frequently linked with leadership in the literature, this quotation enabled me to explore the relevance of these to the Principal Lecturers. To consider, which were drawn on by them? Which were contested? Which others were added? How do they contradict or complement one another? And so on.

A range of descriptions of leadership arose, which offer complementary and competing subject positions. These accounts included examples of co-leadership, leadership teams and individual leadership which occurred through both formal positional roles and processes and informal relationships. The presence of such diversity in leadership practice is indicative of Gronn's (2009) contention that we should consider leadership 'as hybrid' (p392) (Chapter 2). The chapter first turns to an exploration of the collective forms of leadership described to be occurring at Acorn University.

Co-leadership

In the following extracts, Daphne discusses an informal and intuitive co-leadership relationship that has developed with a colleague who works in a similar role. Through this relationship they have come to a shared understanding of their roles (intuitively), and they benefit from the support that they are able to provide each other, particularly in terms of cover/substitution, an arrangement Gronn and Hamilton (2004) call role overlap. This particular relationship benefits from shared working space, which enables regular communication. The end of this relationship is viewed with trepidation.

> I've got a colleague and he works with the undergrad team and I work with the post grad team and it was a fear almost of the job because the the role in [faculty] is (Job title) so emphasis on the delivery so it's not about development and we were keen that it wasn't going to be the policing role and we've sort of managed over, for a while to avoid that (Daphne)

> there's certain meetings that I have to go to and then other meetings I negotiate with my other colleague who does the same role for undergrad and we say well it only needs one representative from the department it doesn't need both of us (Daphne)

> My colleague who I work with is retiring soon and we get on really well, we cover for each other and I think once (x)'s gone I think that'll have a big impact actually cause you know you've got to get used to working with someone else (Daphne)

Grayson talked about an intuitive co-leadership relationship that had developed with a colleague in which the importance of sharing a work space is apparent. This physical closeness enabled them to substitute for each other.

> So the subject leader is the worst of all worlds, and I've seen (name) today and (x) you know (x's) really just had enough you know but because in the end everything falls at your door, but that's why (name)

and I when (x) sat in my office we had a tacit agreement that we would cover each other, so we have a working relationship that means I pick up the things and I manage things for (x), and I manage so that I don't expect (x) to do it by (x)self, why would I? But that, that comes from a commercial understanding of work (Grayson)

Grayson explains his engagement in this type of relationship as a result of an understanding of the business/commercial world and positions it as a consequence of that experience. In doing so suggesting that these relationships are more apparent in commercial organisations compared to higher education. There is a system of differentiation (Foucault, 1982) at work. A superior status appears to be attached to the operation of the business world in comparison to higher education. In relation to the individual's identity it enables him to claim knowledge of work which might be considered superior to those with less/ different work experience.

Leadership teams

Iris specifically talked about a leadership team, which was a formal, organisational structure within her faculty. How it was decided who was in and who was out of this team was shrouded in mystery. But being part of this team gave you formal authority and control over budgetary concerns with regards to staff, so conference and training expenditure for example. Not being in the team, meant that you no longer had this authority, even though this was something that had previously been granted.

> Well I think generally speaking and it could about the structure within the department I think now that we've got this weird structure where we've got some PLs who are in the leadership team and some PLs who aren't in the leadership team. That's quite disjointed and has led to I think general discontentment amongst not only the PLs but anyone more junior as well because again you know a couple of years ago if someone had wanted to go on a conference they'd have come to me and I'd have said yes or no and that was it but now they know there's no point coming to me they've got to go to someone who sits on the leadership team and that's very disempowering for everyone concerned (Iris)

The notion of teams was prevalent in the Principal Lecturers' talk. In terms of their own roles, it was used in two distinct ways. The most frequent was to discuss their leadership of teams and a sense of ownership over teams, 'leading teams to do something' (Sally); 'I have (job title) and others in the team who sort of whose role it is to work in (job), so I'm sort of overall responsible' (Pete).

156

However, there was another use of the notion team, to explain a sense of belonging, togetherness, a shared responsibility and identification. That seems to operate in such a way as to encourage acceptance of work/conditions 'that might otherwise have been experienced as frustrating and negative' (Alvesson and Willmott, 2002, p629). Thus 'taking one for the team' (Daphne) was used to describe why one would take on a complex and large teaching role in addition to an already demanding job.

This notion of team also enables certain behaviours to be positioned as unacceptable. In particular, behaviour considered overtly individualistic and self-interested:

> But you know where there's a job to be done and you know that almost no woman that you know, would actually if somebody asked them to do it wouldn't say "I'm sorry I'm too busy" they would actually squeeze it in and yet there're males kind of working at PL level will say "sorry I've got to get on with my research sorry no, no, no I can't help you do that" and they're the only person that could possibly actually provide the answers that are required, and there's a kind of certain brazenness about it that people have got away with it for years. You know I don't know what goes on in their head that they feel that they can behave like that. That there isn't the team working approach which is very prevalent and helps people cope with their roles is not universal (Louise)

If we consider the notion of team to be a mechanism for bringing power relations into being, through the acceptance of negative working conditions, then the men in this example, are perhaps refusing this form of understanding. This then raises questions; why is it that they are able to refuse almost en masse, as Louise suggests in comparison to women? Has this particular notion of team and its utilisation in this capacity had a greater effect on the subjectivities of women? The reflections of Small et al (2011) would suggest that this is the case, as they considered, as female academics the need to learn how to say no, and resist 'being good and helpful' (p30).

Individual leadership

The leadership literature suggests that there is no getting away from the importance of individual leadership in higher education (Chapter 2), and my data can be used to support this contention. A number of leader identities were expressed in the focus groups and interviews:

- Leader without authority;

- Third space leader;

- Managerial leader;

- Entrepreneurial leader;

- Privileged leader; and

- Spin leader.

The remainder of the chapter explores each of these subject positions in turn, examining the power relations which operate through discourse to construct, sustain, and disrupt them. This enables us to develop some understanding of the field of possibilities and limitations that are placed upon these particular Principal Lecturers in the formation of their identities. As I described in Chapter 3, in my attempts to disturb the subject as object dualism I was committed to sharing my initial analysis with the participants. This I did through interpretation focus groups. At these focus groups I shared these identity categories. Whilst this did provide additional data, to both support and extend my analysis, (and I shall highlight specific examples of where this is the case), I was driven by an emancipatory effect agenda and as such, I shall also draw attention to instances in which participants entered into explorations of their limitations and possibilities.

Leader without authority

This subject position was the most frequently expressed by the participants. When I took a description of this into the interpretations focus groups, it was of a subject position characterised by talk of leadership as influence which was particularly linked to issues of line management, appraisals, budgets, performance and accountability. In this description authority is considered in terms of influence downwards in their relationships with Senior Lecturers and

Lecturers and a desire for greater control mechanisms, reminiscent of the discussions of top-down managerial leadership in Chapter 2. However, this does not fully capture this identity. There is also a desire for greater authority in terms of influence upwards, in their relationships with senior managers.

The institutionalisation (Foucault, 1982) of the hierarchical structures/perceived lack of them embedded in the university is clearly articulated in the various exchanges discussing their experiences of lack of authority and power. How this plays out in their discussions demonstrates the complexity and contradictory nature of power relations. The distinction in their talk was between relationships with senior managers and relationships with Senior Lecturers/Lecturers and I have used this to frame the following analysis.

Relationships with senior management

A sense of dissatisfaction with 'senior management' was apparent during this research project. Senior management was variously articulated as heads of department, pro vice-chancellors, the executive, but seems to refer to those above Principal Lecturers in the hierarchy. This dissatisfaction referred in particular to their distance and disconnectedness and the challenges of implementation that resulted. The following exchange from the first interpretations focus group explores this:

> Iris: I think that happens quite a lot though
>
> Alan: Yeah
>
> Iris: when you see a clear disconnect as is so often the case it seems between what the expected outcomes are and what you need to do and then the barriers that are actually put in place for you to do what's asked of you I think that disconnect that we can see at this level that it's clearly not going to work and there's clearly going to be issues and I could say that about a number of, a number of topics that I am constantly working with or against or whatever that that feeling that senior management who dictate what's gonna happen are so disconnected it's almost like well it doesn't really matter what I do then because it doesn't make sense and I think that serves to you know just push your morale down lower
>
> Alan: But also these kind of initiatives have a sort of momentum you know so that, so that they they're constantly working at cross purposes that's kind of where that schizophrenic thing is about and you start one initiative and it just rolls on and meanwhile something else is happening which has kind of works at cross purposes and there's no kind of control over that really and no uhh no yeah sort of no sense of recon, reconciliation.

159

> Iris: No

> Alan: Yeah

> Iris: and then you feel inadequate because you can't reconcile it. You can't do everything that's asked because quite often the left hand really doesn't know what the right hand's talking about so and then it gets down to us and do you go with that? Or do you go with that? Because you can't have them both

In Bolden, Petrov and Gosling's (2009) study of distributed leadership in higher education, they too encountered experiences of leadership tensions. Their research focused on more senior people in the hierarchy, (in comparison to Principal Lecturers), the majority being Heads of Departments and Heads of Schools. However, they too describe experiences of distant leadership:

> Leadership is felt to be removed from the operational level of the organization; inaccessible, imposed; not necessarily 'in our best interests'. Decisions taken at senior management level and imposed with limited consultation. This situation seems to be amplified where senior managers are physically distant from academic departments (p268).

This description clearly resonates with the experiences of my participants. It also highlights some of the ways in which power relations can be brought into being (Foucault, 1982). The first being inaccessibility and the importance of physical distance, space can be utilised as a means of bringing power relations into being. It helps to maintain a hierarchical structure. This physical distance was discussed by Grayson:

> When (name) started (as pro vice-chancellor) it was "I will go round the place, I will drop in the offices and you will see me". And you knew that would last about 6 months. And then you know as, by the time (name) left, nobody saw (name), there were no key note speaks, there was no meeting of the staff, there was no, it was those promises that you start with and then the job overtakes you and it becomes all-consuming and you do not have time to do what you promised and to me that is not leadership. That's a negation of leadership (Grayson)

The second means of bringing power relations into being is the use of consultations. In Bolden, Petrov and Gosling's (2009) definition they refer to imposed decisions and limited consultations. In my own study, the experiences of consultation were different. Consultation was prevalent, in that, the participants were frequently being asked to contribute to consultations at various levels, department, faculty and university wide. However, they were experienced as repetitious and devoid of measurable outputs:

> I think I'd change one thing it's to actually listen. Because I found myself in the latest consultation meeting saying the same things I've said virtually every consultation meeting (Sally)

> I mean that's the thing consultations should, should be real because they're not I can't think of any sing(le) type of consultation that's happened where there've been any clear beneficial outcomes actually they could be small scale local consultations and they could be some of the really big ones that have happened but I think it's very hard it's very difficult to see any real you know apart from a little bit of rhetoric there's no real kind of concrete measures you know that I think would have you know would have benefited that have come out of these so far (Alan)

Grayson described his experience of imposed decisions:

> Oh yes we were talking about that today so you've got on one level a decision was made we're going to restructure yeah and there was a logic to that in terms of a university corporate or [faculty] plan and so you see the logic then there's a consultation that wasn't....

> Well it's what I saw, there were subtle doors which were shut on you (Grayson)

Here I will add my own observations of one consultation process. This particular consultation took place within one faculty and was open to all staff. The consultation concerned a series of changes occurring within the faculty at leadership level. Whilst the comments that follow are therefore based on this faculty alone, the other faculties are bound by the same rules and procedures regarding consultation. Consultation on the proposed changes was initiated by the Assistant Dean of the faculty via email to all staff within the faculty. Attached to the email was a consultation document and an invitation to either submit written feedback or attend consultation meetings which were organised for 2, and 6 days after the date of the email. The period of consultation as detailed in the document was 13 days (including weekends). Consultation took place at a time of year when academic staff were engaged in marking.

In the initial consultation document scant reference was made to changes at the Principal Lecturer level, the changes being consulted on were those affecting more senior posts, specifically the creation of new roles, some of which embraced existing positions and others which were totally new. However, it was clear to me reading the document that the changes would have significant implications for those at Principal Lecturer level. Just how much of an impact was crystallized in the follow up email post-consultation in which the Assistant Dean described stage 2 as comprising a full review of Principal Lecturer roles.

161

The proposals as outlined in the consultation document are framed within a neoliberalist discourse. The need for change is positioned as self-evident, it is because of external competition and the potential for governmental policy changes to influence undergraduate recruitment (Acorn University, 2014a). Risk, accreditation, external impact are all mentioned. Change is positioned as a necessity, the need for change has been pre-determined and the document is clear that this is not a matter for debate: 'we are not consulting on the need to change' (Acorn University, 2014a, p4).

The consultation wasn't about exploring the identified challenges, whether these were the challenges we should be most concerned about, how we might meet these challenges, whether change was a necessity, what the executive were looking for was evidence that the decision they had made supported their corporate objectives and faculty plans: 'We are asking staff to comment on the proposed new posts and the extent to which their addition will help us to respond to the Acorn University corporate objectives and help (faculty) meet the mission and vision we are setting out in our long term faculty plan' (Acorn University, 2014a, p4).

Similarly to Bolden, Petrov and Gosling's (2009) description, there was 'a decision taken at senior management level and imposed with limited consultation' (p268). If we understand limited to refer to the scope of the consultation as well as the time period given to consulting. This example and my participants' experiences highlight a disjuncture between interpretations and understandings of consultations by the various parties at different levels within the institution and the differing objectives that are being pursued. The executive in the situation described above, it can be reasonably inferred, feel that they are engaging their staff in meaningful dialogue and following appropriate procedures; to invite everyone (all faculty staff were included in the emails), to encourage participation ('I do hope that you are able to participate in this important stage of the process and to thank you in advance for your contributions'), to publish findings (available through the staff intranet) and to explain next steps ('I will then take time to consider the feedback and make a decision on the final structure'). The explicitly stated objective for the executive in this example is to explore the faculty implications of the changes they have decided upon. But they are also using consultation as a means of maintaining

162

hierarchies, the decision making, still lies with the executive, in this case the Assistant Dean as is made clear in the terms on which they are consulting (within the consultation document) and the closing remark on the initial email: 'I will then take time to consider the feedback and make a decision on the final structure' (Email from Assistant Dean, Acorn University, 6 May 2014. pers. comm.). This subtle objective, partially hidden within a process described as an 'important stage', coached in terms of 'contribution' and 'feedback' would often I think go un-noticed by the staff being consulted, but could explain why the Principal Lecturers' experiences of consultations are of 'closed spaces where decisions and power lie' and enquiries that are completed but then disappear:

> Where did that whole enquiry into kind of the administrative load go? It doesn't really seem to have gone anywhere sadly (Louise)

Consultations it would seem enable senior managers to be seen to devolve decision-making and to be interested in the input of their staff, but ensure that the decisions themselves aren't consulted on and what is consulted on is done so within a very tightly bounded and prescriptive framework, which serves as a subtle reminder of who's in charge. Processes of consultation appear to be a highly rationalised, elaborate and effective means of bringing power relations into being (Foucault, 1982), enshrined as they are in university wide policies for their implementation. Despite the Principal Lecturers' discomfort, they continue unabated.

Another mechanism that can be used to bring power relations into being and maintain hierarchies is the use of surveillance. Both within the focus groups and interviews the participants discussed the use of surveillance by senior colleagues, up to and including pro vice-chancellors. This surveillance is enabled by the continuous collection of data and the use of technology, both to collect the data and as an instrument (through the use of email) to challenge or threaten those who fail to adequately comply.

> it was kind of hammered home to me about a month or so back where I'd been asked by our acting head of department to lead a piece of work I instigated all the activity and then had a tightly worded email from this very senior colleague in the faculty basically saying what do you think you're playing at who asked you to do this kind of thing? (Sally)

> There is this sort of happening now, lists of names are going round, if people haven't sort of done things, that's interesting because that's

intensifying things as well. That's not been seen before. So out there unbeknown to people there are lists being collated of x and y and z who are not doing things and then they'll get a tick off. They'll get summoned to meet the head of department or somebody else. I think you know you asked me later about control, I think that's coming, it's already there because it's all these electronic systems of course, the ahh performance review and all the stuff that's available which well we have to put everything onto a website although that's got problems at the moment because it's unreliable therefore people are coming back to people saying you're not doing things, but actually they are and it they haven't got a proper record, so that's got to be sorted out otherwise you're making unjust accusations against people (Grayson)

Interpretations focus group 1:

Sally: And uhh for some reason our PVC decided to get personally involved and started emailing people who hadn't completed and one what the hell is that person doing that for? It's beyond me, but my colleague got one of these emails which really cheered her up umm and the reason that she hadn't been able to file was because she was going through another process of minor modification and the datelines didn't match up so what was the point of her uploading all this outdate stuff to hit that deadline when she then had to wait, wait another month to get the approval for the minor mods and yet she was being told off for not reaching that one and it was just this kind of absolute disconnect

Alan: And as managers people have to be very careful, there's a very similar one that I came across recently as well with one of our managers who came chasing after some I think it was a whole group of people who hadn't done their [course] training and as it turned out, you know having sort of done these angry emails and chased after people I think in nine cases out of 10 there was actually a completely legitimate reason why either why they hadn't done it, or why the system hadn't itself hadn't recorded properly the fact that they had completed this training and you know perhaps before they went chasing after people

Interviewer: they should have checked

Alan: causing a lot of bad feeling and kind of anger and alienation they could have least got their facts right. You know maybe they shouldn't have been chasing after people maybe that's not the right way to pursue something like this anyway so in every respect it was wrong so it's kind of interesting

These extracts explore the drive to use 'data' to monitor compliance by senior management. This desire to use 'data' was discussed by participants from each of the faculties, suggesting that it is a university wide phenomenon and as such can be thought of as an institutionalisation in the Foucauldian (1982) sense. I suggest that this might be because the use of data creates distance. It enables managers to maintain an independence from the data, it's the data that is telling

164

them what's not been done and who's not done it. In this situation the data is assigned 'truth' by management and given an independent status, it almost has a life of its own. This signifies an understanding of data as neutral and objective, thus people are removed (as far as possible) from the process, because people are considered unreliable, capable of bias and likely to make errors of judgement. This scientification of the process of management changes the role of managers. It is their judgement and their presence which is often being eliminated from these processes. They are being used as vehicles for the implementation of the threat aspect of surveillance; they are delivering the 'threats' of non-compliance; but the data is assessing the compliant behaviour.

Yet the data itself is problematic seen to be incomplete, out-of-date and/incompatible. One participant referred to this as 'management by flawed data'. The consequences of being on the receiving end of this type of surveillance are feelings of anger which only adds to Principal Lecturers' perceptions of distant leadership, providing them with evidence that leadership is disconnected from the operational level of the university. The use of email by senior managers in implementing this surveillance also adds to this feeling of distance, physically removing the sender from the process.

Whilst the stated objectives of management in these situations are often about maintaining standards with regards to quality, student experience, or strategic priorities, the underlying objective is one of performance monitoring and control, through the use of surveillance; are staff doing what they've been asked to do, when they've been asked to do it? That those who are implementing these processes are heads of department and pro vice-chancellors serves to maintain hierarchies.

For the Principal Lecturers the use of data was experienced acutely within their roles. Their dissatisfaction with this approach to management led to frustration and feelings of powerlessness. They found themselves engaged in continuous discussions about the problems of data, which took up considerable amounts of time and led them to conclude that they are unable to change the processes of data collection, further supporting their understandings of themselves as leaders without authority.

Louise: ....which is one of the most serious problems of the university is that there's masses of flawed data all over the place most data sets are kind of incorrect and yet senior managers make judgments about departments, staff groups all sorts of things on the basis of completely flawed data

Alan: And actually it's not just flawed data but it's competing data

Louise: Yeah

Alan: that's really quite interesting I've been in a situation where you've actually got three sets of competing data created by different people

Louise: Yes

Alan: with slightly different interests and you know you're having this conversation or an argument based on these you know there's no, there's no reconciliation again use that word reconciliation because, because it's really you know it's really hard to kind of get to the basis of which one is correct

Louise: I suppose those are the things that managers at our kind of level get caught up in more than if you were a senior lecturer so I find it very dispiriting to spend you know long meeting times talking about you know why, how is the data flawed? Why is it flawed? What can we do about the fact it's flawed? So the thing that the meeting was actually originally designed to actually move forward on something just kind of spends the whole time exploring the kind of problems with the data which we actually really have not got much hope of influencing the processes that created it so it feels it's very dispiriting kind of experience to get caught up in that and find realise that a lot of your time and a lot of your colleagues time is rather fruitless.

Relationships with senior management were a clear source of tension and dissatisfaction amongst the Principal Lecturers. Their interpretations of these relationships led them to construct their own leadership as lacking in authority and influence. The distant leadership approach that they felt management took, was maintained and supported by managements' use of power relations, including the utilisation of space and processes of consultation, surveillance and management by flawed data.

I have suggested that senior management use space, surveillance, consultations and data, to maintain hierarchies. The importance of 'top-down' leadership is suggested by this. In addition, the focus on institutional outcomes evidenced in senior managements' approach, indicates that they are prescribing to a managerialist model of academic leadership (Chapter 2).

There is clearly dissatisfaction with this approach, which agrees with Bolden et al's (2009) findings. However, this contradicts their assumption that such disagreement is only applicable to 'certain parts of the sector' (p292). Their discursive positioning of post-1992 universities as inferior may have led them to draw conclusions which my data contests.

Relationships with Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

This subject position was characterised by talk of leadership as influence and was particularly linked to issues of line management, appraisals, budgets, performance and accountability. Whilst the Principal Lecturers were often responsible for large scale initiatives, involving numbers of academic staff, this did not often come with any formal reporting structures or ability to hold staff accountable. Thus, workload and administration was devolved to the Principal Lecturers but not necessarily power and authority (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009):

> Someone could come and have their appraisal with me and want to do a, b, c and d knowing full well that I can't say whether they can do it or not I've got to go and speak to someone else so that's certainly disempowering (Iris)

This subject position draws on numerous discursive interventions identified by Ball (2003) as policy technologies of educational reform; management, performance, appraiser, accountability. It is natural and desirable for the Principal Lecturers to take up positions as appraisers and managers, and to want greater authority in order to hold staff accountable for their performance. There is also talk of a desire for the translation of business practices into academia:

> So certainly from my experience in industry it wouldn't be arranged like that you would be a manager or leader and then people would report to you and then there's a direct line of communication there and direct line of responsibility they wouldn't report to someone else but sort of pseudo report to you (Pete)

> Pete: I think it's interesting that you're looking at PL Levels because I think there are certain challenges there that I think are quite difficult I'll give you an example with (my role) so my (job title) so academics who have a (job title) role don't report to me in that I don't do their appraisals. They are within the team but I'm not their line manager and I'm not involved in their selection so it's the subject group leaders invariably who say actually you're going to be doing that role so I think more pressure

comes from that because there's responsibility but not the control mechanisms in place so I'm responsible for it and I rely and need you know academics to work in the role but they don't report to me and their main priority is towards their subject group and their subject group leader because that's essentially their boss but yet they've got this other role and I think that in order to reduce some of these issues you know some of them that you were looking at before I think that, that really does need looking at because you've got this funny system and I think that's a really good example and I expect it's mirrored with lots of other roles where you're almost reliant on someone else and you can't you just don't have that authority in the same way that you would have say in industry if I think about (sector) or (sector) as well there's a clear line, you know that guy works for that guy and

Grayson: Ah but Pete you see absolutely there's a clear line, a clear sense of reporting, a clear sense of what people are doing. What we have a problem with, and why some of these stresses and concerns might be bubbling up is because the way we appoint people into roles and the way people apply for these roles isn't in a systematic well-defined process, are you the right person for this role? Is this what you want to do? Oh no no I've got to have some time I must have a role. Take this role nobody else has applied for it, do you want it? You take the role then you find actually it's not the role you really wanted you've got a commitment to it you don't understand it and then things start coming up because you can't cope

A number of mechanisms for bringing power relations into being are discussed in this extract including; reporting, appraisals, line management and selection. The vocabulary of performance (Ball, 2003) is being used by these Principal Lecturers and a particular form of relationship that of the manager and the managed, between themselves and the Lecturers and Senior Lecturers who work with them is presented as a necessity. Other ways of experiencing these relationships aren't considered and this form of relationship is positioned as desirable and natural. To position it in this way, the Principal Lecturers draw on private sector/industry examples of practice. The implication being that industry is superior in this regard to higher education. The explicit suggestion in this extract is that what is needed is more control and more clearly defined processes. The objective being pursued is one of performance monitoring. Their perceived lack of formal monitoring mechanisms enables the Principal Lecturers to sustain/claim an identity as a leader without authority. The authority desired in this instance is authority over, and control of, a particular set of relationships, those with Lecturers/Senior Lecturers. This suggests an additional and complementary objective, that of achieving a greater hierarchical distinction between Principal Lecturers and Lecturers/Senior Lecturers.

This system of differentiation (Foucault, 1982), the distinction between Senior Lecturers/Lecturers and Principal Lecturers was significant for some of the participants in relation to their identities. They expressed a desire for clarity across the university regarding the scope of the role and its requirements:

> I do think cause one of the reasons for talking to me and others in the focus group was cause of our PL roles I do think there's a major significant difference between SL and PL definitely ......so there's quite a big step up I think. I'm not complaining. I'm just but I think you learn to live with that (Pete)

> Interviewer: When you say a step up do you mean in terms of?

> Workload, responsibility, in terms of sort of wider, more managerial I think, I guess it depends on the PL role, but I can only speak for myself, there's so many more things that you're suddenly involved in, as I said I think it may be different for certain roles (Pete)

> I think there's a bit of confusion and that's why PL is seen as a management role because you get PL you get line management responsibilities or you have a special job. But you know I only do that special job three days a week so my one day a week I've got a teaching function. I'm AWP for it so there is that again the university's a bit unclear about that so. One day a week I can't take a leadership role on teaching, cause I'm a module leader at the moment but I'm stepping down, but that's SL (Sally)

> Interviewer: But you do that as an SL so what's the distinction?

> Exactly. It does seem that reader is a better title for expertise and stuff. So I've got colleagues in (faculty) who are readers who don't have line management responsibility, but in our faculty, you're a PL you line manage unless you're fully protected. So I think there's kind of a you know you've got x number of people at this level you need to utilise them according to that even though technically that person's a reader and there's not consistency then across the faculties as well (Sally)

Sally describes the conflict and tensions surrounding a Principal Lecturer role, which is perhaps, heightened by the simultaneous existence of differing leadership models within the institution. On the one-hand she refers to the traditional higher education leadership model (Chapter 2), which she sees as represented by the role of reader, whose research expertise 'protects' them from additional responsibilities such as line management, and is also the reason that they are leaders (Rowley, 1997; and Yielder and Codling, 2004). On the other, the 'special job' associated with the Principal Lecturer role, is in keeping with the managerialist model of leadership, in which the leader is expected to meet institutional requirements not focused, (in this case), around research

(Askling and Stensaker 2002). Both leadership models construct heroic leaders, but the expectations required of them regarding appropriate behaviours are different (Chapter 2).

Sally's description also suggests that line management isn't necessarily a desired responsibility. In her interview Nina described her own anxieties with regards to line management:

> I've worried a lot about that and I've spent a lot of time mulling things over, and the way I say things to them and whether it sounds like I'm being patronizing, or whether I sound bossy or all that kind of thing I've really thought long and hard about the way I am when I'm in that role because they do what I've noticed more and more is that they do check everything with me and I've been asking myself whether that's because I've created that atmosphere or whether they feel better checking everything with me and it doesn't matter what I say they will still do that because that's the nature of their personalities (Nina)

For Nina, line management effectively operates as a form of self-governance, as she attempts to control and monitor her own behaviour in order to meet its demands.

In the second interpretations focus group the participants began to question their desire for this particular form of manager-managed relationship:

> Grayson: Well I'd say for me certainly leadership, leader without authority
>
> Pete: Yeah I definitely think that one
>
> Grayson: and which I think we discussed in the interviews for me everything I do is about subtle, subtle influencing of, of, of behaviour and getting getting agreement for things in a way that makes people feel that it's their idea in the first place you know cause you don't have any power to make things happen you can only operate by consensus
>
> Pete: Yes the thing is and there's an interesting paradox here, because the people that we're trying to manage have their own agendas, but then so do we that's the thing. That's the thing because we have our own agendas because we're trying to delve and dabble and lead and manage if you like but at the same time that's within the framework of our own things that we wanna be doing, what research do I wanna be doing and which modules would I like to be involved in? And you know would I like to liaise more with industry? And what else would I like to do? And you know do I you know what I mean? So in actual fact, I've just realised I'm sort of looking at it as just they're not conforming to what I want to do but actually when I think about myself, sort of metaphorically step back and think well actually I've got my own agendas really and that it might be possible

170

In this extract, Pete is beginning to address the notion of conformity, their own and that of the Lecturers/Senior Lecturers in their teams. In so doing, it opens up the possibility for the manager-managed relationship to be shifted. This reflexive questioning of his own desires enables him to begin to unsettle his own taken-for-granted assumptions. He is realising that he had understood Lecturers/Senior Lecturers as a 'generalized other' and is turning these readings on himself, liberating his own potential (Cunliffe, 2002).

Participating in the research process helped Alan to reconsider aspects of his manager-managed relationships:

> Alan: that's made me think a little bit about the way we organise our appraisals...and you know trying to, trying to move those away from line management you know cause a lot of people want those to be part of line management whereas I'd rather they were independent of you know management responsibility so you have somebody to talk about in the round about your experience you know not just about which training you want and which particular university agenda you're gonna

> Interviewer: fit into

> Alan: fit into I mean I'm, I'm fine with those things but I think you need the rest of that as well so yeah it's helped me to it's got me thinking about the benefits of this type of discussion although that's a bit different cause that's a one on one this is sort of a group get together

Alan wants the appraisal process to be different, he is still operating within neoliberalist practices of managerialism and performativity, but he is 'retranslating' them (Ball and Olmedo, 2013) in order to create a different kind of relationship, which isn't simply focused on meeting institutional outcomes. He is practicing resistance. In his resistance we see his struggle, he is willing to accept university agendas and the need to 'fit into' them, but at the same time he sees this as inadequate. He is both accepting and resisting practices of neoliberalism and finding space to be and do differently.

There are clear contradictions evident in the Principal Lecturers' understandings of their relationships with those above them in comparison to those below. In their relationships with those above them, the Principal Lecturers expressed the desire for greater influence and a general dissatisfaction with the managerialist leadership model in operation. Yet, in their discussions of their relationships with the Lecturers and Senior Lecturers below them, they call for greater control mechanisms and there is a clear desire for a stronger hierarchical

171

(managerialist) leadership model, based around their formal positioning as a Principal Lecturer. Perhaps they are stuck in 'first-order reflexivity'? Able to be 'critical of a generalized other' 'without becoming aware of how to liberate' their own potential? (Cunliffe, 2002, p40).

Some of these contradictions and tensions are, I think, heightened by the nature of the Principal Lecturer role and the leadership identities and behaviours which they are expected to adhere to. Both models of leadership, traditional and managerialist, exist simultaneously. On the one-hand there is some desire for the Principal Lectureship role to be understood in terms of the expertise and heroism associated with the traditional leadership model. Whilst on the other, it is anticipated that they will behave in keeping with the institutional requirements of the managerialist model.

The paradox described by Askling and Stensaker (2002) and Yielder and Codling (2004) is apparent, as the Principal Lecturers struggle with the demands of the heroic leadership discourse whilst experiencing little authority or control to act accordingly.

Despite the tendency towards the fulfilment of the neoliberalist agenda of performance, itself a key concern of managerialism, practices of resistance are happening. In keeping with those identity writers who recognise the potential of neoliberalism for positive productivity, (Clegg, 2008a; or Archer, 2008a), this suggests that it is possible to find spaces to work within the discourse to be and do other (Chapter 2). But as Pete and Alan's struggles demonstrate, this is challenging precisely because it is a struggle for subjectivities, in which their agency is constrained by power relations (Mayo, 2000; and Chapter 2).

Third space leader

The third space leader identity represents talk of leadership of project work encompassing both administrative and academic domains (Gronn, 2009). Leadership is required of people in various teams, disciplines or roles both within and outside the institution:

> I work on quite a lot of different projects if you like, with short term team memberships you know sometimes you've got a person may only be a member for a couple of meetings if you like, or maybe part of it for longer and then you are you are really leading that really, you're coordinating things you're keeping people on board and sometimes that's also outside

172

the university so I suppose in that you know that's where the leadership lies in that type of business development role is just holding the project together and try and sort of lead people forward (Alan)

The talk was particularly focused around issues of outcomes, reputation and income, and is very much focused on valuing the institutional interests (Ball, 2003):

> Whatever it is that I'm deciding about is likely to have a positive financial outcome so it's going to bring us some money in in other words but then I also have this other thing going on at the same time which is around enhancing our reputation out there and bringing in new business to the faculty and new funding streams (Nina)

The managerialist model of leadership in which the leader is focused on meeting institutional objectives (Askling and Stensaker, 2002; and Chapter 2), is evident in Nina's description, as is the profit subtext of neoliberalism (Ball, 2012b; and Chapter 2), as she seeks to maximise income. This particular identity is closely aligned with specific Principal Lecturer roles around business development.

Managerial leader

The managerial leader identity represents talk focused on the administrative and bureaucratic side of leadership ensuring that individuals/teams meet deadlines. This is a much narrower interpretation of leadership in comparison to the managerialist leadership model discussed in Chapter 2. This approach was particularly prevalent when leading teams in areas outside their own expertise:

> In fact a large amount of my job seems to consist of chasing up other people to meet deadlines that they're struggling to meet which is not a very enjoyable part of it (Louise)

This subject position, also interestingly appears to be in conflict with the desires for more authority and influence, as discussed in reference to leadership without authority. Louise, (like Sally), suggests that this kind of performance management relationship is undesirable. This is also perhaps to do with their perceived lack of expertise in relation to the teams involved, as expressed by Louise:

> I guess I have some courses in my programme that I know better than others so where I where it's my subject expertise, so where it's about (*particular area*) I feel much more involved and that I've got much more to offer in terms of leadership..... I kind of feel like I have that more of an

insight into what we need to be offering students and how we need to be developing courses so that they meet the students' needs (Louise)

Louise positions her own knowledge as inferior due to her lack of expertise, which debilitates her capacity for leadership. This suggests that the traditional model of academic leadership underpins her thinking and actions, in which leadership is located within the person 'because of their expertise and knowledge' (Yielder and Codling, 2004, p320). Faced with this, Louise focuses on meeting the expected behaviours of a managerial leader, but she finds this unsatisfactory. Given that leadership writers continue to argue for the distinction between leadership and management (Middlehurst and Elton, 1992), in order to reinforce the specialness of leaders and leadership, it hardly seems surprising that this managerial leader identity is experienced in limiting ways. For it positions such leadership and leaders as inferior.

Entrepreneurial leader

The entrepreneurial leader identity consists of talk of academic leadership as being something requiring innovation and creativity. This was seen as a response to increasing pressures on individuals:

> As leaders of curriculum or any other aspect of the university's strategy where we have to be more creative and entrepreneurial to coin the phrase (Kate)

Bolden et al (2009) argue that institutions have embraced entrepreneurial approaches to leadership, founded on principles of individualism, competition and meritocracy (Nikunen, 2012), which supposedly enhances 'productivity, quality and innovation' (Ainsworth and Hardy, 2008, p389). Ainsworth and Hardy (2008) discuss the spread of the entrepreneurial discourse, usually associated with business, in particular small business owners, into other types of organisations, and how it legitimates particular identities. This discourse they argue, advocates the reshaping of organisations in the image of the private sector, positioning enterprise as the antithesis of bureaucratic organisations that are overly influenced by governments. This discourse, suggests that anyone can be enterprising, however, Ainsworth and Hardy (2008) found that only particular workers were constructed as suitable, those who were deemed young enough. Similarly, Ogbor (2000) argues that the enterprising discourse is gender and ethnically biased, legitimating a white male identity.

174

I think in terms of particularly from a leadership point of view the external factors currently are, the obvious one's the reduction in public funding, the increase in fees, so we all need to be more creative and use more innovation in how we deliver our services because resources will be and are it's not, it's not healthy for your for your own sanity really so again I suppose it's back to managing your own expectations and knowing that you can't achieve everything that you want to achieve but in the same token not delivering half measures either. Knowing that there are ways of stretching yourselves, but I don't think anyb I don't think anybody trying to be a perfectionist is ever going to really achieve anything. I think that's about going to back to what I said about emotional intelligence and having that self-awareness (Kate)

Kate's understanding of entrepreneurial leadership is closely intertwined with reductions in resources. Limitations in resources create the need to be more creative and entrepreneurial with what's available. The notion of universities as service providers is clearly evident in Kate's understanding. The subject produced by this discourse is one requiring continuous work and self-surveillance; 'stretching', 'self-awareness', 'emotional intelligence', striving for the highest possible outcomes. In contrast, for Iris, lack of resources particularly funding, were barriers to innovation as opposed to catalysts. She experienced a managerial desire for innovation and creativity from employees which was not supported by the structures or funding of the university. Perhaps this is a function of the discourse, designed to produce the self-governing subject, continually striving for improvements, the onus is on the individual to look for ways to be better, or work better, which removes the emphasis on the organisation to provide support. For Iris, this created a challenging leadership environment for her as a leader, but also a frustrating experiencing of being led.

We could all write a range of modules that were very international and contextualise it, and you know provide texture and provide that experience it won't run not unless there are more than forty students on it and that perhaps is the austerity side again that when we want to be innovative and we want to try and introduce whatever it is I mean obviously employability is more my bag, but almost any of the strategic drivers that the University is talking about unless the funding is there it's not going to happen and as a leader I find that very difficult (Iris)

we've done quite a few things me and a colleague over the last few years, before I was a PL, and it's constant bid writing and what have you to get money to be innovative, and then slowly but surely, you know we were approached by the HEA to put in a bid for national teaching award based on a lot of the work that we'd done but there was no support for that, and when that's questioned "oh yes we're very supportive as managers", you know the more higher ups but they're not forthcoming in

175

terms of buying you out of teaching, in the same way that they would if you said you were going to do you know a 3000 word article for a notable journal so it's definitely the poor relation I think at the moment (Iris)

The entrepreneurial discourse was particularly associated with teaching, whether that's the planning or delivery. This can be seen in Iris's example. A system of differentiation is also drawn on in Iris's talk that of teaching competencies. Her perception is that the status of teaching within the institution is lower than that of research. The differential status of teaching compared to research was experienced both within the institution and in relationships with those outside:

> I think when you're talking to other people from other places "oh Acorn University that's one of those teaching universities" and depending on where they're from they can see it makes you a lesser, a lesser academic a lesser being (Nina)

The term 'teaching university' can be used, as is demonstrated above, to position academics from within them as inferior to those from otherly focused institutions. Yet as Brundrett, Burton, and Smith (2003, p186) stated 'there is no such thing as a teaching only university'. The discursive superior-inferior relationship between universities brings power relations into being (Foucault, 1982). Superiority is driven and maintained by the discourse of research which is cultivated by institutions such as those from the UK's Russell Group who call themselves research-intensive. This discourse positions the 'teaching university' and consequently the identity of teacher as inferior and thus claiming the identity of teacher, can be experienced in limiting ways. Iris, for example, discussed the limited opportunities of career progression based on a teaching identity:

> I think in terms of promotion I mean I'm actually looking to do some writing based on teaching over the summer and get some publications out there because where I am at this point I can't see how I can go higher based on my teaching abilities and therefore I need to get some publications out there or in all likelihood will stay at this level in this University in the same department for the next 20 years you know (Iris)

The close connection between the discourse of entrepreneurialism and teaching is illustrated by Kate and Grayson who position entrepreneurialism as not only desirable but necessary in teaching:

teaching takes a lot of time, I mean I do teach and it and the preparation particularly not the delivery the delivery's the fun part but the preparation and keeping what you do current and being you know creative and using innovation in the classroom it all takes a lot of effort (Kate)

there is a sense of self-protection here. You know it's a tough life, it's a tough world we have to find a way of designing assessments that are more innovative where you, I work with I co-create a lot of modules with students and as a result I create things which are very easy to manage and to mark and once people have done it a few times it's very simple. I don't keep changing the rubric I don't keep changing the rules....

Why don't we have more multiple pen scanned exams for example, where students can, in medicine they write 2000 questions, 13 answers, multiple choice nobody has to do anything and the machine marks them. So why are we not being more savvy? Let's use the technical age we're in. Let's use the software. Let's use the stuff we've got, and be a bit more sensible, and forgetting about the past and thinking about the future. Cos that's what students are expecting because they're coming from a system that is now driven by technology and we're not responding to that I don't think (Grayson)

To meet the demands of entrepreneurialism, to be creative and innovative in teaching planning and delivery requires time; this is recognised by Kate and Grayson. Grayson's extract is full of contradictions. On the one-hand he calls for greater innovation in designing assessments, but then describes his approach which is to produce a manageable assignment which doesn't change. His solution is to use more technology, but again the objective is to create manageable assignments and teaching workloads. This is reminiscent of Elkington and Lawrence's (2012) working smart, achieved by being selective, and the coping strategies adopted by the academics in a post-1992 university in Trowler's (1997) study. For Grayson being entrepreneurial is a response to the increasing pressures on individuals and a way to manage these pressures. His notion of self-protection is in keeping with a principle of individualism inherent in the entrepreneurial discourse (Nikunen, 2012). His notion of enterprise is of being forward looking, there is an implicit assumption that he is part of a slow moving bureaucracy in keeping with the discourse of enterprise described by Ainsworth and Hardy (2008). The idea of universities as service providers is also evident in his talk, demonstrated by his desire to meet student expectations.

A particular identity is created of the entrepreneurial teacher which carries with it an expectation of creativity and an inherently individualistic approach. For

177

some of the Principal Lecturers, (Kate, Alan, Daphne, and Louise), curriculum/course design represented the aspect of their role which they connected both with leadership and creativity:

> so the nice bit of my job is I do get involved in curriculum design with course leaders and I feel that there's still some creativity within that (Daphne)

> I guess in terms of leadership roles the kind of course development as opposed to the staff development aspects so working with course leaders around course development is both can be quite engaging and fulfilling but also it can be quite frustrating at times (Louise)

But within their descriptions there is a sense of creativity being constrained/stifled:

> people are almost disheartened by what's happening with changes to academic frameworks and things cause they can't see those opportunities to be creative anymore. So it's trying to say but you know it's almost like you've almost got to play the game a bit, tick these boxes and do a good job and then you know save some energy for trying to be creative but I think people are, are quite worn out by the level of change (Daphne)

This constraining of creativity is at odds with the discourse of enterprise and the enterprising-self produced. Daphne's description of playing the game is reminiscent of Kate's self-governing subject. The removal of opportunities for creativity and self-expression within one's work, suggests that what is required of the enterprising self are very particular activities. Those things which support the institutional agendas, as opposed to any derived from personal desires. This suggests that the managerialist model of leadership underpins this particular identity (Chapter 2). The lack of opportunities for creativity was linked with desires to downshift amongst some of the participants (Chapter 5).

Whilst the entrepreneurial identities created can be seen as a response to increasing pressures on individuals and as a way to manage these pressures; the identities themselves create pressures on individuals, to behave in certain ways, in particular to be creative and innovative. The subject produced by this discourse is one requiring continuous work and self-surveillance. The focus of this discourse is on the re-making of individuals, who are required to respond appropriately to the increasing demands placed on them at work. Attention is

therefore, on the individual as opposed to the need for an organisational response.

My review of the academic identities literature suggested that a teaching identity would be important in a post-1992 context (Chapter 2) and the entrepreneurial leader identity is in particular associated with teaching. The review also suggested that a teaching identity might be experienced in limiting ways, and both Nina and Iris explored how they are positioned as inferior both within and outside the institution. They suggest that this leadership identity can be discursively constructed as inferior to identities built around subject expertise, reinforcing the relevance and power of the traditional model of academic leadership within this context.

Privileged leader

The privileged leader identity is characterised by talk of leadership offering variety and interest to a role which is highly time consuming:

> So I think that in a way the leadership roles give you a bit more variety in terms of your job. So it's not as much face to face teaching. There's more kind of different kinds of meetings that you go to. More work with external people, so I think that variety is probably easier to manage than the kind of intensive teaching loads that people at senior lecturer level have (Louise)

> we do feel in quite a privileged position they're hard to get a PL post isn't it and alright yeah put the effort in but they're few and far between (Daphne)

> I could see myself as a privileged leader as well (Sally)

This subject position was only taken up by women. In the descriptions above we can hear what Small et al (2011) referred to as the sense of privilege that women academics have with regards to their employment and the opportunities it provides. In terms of work-life balance issues, this sense, serves to individualise the negative implications of work, (Chapter 2), specifically in these descriptions the long hours, and acts as a disciplinary mechanism, the privilege must be continually earned (Daphne). That this subject position was only drawn on by female academics might be indicative of the gendering of academic work, as my male participants felt unable to legitimately use it, or perhaps as Acker and Armenti (2004) suggest, academic work does not tear men 'apart in the same way' as women (p20).

179

Spin leader

The spin leader identity represents talk of leadership as image making, with a particular focus on projecting desired images to people in more senior roles:

> I think there's a rise in people who get PLs because they do fantastic interviews and we know that they don't do anything that they say that they do, and back to being disconnected you know if you can spin it if you can stand in a room with the right people and paint a very pretty picture umm it doesn't mean that you have to be a hard worker and then the impact of those people getting those roles is that we get you know the people who will work are the people who won't put it down, you've got more that you can't put down because you're taking up the slack, and it could just be because I'm more senior myself now but it does seem to me the last 2 or 3 years this rise in people that you know are style over substance (Iris)

This particular identity reminds me of Sparkes's (2007) characterisation of the Weasel; 'the Weasel was only interested in himself and getting promotion as fast as he could. He had no interest in teaching' (p531). It is also an example of the use of managerialism by academics to meet their own career goals, as described by Deem and Brehony (2005). There are clearly negative feelings directed towards such individuals, but the role that Iris describes, leadership as meaning making, is very much in keeping with historical understandings of leaders and leadership (Parry and Bryman, 2006; and Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe, 2007). The difference appears to lie with the audience; the heroic visionary leader is usually understood as inspiring their followers, (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2008), whereas Iris describes the audience as those above, in more senior leadership positions.

Whilst no-one specifically claimed this identity, others suggested how useful this type of leadership, leadership understood as meaning making, could be as a strategy for self-preservation/refusal.

> Sally: I think it can work in your favour. It's likely that my role is under review at the moment and I'm probably going to have to apply for another role which I don't want in a million years but I know the system so I will go and present a picture which I know the people who are making the decision will absolutely hate and there's no way then I can get the job so that can play in your favour actually, so I will present a very democratic, transformative, innovative picture of how leadership can be take the opportunity to take a bit of a pot shot at one or two people and no damn well I won't get the job, however

Alan: But interestingly that was kind of, that was kind of how I pitched it in my, in my interview but I still, I still to my surprise got the, got the job

Louise: Sounds like

Alan: even though, even though I got the impression that my, I've got to be a bit, bit careful about this, my head of department didn't really like what was being said and didn't really fit with but obviously I was being interviewed by a panel

Sally: I know the panel

Alan: But I thought, I thought you know I'm gonna go, you know I'm going to go for a job and I'm going to say what I think about this, cause I spent a while reading all of these strategies and so and thought well I can only say what you know I'm not really going to try and pitch this to what I think people might want cause I'll just get it wrong, but as I said it, it actually worked out so to my surprise it actually worked out. So my, my advice to people is to do that

Both Sally and Alan describe their opportunity to counter the institutional requirements of leadership, as occurring during formal recruitment processes. They both embarked on what Ball and Olmedo (2013) describe as 'a calculative process of decision-making' (p93). Both suggest that this is not without cost; Sally thinks she will not get the job, but not wanting the new role, also gives her the freedom to challenge the institutional view. That they use the interview process as an opportunity for practicing resistance is significant. This would suggest that within such a process, the power relations which normally operate to govern their behaviour in line with institutional demands are altered in such a way as to enable them to articulate a reinterpretation of organisational understandings. That Alan experienced success, despite his prior reservations, might be because during interview processes such actions demonstrate the heroic leadership behaviours, (such as the ability to articulate a clear vision, see Chapter 2), desired by institutions. The contradictory nature of neoliberalism (Shamir, 2008) is evident, as individuals' attempts to demonstrate practices of resistance to managerialism are understood to be desirable behaviours. This example also demonstrates how constraining the discursive construction of the heroic leader can be, because even in seeking to be other kinds of leaders and offer other kinds of leadership practice, both Sally and Alan act in ways which reinforce the importance of this understanding.

Conclusions

My data can be used to support Gronn's (2009) contention that we should consider leadership 'as hybrid' (p392), for both collective and solo formations of leadership are understood to coexist within this institution. It is also apparent that both the traditional and managerialist models of leadership are influencing how people think about and do leadership. That the traditional model of academic leadership exists in a post-1992 university would appear to be at odds with the assumptions made in the literature (Chapter 2).

This research suggests that the discursive construction of the heroic leader continues to be highly relevant and constraining. I suggest that it is so powerful, because, it is at the apex of both the traditional and managerialist models of leadership.

These Principal Lecturers were all dissatisfied with their relationships with senior management and the distant leadership approach that they felt management took. Their discussions suggest that senior managements' leadership approach is consistent with a managerialist model of academic leadership (Chapter 2), in which hierarchy and institutional outcomes are paramount. It would appear from this analysis, that the maintenance of hierarchy is the key objective of the power relations which operate in this discourse of leadership, whether that is achieved through the utilisation of space, processes of consultation, surveillance, or management by data.

Despite their dissatisfaction with this leadership approach, when considering their relationships with colleagues 'below' them in the hierarchy, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, they appear to argue for a managerialist model of leadership, in which greater control and accountability mechanisms are invested in their role as Principal Lecturer. In arguing for this, they draw on systems of differentiation, such as the superior status attached to the operation of the business world compared with academia, an understanding associated with managerialism and practices of neoliberalism (Chapter 2). Again, the hierarchical distinctions between roles are of paramount importance. This is consistent with an understanding of leadership which continuously positions leaders and leadership as the preserve of the special few, and one in which leadership is contained by formal organisational roles. Thus there must be clear

distinctions between the roles otherwise they cannot function as leaders. Whilst this is certainly influenced by neoliberalism, and the principles of individualism and competition inherent within it, I argued earlier, that such principles also underpin the traditional leadership model (Chapter 2).

I suggest that the historical conditions of higher education leadership, which value the individual, their expertise and achievements, have provided fertile ground for neoliberalism. The principles of competition existed long before neoliberalism became a concern in higher education, but neoliberalism has heightened, encouraged and legitimised individualistic practices, designed to meet our own needs. Practices exemplified by the spin leader, who is solely focused on achieving personal career goals.

What this data suggests is the pernicious nature of neoliberalism and its 'capacity to appear as the only thinkable context' (Archer, 2008a, p272). The Principal Lecturers, in thinking about their relationships demonstrate their struggles in this regard. They rail against their experiences of being led in a manner built around its principles, whilst at the same time wanting to lead others in this way. The manager-managed relationship is a taken-for-granted necessity. Yet, there are examples of resistance. Of people finding spaces to work within the discourse and be and do other. The incoherent nature of discourse, which Foucault (1984b and 1986) alerts us to, enables this. But as their struggles demonstrate, and Archer's (2008a) work points out, their agency is constrained by power relations, power relations which make thinking beyond so profoundly difficult. So, even in resistance, they are constrained by heroic constructions of leaders and leadership.

Ball and Olmedo (2013) posit that neoliberalism encourages us to become self-governing subjects, and this is apparent in the leadership discourse. The various identities create pressures on individuals to behave in certain ways and to monitor their own and others actions in line with their requirements. Thus, the entrepreneurial leader must be creative and innovative, which requires continuous work and self-surveillance, and the privileged leader must persistently discipline themselves in order to earn their privilege.

What is also apparent is the requirement on the individual to change themselves, as Billot (2010) and Winter (2009) conclude, the academic is the

necessary site of change (Chapter 2). The increasing demands of work must be met by the individual; they must act differently, or work smarter, as entrepreneurial leaders. They must learn to reconcile the demands of the competing models of leadership, which create tensions and cause dissatisfaction. They must be able to act heroically and decisively in the face of competing initiatives, to be meaning makers and one version of the spin-leader. The onus of the leadership discourse is on the individual, if they cannot meet its demands the fault lies with them.

Maybe the very presence of both the traditional and managerialist models of leadership within a post-1992 context, in apparent conflict to the assumptions of the literature, is a consequence of the implications and demands of neoliberalism, the imagined market and increasing competition between institutions (Chapter 2).

Perhaps, in a post-1992 environment, the neoliberalist agenda has enjoyed a particularly seductive appeal, as it offered an opportunity for the superior-inferior systems of differentiation so apparent in higher education, and drawn on by my own participants, to be challenged, through its use of the principle of meritocracy and the valuing of other kinds of expertise, not just of research. However, my analysis suggests, that the superior-inferior systems of differentiation continue and as the neoliberalist agenda has been mobilised these systems of differentiation appear to have gained, rather than decreased, in importance.

Chapter 5: Downshifting

Chop that wood

Carry water

What's the sound of one hand clapping

Enlightenment, don't know what it is

(Van Morrison, 1990)

Introduction

This chapter opens with song lyrics used by Pete to describe his own experiences of downshifting. The process of psychic disengagement (Archer, 2008a) with work that he appears to have experienced, I discuss later in the chapter, but these words are so expressive, suggestive and challenging that they warrant their own space. To me, they are evocative of Foucault's (1980b) understanding of the entwinement of power and knowledge, despite what we know, we still 'chop that wood' and 'carry water'.

The definition of downshifting that I began with and offered my participants came from the literature: Downshifting essentially involves slowing down at work in order to improve other areas of life. Downshifters employ an array of strategies to achieve their desired balance, including but not limited to; declining promotions or not seeking them, reducing working hours, changing careers or withdrawing from the workforce (Laabs, 1996).

None of the participants had heard of the concept of downshifting, yet the idea of it was immediately recognisable and the definition provided sparked instant responses, often of laughter, with Sally saying 'can I tick all of the above?' What emerged as discussions continued was that this was a complex response, which both contested and accepted differing aspects of the idea.

The notion of downshifting opened up the possibility for talk about bodies in a way that leadership didn't. When talking about leadership, there was barely any talk of bodies, whereas in the discussions of downshifting, bodies were central, and downshifting legitimised talk of health, sickness, age and fitness. A level of discomfort in talking about this is evident but nevertheless these topics were still

prevalent. The topic also provoked considerable discussions of life outside work; families, partners, divorce, children, travel and hobbies.

The word downshifting was itself contentious; 'I suppose that I don't like the term downshifting, because I don't know I suppose it's like umm downsizing it's all of these things that suggests that going down there's something wrong with it. I think the language is invocative and inappropriate cause going down something could be an advantage you know' (Grayson). And the participants offered their own definitions:

> I think everybody whether it's labelled downshifting or upshifting we all employ strategies in our lives at different stages of your life (Kate)

> I suppose my definition for myself of downsizing downshifting sorry would be getting to a certain position within an organisation where I am comfortable I can still see the challenges be happy that someone else is whatever the particular area of development that I've developed being happy for someone else to take that on and go with it and for me to you know go on and do other things and I suppose that's where I am here at Acorn University (Kate)

> I think this downshifting is like a big filter and I think people have their own filters and everything goes into the top and they sort of filter it out and what comes out is what they have to do or what they feel they have to do or whatever and it's like this funnel (Pete)

> you end up focusing on the sort of have tos rather than would like to and in actual fact that's the problem though because the like tos are the things that really enrich everything else (Pete)

> Cause I suppose a downsize a downshift for me is finding a manageable level of (work) (Daphne)

The question of who can downshift has framed this analysis. What identities are constructed as suitable for downshifting? What are the implications of these identities? What are the discourses which are drawn on to legitimate a decision to downshift? This analysis seeks to contribute to an expanded understanding of downshifting and experiences of this phenomenon in higher education.

Identifying with downshifting; the parent

A number of participants identified themselves as having downshifted, either in the past or more recently. Those participants who identified themselves as having downshifted, had done so for a variety of reasons including family commitments; 'when I went part time after having the babies' (Nina); 'when I had children I thought maybe I need to move on and there were shifts involved so

there was earlys, lates and nights and that was sustainable when I had my son my first one but when I had my daughter it would just, it would just have been a nightmare' (Iris). Other reasons included: 'rest, recovery and renewal' (Alan).

These downshifts occurred in a variety of forms, for some it involved moving to part-time/reduced hours of work (Nina, Louise and Sally), re-entering education and changing careers (Iris), taking unpaid time out of work (Alan), not seeking promotions (Nina and Sally), or a change in thinking (Pete, Daphne and Kate).

For two people, Louise and Sally, who identified as current downshifters, this downshift involved a reduction in their contracted working hours. To do this, Sally used the Flexible Working Regulations 2002, which provided parents and carers with the opportunity to apply for flexible working. Her initial request was met with resistance from her manager, with regards to 'teaching cover and workload';

> I suppose she didn't say no you can't but she did "but the difficulty is and blah blah blah and I don't know if I'd be happy to support it really" and I was like yeah OK then, it didn't feel easy to do (Sally)

But when this same manager was leaving the organisation she was 'giving out pardons like Bill Clinton' and offered her a day a week off, to give her some 'breathing space'. The request which was subsequently made for a trial period of six months and later became permanent, was written on the basis of 'supporting my son rather than I want to go out and play' (Sally). In order to qualify for this change of contract, Sally had to be a parent and had to make her case based on the need to care for her child. The legislation therefore provided her with the opportunity to downshift.

For Sally, being able to reduce her hours was dependent on her making a case on the needs of her child. On 30th June 2014, the Flexible Working Regulations 2014 came into force. These regulations allow any employee, who has been employed for a minimum of 26 weeks to apply for flexible working. This extended the right to apply that had previously only been granted to parents and carers. This change in employment regulations potentially makes it possible for a wider group of employees to apply for flexible working and therefore downshift in some way.

For Louise, the prospect of becoming a grandparent for the first time was a consideration in her decision to downshift and contain work:

> I think only one of my children will probably have children and I wouldn't want to be so busy with work that I missed out on enjoying that and supporting her (Louise)

Becoming a parent was a reason why Alan considered downshifting:

> At the time you know I either one of us could have given up our job and really the I was quite prepared to do that and, and for my wife to become the earner and for me to be the kind of carer house keeper to do that it quite appealed to me to do that (Alan)

The strong connection with a parental identity and downshifting is also apparent in both Iris and Daphne's comments. Not being able to claim a parental identity was considered as a reason for not downshifting:

> I'm definitely not having more kids, that's a definite no (Iris)

> I don't have any I'm single you know I don't have a family (Daphne)

Thus a particular discourse of family which involves being a parent and claiming a parental identity legitimates decisions to downshift. Not being able to claim this identity constructed downshifting as an illegitimate decision. This strong connection between parental identity and downshifting is suggestive of the work-life balance discourse which is inherent in the particular definition of downshifting used in this study. This discourse has a tendency to conceive of only those with families, particularly mothers, as the group of people for whom the containment of work and achievement of work-life balance is appropriate (Ford and Collinson, 2011; and Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007).

Long hours and the self-governing subject

In this study, as in many others, including Archer, (2008b), this group of academics discussed their experiences of long working hours, and working in the evenings, at weekends and in their holidays. The institutionalisation (Foucault, 1982) of long hours was experienced as a feeling of 'being on call' (Nina), 'a lack of boundaries' (Louise), and a lack of 'headspace' for anything other than work (Pete).

> I almost felt that I had to leave the country in order to have time for myself, where I felt free from the kind of pressures of work (Louise)

Louise's comment was echoed by others, particularly Alan in the interpretations focus group. Work is influencing all aspects of the Principal Lecturers' lives. As Gronn, (2003b, p153) stated 'greedy work consumes one's life'. The personal is implicated in the professional and vice-versa. The institutionalisation of long hours is brought into being through a number of mechanisms of power relations which include; self-governance, choice, seduction, surveillance and the intensification of work.

Archer (2008a) talks about the discourse of flogging oneself in higher education. This discourse attaches a powerful status to overwork, which can become a badge of honour amongst academics (Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra, 2013; and Chapter 2). The discourse impels people to embrace long hours; they are required to take up subject positions in relation to this discourse (Archer, 2008a). Some, become passionately attached to overwork, it is an important aspect of their identity:

> I think I do manage my time well I think I need to be better at saying no to things and it's a bit of a, it's a bit of a joke in our department that like (name) will kick me under the table at our department meetings if they want a volunteer and he goes "don't you", but I'm really bad and think it just sounds like a little job that, I'll get involved (Daphne)

In her interview Daphne talked about her frustrations with working long hours and putting in holidays and then moving them to accommodate work. Despite this it seems that she continues to volunteer for additional responsibilities. This is illustrative of technologies of the self (Foucault, 2007b). She wants to do more, she is volunteering for more work, and her notion of self is tied up with her 'interest in lots of things'. Daphne, is a self-governing subject, she experiences her overwork in a two-fold way, she is both subject to, an undesired experience of overwork, and subject of, a desire to do more, to be a flexible neoliberal subject (Archer, 2008a). The discourse of flogging oneself impels Daphne to embrace her subordination as a productive subject who governs herself.

The self-governing subject is also evident in the experience of overwork as voluntary. Louise illustrates this:

> I actually felt really ill with working too long hours, I kind of and I kept thinking you know this, this is not good for me, I shouldn't be doing this but you kind of feel like you haven't got a choice (Louise)

189

Louise's comment 'that you feel like you haven't got a choice' illustrates the power of this institutionalisation. Complaining is illegitimate, because she feels like she has chosen to do this additional work. Discussions of overwork were particularly relevant for those who were involved in research. For Alan research is 'an important part of my identity even if it's a smaller part of what I do', but 'I end up doing my research on weekends by and large apart from the odd few hours I snatch during the week occasionally'. To engage in an activity which was an important aspect of Alan's sense of identity, he was working weekends. Similarly Louise, discussed research as a hobby:

> Louise: I think that the research is something that the majority of academics do almost as a hobby if they want to and I kind of feel a pressure to stay research active because I'm supervising at PhD and EdD level so I do feel a need to keep on doing my own research. But I pretty much do it like a hobby you know

> Nina: on top of everything else

> Louise: we have a bit of time within our workplans don't we kind of scholarly activity. But most of it is things I just do because I'm interested in doing and I enjoy writing but you know it's on top of the job really it's not part of the job.

The use of the term hobby is significant, Oxford Dictionaries (2015) defines a hobby as 'an activity done regularly in one's leisure time for pleasure'. Defining research as a hobby thus signifies, both where and when it is done, outside of work, and why, for pleasure. There are a number of layers of power relations operating, there is the seductive pleasure that engaging in research gives individuals, which serves to legitimate additional work. There are the demands of the job, including the supervision of postgraduate students, and the facilitation of external relationships particularly in international work (Alan), for which engaging in research is desirable. Pete talked about 'this pressure for research and wanting to research'. He experiences the pressure of institutional demands to engage in research as well as the pressure which he exerts on himself, wanting to do research. He is both subject to power and a subject of power, which creates his desire to do research.

Ylijoki (2013) discusses the notion of an ideal academic life, which is used by academics to compare and contrast their actual situation to. The ideal academic life, characterised by solitary scholarly activity, and total commitment to one's subject can be considered a form of institutionalisation as defined by Foucault

(1982) for it appears to be a widely held academic cultural belief (Ylijoki, 2013). The importance of research to the Principal Lecturers' sense of ideal academic identities is demonstrated in the following quotes:

> I've always found since I worked here that I've never really felt like a proper academic in that I don't think that we ever had the luxury in the part of the organisation that I work in of having long stretches of time to go and do research and think and read and those things that I would see as proper academic working (Nina)

> What is an academic at this University? Or in any University really? Because a lot of my colleagues who call themselves academics, but the sense of being academics in terms of research outputs etc they wouldn't fit into that criteria they're more educationalists I certainly don't now call myself an academic because I, I don't have time to do any research even though we're being told we have to publish once a year we don't actually have the capacity to do the work to do the publications (Sally)

As Clegg (2008a) writes, 'how to be a proper academic is a moving goal; moreover, one that is fraught with ambiguity' (p336). Not engaging in research is as significant for the identities of these individuals as engaging in it is for others. The traditional model of academic leadership built around subject expertise is possibly influencing their thinking (Chapter 2). The ideal academic life is seductive and desirable and brings power relations into being, as academics strive to fulfil this ideal. Research, it appears, has become a marginalised activity, subordinated to the other aspects of work, which very much depends on the particular Principal Lecturer role, but which was experienced universally as time consuming. Thus, doing research requires Alan, Louise, Pete and Daphne to engage in what Archer (2008a) calls invisible extra work. Without which the research would not get done (as in Sally's case). In this way research becomes an individual's responsibility and the self-governing subject provides the means through which this can happen.

For Alan the marginalisation of research in his working life and its importance in legitimising his identity as an academic became a reason for choosing to downshift:

> I've considered this as well taking a day off or two days off a week let's say for a year in order to pick up research again because I am research active but it's pretty tenuous you know I am publishing but it's not the level I'm not doing the reading I should be doing there's a real resentment that the only way I can achieve that which should be an academic outcome would be to actually go off the salary and come and

get off and you know not be part of the academic environment in order to pursue my academic career (Alan)

Here the responsibility for engaging in research and finding the time to do so is transferred from the institution to Alan and would involve the personal sacrifice of salary and pension entitlements. Whilst the benefits of engaging in research on an individual level are recognised by Alan as; intellectual stimulation, satisfaction, promotional opportunities and external recognition, there is a reluctance to acknowledge the institutional benefits which derive from his or others engagement in research. In his interview the only reference he made to this was the following:

> a good academic profile is very important as well to demonstrate that the university does to research and does engage in meaningful scholarship and values you know values that that kind of thing highly (Alan)

This discourse of research equates success as personal, in terms of reputation, or career advancement, which serves to mask the institutional benefits of its academics engaging in research. This encourages individuals to bear the burden of doing research and accepting the long hours which can result. Thus, the discourse of flogging oneself and the institutionalisation of long hours intersect with the discourse of research.

The institutionalisation of long hours creates fears that downshifting wouldn't work. Both Nina and Alan believed that reducing their contracted hours wouldn't reduce the amount they actually worked:

> I've considered similar, similar things in the past and actually when I started off working in academia I was working part-time and doing freelance work but I just found that the academic work expanded to fill the week and I eventually bowed to the inevitable in a sense and took on extra hours so that I was being paid in theory for the hours I was doing although it actually expanded beyond the five day week (Alan)

> I don't think it really works unless you can be very structured in your week and as we've already said and quite a lot before I think when you're in a PL role a leadership kind of role it's very difficult to say I'm never going to be working on a Friday for instance and I know that other lady in the focus group said she does that but I, I imagine it's very hard to do you have to be extremely disciplined (Nina)

The greedy organisation is evident in their descriptions as is a sense of individual responsibility, 'you have to be extremely disciplined'. The burden is on

the individual to ensure that they manage their time. The voluntariness of their subjectification is again evident.

When talking about her downshift, Sally described how she negotiated her Academic Work Plan (AWP) and recognised that her ability to do this was perhaps because of her level within the hierarchy, her status and formal position of power:

> I think it's possibly because I'm at that level already that I found it easy to negotiate that, and I think you do need to be quite strong willed to make that happen and I think it's an issue as well for managers to support their staff and enable them and empower them to be able to say no and not feel guilty and just you know if somebody looks at you thinking you lazy cow that's their choice (Sally)

> if you're more senior you have the luxury of making more informed choices and having more power to say what you want to do if you're younger and you're new you tend to have to acquiesce and take what you're given (Grayson)

Grayson also recognised the influence that came with seniority, this he linked with age (a subject I shall return to later). Thus an ability to downshift effectively would appear to be linked with the formal position of the academic, those in more senior positions such as Principal Lecturers have a greater ability, as a result of their status to influence structural processes such as AWP in such a way as to protect themselves from overwork. This appears to contradict their understanding of themselves as powerless (Chapter 4). Maybe the difference is about whose working lives they are able to influence. Earlier it was others' lives, whereas here it is their own.

What is also constructed is an image of those who do downshift as lazy and selfish; Sally refers to others thinking she's a 'lazy cow'. Similarly, in describing his temporary downshift; which involved a period of unpaid leave in which he went travelling Alan describes his reasons as selfish:

> I think it was just it was just enjoyment it was about it was very much about rest and recovery. I became a little bit ill after I finished my PhD because I did my PhD while I was working here full time over about a 5 year period so I was, I was, I was quite exhausted and burned out at the point and I think I actually had to take several weeks off work a couple of months after I'd finished my PhD because it was a delayed physical reaction I wasn't very well but I was already in planning to do this trip at that point so it was about rest, renewal some of it was also just about fun

and adventure you know and enjoyment you know quite, quite, quite a selfish, selfish motivations (Alan)

The downshifter is constructed as lazy and selfish for wanting to pursue other interests, placing them either temporarily or permanently more centrally in their lives. The institutionalisation of long hours and the discourse of flogging oneself delegitimise decisions to downshift and construct the selfish downshifter. The construction of research as an individual's responsibility and as an individually realised benefit produces the self-governing subject through which invisible extra work is legitimised. The marginalisation of research can also create a desire to downshift in order for people to find the time to do that aspect of work which gives them the most pleasure and that which is associated with a position of power.

The older worker

The discourse of age was interwoven with discourses of health and the body. Ainsworth and Hardy (2008) discuss the 'master cultural narrative of aging as inevitable decline' (p392). This is evident in the discussions of downshifting. Age is constructed as a signifier of anticipated as well as felt bodily decline.

> Partly age you know so I'm (age) and sometimes I, at the moment the level of work is such that you actually do worry about the impact on your health so when I was writing the submission documents I actually felt really ill with working too long hours, I kind of and I kept thinking you know this, this is not good for me, I shouldn't be doing this but you kind of feel like you haven't got a choice, so I am very fit I am very healthy, but you kind of think you know that can that can change can't it and it's not it's not very good for you to work at that level and to be sedentary for those numbers of hours it's very unhealthy really (Louise)

> I think age is quite significant actually, not because I feel old, but it's like I don't wanna work, I don't wanna retire at I don't know, I think I'll be, I think if I can stay here I think I'll be here till I'm 65. I don't have any, I'm single you know I don't have a family, not a family sort of tie, I do have lots of friends and I like doing lots of social things, but I do enjoy work but I couldn't keep up with this pace until then to be honest, so I think it's more about sustainability and being healthy and just keeping a better perspective on it all and you know I think I can enjoy work without working till half seven every night or something you know (Daphne)

> Yeah I'd, I'd hate to get to retirement and then feel like I was too knackered to enjoy it. Health definitely (Daphne)

This construction of age enables Louise and Daphne to talk about their bodies and their health. It enables them to discuss the 'pace' of work and the 'long

hours' involved and how this is experienced physically. Age legitimates a desire to 're-balance' in terms of work and everything else (Louise and Kate) and to 'leave it in work and not have to think about it at home, or do extra stuff at the weekend' (Daphne). Age creates a space for them to challenge the institutionalisation of long hours and invisible working in which they are participating. Age also provides an escape from the pressures of work through organisational mechanisms such as phased retirement. The structural conditions of work such as the long hours are confronted only at the level of the individual; there is no attempt to challenge the necessity and occurrence of these conditions in general. The individual bears the brunt of these conditions, in terms of their bodily decline, through ill health or exhaustion. The individual is responsible for detecting these bodily signs which are recognised as arising from the working conditions, but it is the body that is constructed in a limiting way. Their bodies are preventing them from continuing to participate in work in the same way.

There is a particular body being constructed as suitable for academic work, one that is fit, healthy and young. There is a great irony here, bodies have largely been ignored or considered inconsequential in academic work, which has privileged issues of the mind (Bell and Sinclair, 2014). Being an academic is constructed as an intellectual endeavour, a striving for subject expertise in which the body is irrelevant (Sinclair, 2005b). Yet here we have a discourse of the body which constructs a particular body as suitable for academic work.

Being young or at the very least younger is constructed as necessary for academic working but being perceived to be a young academic can create a number of challenges in an environment in which 'the chronological acquisition of knowledge and expertise' (Archer, 2008b, p392) is seen as supreme. Appearing to be young/youthful creates barriers to being accepted as an academic by colleagues and students, who construct them as a novice (Archer, 2008b). Consequently younger academics engage in performative practices which include dressing in order to appear older (Archer, 2008b). This is a practice that I have engaged in, in my role as a Graduate Tutor, and recognise the experience of 'deliberating over whether to dress as myself' (Archer, 2008b, p392). Sinclair (2005b) highlights the hidden body work that women in particular engage in, so that their bodies are displayed appropriately in line with

organisational expectations. As both she and Archer conclude, students and colleagues 'use body appraisals as power tools to dilute female authority' (Sinclair, 2005b, p97). It is the male body that is constructed as the organisational norm and suited for academic work.

Whilst there is clearly a fine line between appearing too youthful and therefore naive and lacking in knowledge, being an older academic is constructed as being in physical decline which is linked to a constraining capacity to work. Thus the construction of a particular body as suitable for academic work is one which is young, but doesn't appear too youthful, is fit and healthy, which means it can't be too old, and is male, or is worked on so that it doesn't appear too feminine. This construction then of a suitable body is highly divisive and constraining for anyone who could be considered to be outside of this.

Age was also used to challenge the discourse of individual success, through the positioning of age as a reason for not seeking promotion:

> I'm fifty and a half now I haven't got a massive ambition to climb up the greasy pole very much further than I am, I don't want to be a manager, department head, or faculty lead or anything like that. I'm quite happy where I am. I don't lack ambition, I don't lack ambition, I want to be good at what I'm doing (Sally)

> Daphne: the promotion thing, there was a job came up and a lot of people said to me "I'm surprised you didn't put in for that job" and it was like it was just too much to think about, even putting forward a decent a half decent application at the time. So I think I'm going and I mean it's to do with my age as a woman, you know just a funny age and

> Kate: yeah I had that thought

> Daphne: Your energy levels

> Kate: about myself

> Daphne: You know so I think emm I think I'm going through that bit of a transition. That you know I think if I said that to my colleagues or friends they go ooh I wouldn't believe it because I think I'm seen as a slightly bit of a

> Kate: But it doesn't

> Daphne: bit of a perfectionist as well

> Kate: It doesn't make me any less conscientious about my work

> Iris: Oh no

Kate: I will still do my you know

Daphne: It's the perspective is changing. It's a job and sometimes I care too much about it, it's a job and think I'm actually it would be good not to care so much about it.

In the second extract from their focus group Daphne and Kate discuss their changing perspective towards work, which in Daphne's case includes the decision not to apply for a promotion. This change they connect both with their age and their gender. In his interview Pete also talked about a male colleague who had decided not to apply for promotion because he thought it was too late in his career. Pete considered that 'actually time wise it probably isn't probably got another 10 years or so but it was interesting to note that he'd sort of thought about downshifting'. So we see age as legitimating decisions not to seek promotion, it enables people to refuse upward career trajectories.

We have seen how ageing can be constructed as physically limiting, which legitimates desires for re-balancing lives, the challenging of the institutionalisation of longs hours and the refusal of career progression. The discourse of ageing appears to create the opportunity for people to downshift by legitimating their decisions; however age can also be constructed as a reason not to downshift as Nina said 'at this point really I'm just, just a bit too young'.

Improving other areas of life

There was recognition amongst the Principal Lecturers that downshifting could be used to improve other areas of life, including family life, 'I spend the day off doing those bits and bobby things that I would be doing in the evenings so I can spend time helping my son to study which is great and it has just really has made me feel much better' (Sally). However, the existing definition fails to acknowledge the impact on the downshifters' working life. For Louise and Sally, who have both reduced their contracted hours, it was the improvements to their working lives which were more significant, 'my students have a very happy me who bounces in' (Sally).

> so it kind of feels more manageable it feels more like perhaps like a full time job with maybe where you do a bit of overtime but you're not completely overwhelmed by it. So I feel like I you know it gets to the weekend the weekend's mine I might just check up on emails is there anything urgent? I maybe spend a few hours on a Sunday afternoon or something like that a Sunday evening doing a few urgent things but and I

might not work all Friday I might just work 4 or 5 hours on a Friday catching up with stuff. So it's more manageable (Louise)

Louise describes working more hours than she should, but she feels better able to cope and it gives her time of her own. Work continues to encroach on her life outside of the university despite having downshifted the institutionalisation of long hours and invisible working is still evident.

> it has just really has made me feel much better and therefore I think I am genuinely more productive at work cause I don't feel knackered, cross, angry, fed up etc etc etc. I was talking to a colleague yesterday and she was saying "Oh! I was up at 3 o'clock this morning marking argh, ahh, ahh," I said I'm really sorry you feel you have to do that. And when I was telling her what I was doing you could see her looking at me going you lazy cow. Well that's my choice! I do my job I think I'm doing it better than I was doing it when I was full time and you know I do feel more cause I was before Christmas I was really, really, really unhappy about being at work and working at Acorn University and now I'm in a position where I've got a plan but it's a long term plan, so I think I'll probably still be at Acorn University by Christmas whereas last year I was if I'm in that bloody place by April I'm going. Now, now I can cope with this, I've got a plan and it's you know, I feel quite good about it really, and it's just that one tiny seven hours, crazy, crazy stuff (Sally)

> I've really enjoyed it, I've really enjoyed it. It's completely surpassed my expectations of how much difference it would make to me. And people have commented that I look much better and I seem more positive and calm. I mean, yeah some people joke cause I've only been with my partner for just over a year now, "oh you know still in love", well there's that, but actually this is a bit different, I'm actually starting to feel a bit more comfortable about being with Acorn University still not in love with them anymore but I can live with them (Sally)

In these extracts we see how Sally's body, emotions and thoughts about work are intertwined. In talking about downshifting she reconnects with the emotionality of life and allows herself to recognise her body and the effects of work on it (Chapter 3). For Sally, downshifting has been used as an individual's strategy for containing work (Chapter 2).

The notion of a productive self, is very much part of her identity. When talking about the catalyst for reducing her contracted hours, Sally spoke of her 'constant frustration of not feeling I was being very productive', the change to her contract of a 'tiny seven hours' enables her to feel 'more productive at work'. Sally is judging herself in terms of productivity; she is subjecting herself to mechanisms of power, surveillance and discipline. Her employer is also benefitting from Sally's downshift. They have retained her when she was clearly

considering leaving; she has improved morale and considers that her productivity has increased. These employer benefits are expressed by Sally but are hidden within the personal benefits she has experienced.

When talking about how this change to her hours came about, Sally spoke of a 'stress plan'. This reference to a stress plan highlights a human resources (HR) driven response to Sally's experiences of work.

Acorn University has a stress management policy, which uses the Health and Safety Executive's (2014) definition of stress as; 'The adverse reaction people have to excessive pressures or other types of demand placed on them at work'. This policy, places responsibility for managing and monitoring stress with the individual and their line manager and where stress is identified as a risk requires them both to 'engage with the stress management procedure' (Acorn University, 2013b). This procedure involves a series of meetings between the two parties in which they identify work and non-work related stress, its causes, develop an action plan and review progress. By asking employees to identify non-work related issues the university is making explicit links between these and work productivity. This ritual is reminiscent of the confessional, and the belief that through the verbalising of our thoughts the truth can appear. We can transform ourselves; become a happier less stressed person, by changing ourselves, our thoughts, our actions (Foucault, 2007b). Such a notion suggests that with awareness of our selves comes freedom, that we are able to alter our situation, 'remake the world that precedes the subject' (Mayo, 2000, p105). This process 'unfolds within a power relationship' (Foucault, 1976, p61), the one who listens, the line manager, is in a position of domination over the one who speaks.

The view that emerges is that stress can be managed, if the individual and line manager follow the correct procedures. The role of HR in this process is to provide 'appropriate guidance, support and development opportunities' (Acorn University, 2013b). This cascade notion of HR policy, places the responsibility for implementation with managers.

Stress is perceived and articulated as the individuals' problem and the policy states that individuals should 'recognise their own responsibilities in maintaining a healthy lifestyle and appropriate work-life balance' (Acorn University, 2013b).

199

In this way employee grievances are individualised, they become the responsibility and fault of the individual, lying in some deficiency of their character or pathology (Fleming and Spicer, 2003). Once established these then can be addressed through appropriately identified and action planned training and development. In such a way, the challenging nature of the work environment can continue unabated. This is the process that Chandler, Barry and Clark (2002) noted, the individualisation of stress which can facilitate 'a blaming of the victim', (p1056), and divert attention away from the causes of stress such as other people and their actions.

The psychologising of grievances was evident in others' talk as well. For instance Louise described the complexity of her role and teaching commitments in the following way:

> So I've got kind of unusually varied teaching responsibility from level four and foundation degree to PhD supervision so and like most things in between, little bits of most things in between so that I can kind of be part of different staff teams. And maybe that's partly my choice, maybe I could be a programme leader and actually only know a little bit about one of the kind of courses within it. But I would feel that I wasn't doing my role. So some of it's probably coming from inside as well (Louise)

She positions the insatiable demands of her job as a personal fault/character deficiency. The vocabulary of choice indicates her responsibility. Similarly Daphne describes work in the following way:

> I think it does feel all-consuming this sounds martyrish but you know the time I spend in work has definitely increased I find that I personally find that hard to just put things down at 5 o'clock or something, it's just impossible (Daphne)

It's her fault she can't stop. The volume of work and its complexity are irrelevant. Others use the psychologising of grievances to position those who cannot cope with the demands of the job as personally lacking in management and organisational skills or a sufficient understanding of the job. The job isn't the problem, it is the person who is deficient (Fleming and Spicer, 2003). This echoes the dominant leadership research agenda, in which success/failure is considered to be equated with the individuals' leadership qualities (Jones, 2011).

> The other side of that as well because I know some people who work not just in this organisation work lots and lots of hours but they're not very

> organised so they end up doing, it takes them twice as long to do something. I'm quite grateful to be quite organised so you know I'm quite succinct in things I do (Kate)

> Some people get a kick out of it some people thrive on this being a martyr to the cause, look at me you know I'll tell you how good I am, I read everything, I'm here for everyone, and I do this. And well I've met very few people who can do all of these things that well and I think they have no sense of how to find the strategies to work better (Grayson)

This understanding enables the workplace practices to remain fundamentally unchallenged, which is reminiscent of the work-life balance discourse (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007).

Sally and Louise understand their downshifts to have improved both their home and working lives. Although for Louise downshifting did not enable her to disengage from the long hours and invisible working. The psychologising of grievances enables Louise to position herself as the problem; it is her fault and her choice that she continues to work so many hours. In this way complaining about working conditions becomes illegitimate, because the fault lies with the person not the institution. An example of the institutionalisation of the psychologising of employee grievances is Acorn University's Stress Management policy, which positions stress as an individual's problem and responsibility.

A change of thinking

In her study of younger academics Archer (2008a) identified a practice she termed psychic disengagement, in which people attempted to detach themselves from work disentangling their mind and bodies either through working from home, or mentally dis-identifying with the job. The reconnection when it happens between mind and body can be overwhelmingly negative, as Alan described:

> I became a little bit ill after I finished my PhD because I did my PhD while I was working here full time over about a 5 year period so I was, I was, I was quite exhausted and burned out at the point and I think I actually had to take several weeks off work a couple of months after I'd finished my PhD because it was a delayed physical reaction I wasn't very well (Alan)

In his interview Pete described what can be considered to be a process of psychic disengagement:

recently as I said I hit this sort of metaphorical brick wall and that has fundamentally changed me literally this week where I've thought actually I can't keep going at that pace I can't you know I was so exhausted I just thought no I can't you know I've got to be careful with this I'm not going to be good to anyone if I'm just like really really tired. So I think the sort of landscape changes and then you have to readjust the filter a little bit. So whereas during the day I'd always be trying to make the use of the time sometimes like today if I haven't quite you know if I've had 10 minutes where I haven't been sort of focused on something then that hasn't worried me whereas before I'd be more concerned about actually what can I do now? Can I do that? What about that? You know whatever it might be so I think that's interesting (Pete)

obviously that has impacts on anything else your physical state and everything else so I think that was quite an important thing so I'm trying much harder to so I suppose slowing down I suppose slowing down when I first saw that I thought well I'm not really slowing down, so I don't think because I was in today at seven thirty so in one way I am, but slowing down is a sort of catch all term isn't it? Or appears to be which most people will associate with you know doing less, or whatever so I'm not sure if it's doing less I think it's just it's just it's just that bit that Van Morrison sings about with enlightenment, chop wood, carry water, enlightenment, chop wood, carry water so it's about that sort of mind-set so you're doing the same sorts of things, chopping wood and carrying water in his case all the same sorts of activities but your view of the whole thing is different (Pete)

In these quotes, Pete separates his mind from his body, he appears to be doing the same things, he is in at seven thirty, routine for him, but he describes how he thinks differently about it. This separation enables him to cope with the bodily effects of work, exhaustion and tiredness; whilst making only a slight change to his behaviour, to be slightly less demanding of himself, to watch himself less, 'if I've had 10 minutes where I haven't been sort of focused on something then that hasn't worried me'. This self-surveillance, is an example of being subjected to power from oneself, (Foucault, 1982), which operates to discipline oneself, to hold oneself accountable, to ensure, in this case, that he is being continually productive.

This idea, that he has an 'internal psychological realm' separate from his external reality, is an important theoretical distinction. Fleming and Spicer (2003) propose 'a radically social understanding of subjectivity' in which 'belief is not necessarily something which is inside us - a rather psychologistic proposition - but somehow outside us, or as the Russian linguist Voloshinov (1973) more accurately puts it in between us' (p169). This does not exclude an experience of belief as interior, as with Pete, but it also allows for identification

202

to take place externally, 'in objects and actions', which allow us to free up our subjectivity to imagine anything we want; what we're going to have for dinner and the shopping we need to do on the way home (as Iris described in her interview) for example.

Pete continues to 'chop wood and carry water' he is still externally identifying with an image of a productive self which is demonstrated by his continuing to put in the same hours. Within his statement is both an acknowledgement of his body, its fatigue, and at the same time a denial. His activities and exertions have barely changed, but he has seemingly found a way to become a more effective master of his body.

Bell and Sinclair (2014) argue that bodies are 'cast as unnecessary, intrusive or incidental to reasoned academic work' (p271) which privileges the intellectual mind and demands total commitment. Thus his focus on his change of thinking, as opposed to changes in his actions, might well stem from this cultural norm. In the interview Pete doesn't confront the working conditions/practices which have caused these ill effects, the excessive hours and working in his holidays, his embodiment of being an academic does not at this point allow that.

In the interpretations focus group, he does begin to confront the consequences of his academic life, which impacts on his sleep as well as his days off, but this is still framed in terms of his need for 'headspace'.

> I think for me the critical things in this profession if we call it a profession as opposed to an occupation, so if I look at say the girl I was going out with until fairly recently, she was a (job title) when she finished work that was it OK so she did do shifts and stuff but she didn't have anything else in her mind, and she'd just you know do the garden or whatever she wanted to do in her days off so physically it was a lot more demanding so she was doing shifts, working nights all of that but her mind was very very clear so physically I'm not necessarily doing nights but the number of times I wake up or I'm wandering around the house thinking about something, problematising that, partly because of study but this pressure for research and wanting to research and to try and do it I think that's where it comes from because you just it's very difficult to just park it and leave it and even a conversation I had with some colleagues earlier today they were saying about "oh if you're on holiday, just if we email you stuff if you just look at it you know because if you're not going away it doesn't really matter", and I was saying well yes it does matter because it's not about whether I go to the Seychelles or whether I sit in my garden or whether I clean the kitchen floor it's about the headspace that you have and I think that, that is the most demanding and back to Grayson's

> point that's one of the difficulties that we do have with post 1992 it's trying to do everything, it's trying to be a teaching institution we've still got pressure with REF and research and we can't ignore that because that makes us competitive and all of that sort of stuff and people wanna do research plus we have quite a lot of admin bureaucracy (Pete)

For Pete the notion of a profession is invoked to explain the total commitment demanded by the job. The desire to do research is seductive and brings power relations into being as he strives to fulfil this desire. It is clear that Pete is thinking about work all the time, it is central to his understanding of himself and his identity as a professional. Casey (1995) uses the term corporate colonization to refer to the way in which employee identities are appropriated by companies, so that employees are 'company people even at home' (Fleming and Spicer, 2004). Casey describes these employees as neurotic and obsessive/compulsive for allowing their identities to be appropriated in this way. An unsympathetic view which pathologises the individual, it's a personality disorder that causes this to happen.

In my study I am interested in how my group of employees' identities come to be and the discourses and power/knowledge which are used to claim or assign identities and qualify them as truthful. Here, we have the discourse of profession being used to refer to being an academic as something more than a job/being an employee; being a professional is an identity of its own; an identity which is interlinked with long hours and personal sacrifice. The discourse of profession does not merely describe social reality but it creates it, being a member of a profession requires surveillance of yourself and others to ensure that your focus and behaviour is appropriate. Daphne describes how this surveillance of self is extended to the surveillance of students:

> I think in our profession particularly our profession there is you know people say things like "if you stab me I'd bleed (colour)" cause that's the colour of the uniform we work, you live, I live in breath (profession), you know it's something about you, it's inbuilt into you and I think because the sort of philosophy of the profession is very it's humanistic and it's very person centred. I think actually you know we, we almost judge our students if, if it becomes about them, on the course cause it shouldn't be about them because they're there to provide a service to someone who's more disadvantaged than them I guess (Daphne).

Daphne suggests something of the 'historical limits' (Foucault, 2007c, p115) of her 'person centred' profession which is focused on particular persons who are

204

constructed as vulnerable and disadvantaged in comparison to either themselves or the students. This attention on the vulnerable other, will she suggests, always construct personal needs as illegitimate.

Sally also describes the identity of the professional and the personal consequences, 'burn out' that can result. The notion of a professional identity therefore provides another mechanism for legitimating the everyday norm of long hours and the discourse of flogging oneself.

> not being co-dependent it is challenging for health care professionals because our raison-d'être is to care for people and be self-sacrificing, but actually it doesn't do anybody any good in the long run cos the rate of burn out in healthcare professions is high, and all the student's get is this really sort of urgh tutor who's urgh (Sally)

Pete recognises the institutional demands to 'do everything'; teaching, REF, administration. This he frames as a necessity within the economic discourse of competition. Within this discourse there is no space to challenge the organisational demands, or to search for other agendas for the institution to pursue. The notion of competition also focuses its gaze on the external environment as opposed to the internal institutional responses. It is the changes in the external environment which are the problem. Competition according to this view necessitates a response which is in line with market conditions, i.e. what other institutions are doing. This response mobilises mechanisms of power relations, including university strategies and faculty operating plans.

It also mobilises individuals to try and be everything/do everything. In her interview Louise, talked about the seductive lie that the institution presents its academics. This lie says that you can do everything, be a teacher, a researcher and have a leadership/management role:

> so I think you have, you have choices but unfortunately at the point where you don't always you're not fully aware of the choices, cause in a way I don't think the university's totally honest with people about you know that these are, these are your choices and they kind of present, they do like to present the image that you can almost like have it all, like you know a woman who goes out to work and has children you can like you know have a research and academic career and you can you know have a leadership management role and I actually don't think that that is possible. But it may be in some parts of the university but the bits of the university I've worked in it doesn't really seem possible so I think there's quite a lot of wasted research talent because of that (Louise)

205

Looking back Louise was able to recognise that she had made choices, which for her, meant that she had had '14 years of good intentions' to do research, but she could now see that this had not been entirely her own making, that she was structurally located and produced. That desiring to do and be everything was also a product of the university's making. An identity that she considered it was impossible to fulfil. The pressure that she had felt to do research, as well as everything else had been experienced as a form of surveillance, as she monitored and judged herself on her ability to manage these competing and contradictory pressures. The desire that she had had to claim this identity had not been entirely of her own making. It was and is in the university's interests to cultivate not only the identity of the 'all-round' academic, but the belief that this identity is a possibility. As it creates the self-governed subject, like Louise, who continuously strives to do everything, accepting the institutionalisation of long hours and invisible working, seduced by a belief that this identity is desirable and possible.

Archer's (2008a) term psychic disengagement describes a process which is expressive of a number of my participants' experiences. For Pete this enables him to think differently about work but his external practices, i.e. identifications, continue to align with an image of a productive self, for which he exerts himself fully, performing his job to the best of his ability. As such the organisation is unaware of the change and continues to benefit from his efforts. It would seem that Pete has in effect become a more effective master of his body. As such the power relations may have been subtly strengthened, as his change of thinking enables him to more carefully monitor and control his body.

His denial of his body is in keeping with the cultural norm in which bodies are considered unnecessary to academic work. This helps to ensure that working practices remain uncontested. Alongside the discourse of professionalism an identity is constructed which involves long hours and personal sacrifice, requiring surveillance of yourself and others.

Not seeking promotions

Not seeking promotions was prevalent amongst the Principal Lecturers. As we have previously seen, age was used to legitimate decisions not to seek promotion. In addition to this was the sentiment that the financial rewards on

offer were not sufficient for the additional stress, strain and responsibility of taking a more senior position. There was a pervading sense that staff are just a 'cost line' to the university and that management hides behind talk of the value of staff:

> It's interesting in our faculty we're having various meetings about the faculty strategy in relation to the university strategy and one of the points that came up in this is what the executive are thinking and talking about based on the feedback is called the myth that the university doesn't care about its staff, and actually it's very clear in the university strategy that staff are important after all we all want happy staff. That was the statement on the presentation slides. I'm thinking (sits up straight, arms rigid to sides, fixed smile) I'm going to smile now and be very happy (Sally)

> I think what you said Sally it reveals that in a sense a detached wishful thinking there that, that either is unaware of the reality or is wilfully ignoring the reality. You know so it could be a very, very cynical, just a very cynical statement, saying, saying, what they feel they ought to be saying or what people want them to say it's not really what they think. I mean most of us have suspected it's quite wilful and that they do know and they don't really care that much and it's really just about kind of empire building (Alan)

In the situation described by Sally the explicit objective of the executive is to reassure staff that they are important to them, but the manner in which they do it, by naming staff expressions of a lack of care, a myth, creates the impression that they believe that there is nothing wrong. It closes down opportunities for discussing why staff feel the way that they do and how this might have been created. Thus by labelling staff fears a myth, they are able to maintain hierarchies; they are the dominating ones, able to control the topics of discussion. The invocation of the university strategy as evidence of their intent is illustrative of the manner in which they are understood to wish to lead and be seen to care, through policies, the written word, which is at a distance from themselves and from the staff referred to in the policies.

One of the effects of this talk on staff, which is incongruent to their experiences of working within the institution, is to produce a bodily performance, as demonstrated by Sally, in line with the particular staff member constructed, a happy one. The executives' desired staff body legitimates an element of surveillance, to ensure that staff are seen to be performing appropriately.

The purpose of management's behaviour is interpreted by Alan as the maintenance of power differentials and the notion of empire building he refers to is reminiscent of Bolden, Petrov and Gosling's (2009) description of disconnected leadership, in which 'holders of devolved budgets pursue their own objectives' (p268).

The uncertainty of their positions was in contrast to management's talk of how valuable an asset they are as staff. In my notes following the interviews, I wrote:

> Struck that all of them at different ages and stages in their careers are at points/can see them coming, where decisions/changes in their lives are imminent. The uncertainty they all live with (Cockman, 16/04/14)

Some were instigating these changes themselves, for example those who were applying for/considering promotion, and Louise who was preparing for retirement. Five of the participants discussed faculty restructuring and the potential personal consequences of this, (applying for different positions, demotion, new managers), some were unsure of their place in their faculty because of new management/heads of department and one was in a temporary role.

The insecurity of their positions was maintained by the university's talk of financial insecurity. The constant drive for efficiencies and productivity savings created an exaggerated impression that the university's financial security was under threat:

> Louise: Yeah I thought a few weeks ago I was working in a university that was about to go bankrupt
>
> Sally: yeah
>
> Louise: but I'm assured that I'm not by someone who I actually think probably you know has got an ear to things well enough to know but I actually felt the way that we were being kind of spoken to repeatedly in meeting after meeting and attempting to plan new courses and being pushed back to come up with like more efficient you know approaches to work planning that we were literally at the point of going bust and ahh I don't think that's the case
>
> Sally: It's not
>
> Alan: No no no it's not it's, it's a, it's a search, it's a search for uhh for increased profitability and kind of expansion and empire building

208

Alan expressed the view that despite the university's talk, economic uncertainty was nothing new:

> you would always say that well the future's looking unsure and things are about to change and they have they have changed but actually this university has continued to make, make money I think....overall you know I think it's been a quite a successful money making operation (Alan)

At the same time as experiencing these efficiency drives the university were investing heavily in financially supporting an external, corporate event, which contributed to the feeling of being a part of a 'schizophrenic organisation'. One which was telling its employees they must save money whilst at the same time spending significantly on activities unrelated to 'core business'. Schizophrenia was also used to describe Alan's experience of a faculty health and wellbeing campaign which coincided with industrial disputes over pay and management threats to deduct peoples' pay for short walkouts that had been agreed by the unions and Iris's experience of initiatives constantly working at cross purposes.

Similarly to Bolden, Petrov and Gosling's (2009) description of disconnected leadership, the institution is pulling in different directions; and agendas are competing for prominence, which is experienced as incoherence. This adds to the feelings of uncertainty expressed by the Principal Lecturers.

Louise, Alan and Iris talked about bullying. For Alan and Iris there was a reluctance to claim their experiences as bullying, 'I felt like I was being bullied but then you're always your never quite sure at the time' (Alan). 'I was treated not unfairly would be too much but there was certainly if there was ever any issue about a meeting or whatever and I was struggling to get my mum to pick the kids up from school or whatever you know very shifty eyes around the table sort of thing' (Iris). For Louise, bullying was a reason not to apply for promotion:

> Declining promotions I mean I see my manager kind of being seriously ill through workplace stress and take early retirement when I wouldn't have expected them to. And, it's not so much the work pressure, it's partly the work pressure, but I wouldn't go for promotion here because of elements of a bullying culture within our faculty. Which actually, to the extent which has dissuaded many women from seeking promotion. Having seen what negative effect it can have on someone who was very capable and seemed a very resilient person I think it's a level of risk that I wouldn't personally be prepared, be prepared to take (Louise)

For Louise, gender is an important factor in refusing promotion in her faculty. Not seeking promotion is a positive move, through which she and others can avoid negative experiences.

Their experience of senior management as distant leaders, disconnected from the operational challenges of higher education (Chapter 4), is a reason that both Louise and Daphne give for not wanting to apply for promotion. Whilst they wish to reject this way of leading, they both seem to suggest that it is inevitable that they would end up being distant leaders themselves should they take promotion.

> I actually probably wouldn't have wanted to go to a senior management role anyway because I actually care about the area of work that I've come from and I wouldn't want to go to a more senior management role where I was more divorced from that. So there would be other reasons not to seek promotion (Louise)

> I think I've tried to have one foot in the dark side and one foot in the light side. I don't really have any aspirations to go into full time into the dark side or any higher up but cause I still, I wouldn't like to lose that perspective of what it feels like on the ground (Daphne)

The negative impact of promotions on the aspects of work which the Principal Lecturers found enjoyable was another reason not to seek promotion; this was particularly pertinent for those engaged in research. As the participants feared that promotion would prevent them from engaging in an already marginalised activity:

> I think it is interesting this bit about declining promotions or not seeking them. When I was a senior lecturer when the PL role came up initially I didn't apply for it because I was interested in it, because I suspected which has proved to be the case, it would impact significantly on my studies and my ability to do anything else (Pete)

> I'll have to see how it goes if I if I do get promotion whether the research will go out the window, or whether it continues (Alan)

The sentiment that the financial rewards on offer for promotion, were not in keeping with the additional stresses and strains of the job was prevalent amongst this group of Principal Lecturers. The university's talk of the value of staff was experienced as disingenuous, particularly when the uncertainty of their positions was maintained by talk of financial insecurity and incoherent agendas. Other reasons given for not applying for promotion included bullying and a fear of becoming a distant leader. Not seeking promotion might be considered a

practice of resistance, as the Principal Lecturers resist the increasing workloads and changing priorities that they associate with promotional opportunities.

Creative space

Creativity was linked to leadership and the enjoyable aspects of work (Chapter 4). Downshifting represented an opportunity to fulfil desires for more creative space/opportunities.

> I could go back a little bit and perhaps go onto a smaller scale contract and then try and be disciplined enough to you know to use that other time to do other work, research, creative work, which is also something I used to do a lot more of, as a you know I used to be a musician a long time ago, so so yeah so it's been around for a long time it's always been part of part of my my notion of what work could or should be about actually for a long time (Alan)

> Cause I've always actually had a more creative side and I might just like do something more creative and I've got quite a few ideas for kind of children's books some of which are kind of almost ready to send off, and some which need more work on and need and some which would need quite a lot of you know sustained commitment to writing for a year or so so I'm not quite sure I can't I haven't decided yet which way to go really. Cause I think we all have different potential within us and it's almost like well I gave the academic bit as good a go you know perhaps I need to spend you know the next kind of decade doing something completely different (Louise)

> Pathetically I did some document formatting for a colleague, she's done a really nice booklet to give out to an external client, but she's not very good at word processing, and I'm sad I can, so I spent a whole day setting it out formulating it, making it look really professional and I really enjoyed that, I thought how pathetic is that, that something down to formatting a document has actually made me feel productive and creative. I think I felt so frustrated that I wasn't producing useful things for people that's more about me rather than the job perhaps (Sally)

Alan describes downshifting in terms of reducing his working hours. He talks about the self-disciplinary practices needed to ensure that he uses the time for 'other work'. Although, as we also heard earlier, Alan includes research, a key aspect of his job and his sense of identity, as one of the activities he would use the time for.

There is a feeling of loss articulated in each of these statements; a longing to do other things, 'creative things' such as music, writing, or design work. There is a sense that academic life has stifled their creativity. Sally continues to evaluate herself in terms of productivity and usefulness and in so doing also

211

individualises her experiences, 'that's more about me rather than the job perhaps'. Yet the others echo her sentiments.

Daphne describes how the opportunities within work for creativity are being lost. The intensification of work and the need to take on so many roles and switch between them, Pete describes as compartmentalisation (Chapter 7). What is being done, must be accounted for, it must be capable of monitoring and modification. In other words it must be the subject of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1978; and Chapter 7). In such an environment, creativity is dangerous, for how can it be held to account? In Chapter 4, we heard how creativity is a requirement of a particular identity that of the entrepreneurial leader, who is teacher. In some aspects of the teaching role of the academic, creativity is cherished, Daphne and Louise, refer in particular to the activities of curriculum and course design. But even in this regard, Daphne describes the reducing opportunities for creativity. What is required of the academic is a limited expression of creativity, in line with 'academic frameworks' (Daphne) and institutional agendas.

Whilst not all of my participants described themselves as engaging in research, Alan did. Given that both the ideal academic life (Ylijoki, 2013) and the closely associated traditional academic leadership model, construct the academic as subject expert, one might imagine that meeting the demands of original research and publications must involve some element of creativity. This suggests that Alan might, therefore, enjoy greater opportunities to be creative than perhaps some of his non-researcher colleagues. However, this doesn't appear to be the case. We heard previously how his research is becoming an increasingly marginalised activity, his consideration of downshifting as a solution to finding the creative space to do it, suggests the disciplinary potential of the ideal academic life, to govern whole lives to meet its demands.

There is a sense of loss with regards to creative spaces within these academics' lives. The disciplinary potential of the work-life balance discourse is also apparent, as the damaging effects of work are experienced and understood as personal as opposed to organisational problems (Chapter 2). There is a palpable feeling of self-blame, Alan, needs to be more disciplined, Sally, suggests the problem is her, not the work.

Financial considerations

Financial implications were a factor in people's considerations of downshifting both the longer term implications on pensions as well as immediate reductions in salary. Thus economic security is used both to legitimate and reject decisions to downshift.

> I was hesitant about the decision cos I was concerned about impact, I've had to look at my pension and stuff all that sort of thing (Sally)

> I've got nothing to lose apart from a bit of salary which as it turns out is hardly anything, cos I rang HR last week and said I think you've over paid me, my salary hasn't particularly dropped and she went "no you've just dropped a tax bracket" (Sally)

> I couldn't downshift at the moment financially I just couldn't manage it (Nina)

The literature regarding academic identities is awash with references to the changing context of higher education, (see Archer, 2008a; Archer, 2008b; Garratt and Hammersley-Fletcher, 2009; or Ylijoki and Ursin, 2013). In all of the discussions of insecurity and the implications for identities barely any attention is given to the economic security of academics. Where I have found reference to economic insecurity it is in reference to those in research posts (Archer, 2008a). This absence raises a number of questions; is the notion of economic security missing because this is not an issue for those who are generally researched in higher education? Is there an idea that academics are somehow not interested in monetary rewards? That being interested in these issues taints you in someway?

Research in higher education has tended to focus on those in formal leadership positions either at the top or close to the top of the institution (Bryman, 2007). Furthermore, it has been biased towards reflecting the experience of 'white, middle-class men' (Lumby, 2012, p4) and is American in character and origin (Bryman, 2007). This focus might account for the absence of concerns regarding economic security. Archer's (2008b) study was of younger academics some of whom were in short-term research posts and were experiencing economic insecurity acutely. Ylijoki (2013) describes the 'wage earner mentality' of some young academics; again her quotes are from researchers. This mentality she associates with seeing academia as a job, in which in exchange for salary researchers will work effectively during office hours, but will not

engage in the institutionalisation of long hours and invisible working. This identity, I can only speculate, (having not researched these 'younger academics'), is perhaps influenced by the short-term nature of their posts, the lowly status associated with these positions, as well as their age, which enables these academics to challenge the institutionalisation of flogging oneself. Gender is also a factor of economic insecurity as women are more likely to be associated with precarious roles in higher education (Morley, 2013b). Thus there are participant characteristics, in terms of job role, age and gender which are relevant to experiences of economic insecurity and which have been absent from much previous research in higher education.

In my own study, monetary rewards were only mentioned once outside of discussions of downshifting:

> I you know am very unpopular at the moment because all the strike action and I sort of look at my colleagues and think do you know what I would have given to have your salary and the hours that you work back in the day when I was on 16 grand a year working 40 hours a week. So I have limited sympathy I must admit with the current action which you can imagine doesn't go down very well (Iris)

Here, Iris who came into academia from the medical profession sees the salary as adequate reward. As did Nina:

> I don't have any desire to go up the ladder I'm on a good salary and I think I have enough responsibility and I think if you go up the ladder you get a lot more responsibility for not much more money in this university and I'm not convinced that I want to do that at all (Nina)

This feeling of satisfaction might account for the absence of monetary rewards and economic security in the participants talk. The relative security of their positions, (in comparison to contract researchers), as they are all permanent members of staff, as well as their status within the university hierarchy and ages might also mean this issue is less pertinent to them. However, its presence in their discussions of downshifting suggests the partiality of this view. Economic security, however that is achieved, is important to the participants and downshifting enabled them to talk about this.

> If I won the lottery does that count? Lottery win, rich husband, yeah, I mean yeah essentially what I'm saying is if I didn't need the money I would downshift tomorrow I have no qualms (Iris)

214

But I think just for financial reasons we, we realised that I was probably going to earn a bit more the job was fairly well paid but not as well paid as mine plus she'd had to give up the job as part of the process which meant that it would have been harder for her to go back on the ladder (Alan)

Iris and Alan both articulated a desire to escape academic life but need the job and the economic security that it provides. The kind of downshifting implied and discussed by the participants when exploring economic security was moving to reduced hours/part-time working. For the younger academics identified by Archer (2008b) and Ylijoki (2013) who long for the security and salaries of academics like this group of Principal Lecturers, the notion that downshifting isn't possible because of their need for their continued level of economic security would perhaps be considered an affront, if you can't downshift when you are in their relatively economically secure position then perhaps it is out of everyone's reach.

Ylijoki's (2013) 'wage earner' academics both think and do work differently. This way of thinking about work wasn't part of the discourses of work of my participants. The change of thinking downshift described and experienced by Pete didn't result in the same effects to his practices; unlike these 'wage earners' he continued to engage in the long hours and invisible working. Perhaps these younger academics are thinking and doing work in a way that this group of Principal Lecturers would be envious of as Kate described:

maybe in the past there's been periods of, of my life where work was the most important thing and everything else was secondary and I think now I'm much more balanced in that respect and I think with me that's just come through time and experience and getting older. I'm envious of the people who can get to that point much younger yeah yeah yeah I'm not being patronising cause you know I do I do think other people find that much younger and I do take my hat off to them (Kate)

The absence of this way of thinking and doing work from the discourses of the Principal Lecturers could be associated with their notions of being academics and the institutionalisation of flogging oneself, which has formed both the conditions of their existence and their desires to exist in this way. This institutionalisation is acknowledged by the 'wage earners' but they have found a way to refuse participating in it, they are less willing to buy into the governmentality of the soul, which may be a function of their relatively shorter time in academia, or the product of other conditions.

215

If, you only feel able to talk about economic security when discussing your escape from higher education, a level of discomfort and almost disdain for the topic of monetary rewards is suggested. This is in keeping with the notion of the academic as a professional for whom long hours and personal sacrifice are a requirement.

Role for management

Everyone agreed that there is a role for supportive management of downshifters. Be that for people who wish to downshift temporarily or more permanently.

> the culture and the policies of an organisation should support that (Kate)

> there should be a supportive environment that isn't about reprimanding or anything. It should just be the ability to let that person float for a couple of years without making them feel awful (Iris)

> there's a role for managers if staff go part-time, if I was managing someone part-time I'd say OK what strategy are you putting in place to make sure you are part-time. I've got some colleagues who do their part-time working by working five shorter days and one of them is really good at it one of them's rubbish at it and works five full days and I say but you're only getting paid for four are you mad? She says "oh yea but you know and I can take the time when I need to". I think you do need to be quite strong willed about it. Because the organisation will take advantage if it feels it can (Sally)

> But I've had interesting different reactions to that from kind of more senior management. Because I raised it last year and wasn't, (name), didn't want to engage with it at all....to the extent that I kind of thought well I'll leave it a year and I've raised it with the line manager this year and got a much more sympathetic response. I think the organisation is a little bit unclear about what the university's position is on that and how supportive or otherwise it is of that kind of downshifting (Louise)

The greedy organisation (Bottery, 2004) is apparent in Sally's description, as is the need for individuals with support from their managers to resist its demands. Sally describes those who can resist as 'quite strong willed'. There is a sense that to be successful requires one to be self-serving and self-protecting. The selfish downshifter is again being constructed, as resistance is somehow illegitimate, because it's not in the best interests of the organisation. The powerful discourses of work and the ideal worker construct downshifting as an abusive act of power, for it becomes a question of commitment. Why would

anyone ever want to downshift, if they are totally committed to their job and the organisation, as the notion of the ideal academic demands?

The confused organisational response that Louise describes is likely to continue as the institution wrestles with competing discourses and their outcomes. On the one-hand they present the image that academics can and should want to do it all (Louise and Pete), mobilising mechanisms of power relations, including university strategies, faculty operating plans, and the notion of the ideal academic to do this (Chapter 6). Whilst on the other, they are required to react to changing legislation such as the Flexible Working Regulations 2014, which extended the right to apply for flexible working to the entire workforce. That academics should want/need to request flexible working is problematic when you are expecting total commitment and long hours.

In the following extract Alan describes HR's response to his enquiries about taking a sabbatical, which he considered to be a temporary downshift.

> I did actually enquire recent more recently about this probably about a year and a half two years ago about you know about how I could go about taking a sabbatical and so on and they told me I'd need to make a business case, that was that was their exact wording make a business case for, for taking a sabbatical and they gave me a few sort of guidelines for doing that (Alan)

> So you know they appear to have a sort of procedure and form that you fill in for this as they do for everything but you know in a sense I, I kind of thought that was interesting because to me it's kind of obvious it's obvious why somebody would want to do that and actually what the benefits might be to the university in the long run yeah. But even the terminology of, of, of the business case is kind of interesting I think it says something about a certain kind of way of thinking a certain kind of discourse, institutional discourse (Alan)

The use of the term business case is suggestive of a particular approach to workplace practices which might be considered downshifting, an approach which values an objective quantifying of the costs and benefits of a proposal. Such an approach is underpinned by ideas of diversity management, and stressing the organisational, business benefits of diversity (Doherty and Manfredi, 2006; and Chapter 2). It is also suggestive of the neoliberalist view of academics as resources. Resources whose productivity is continuously under review (Ball, 2012a). Thus, they must account for their needs to downshift in terms of productivity gains and losses.

Alan views the employer benefits as obvious. To him, it appears that the institution is hiding behind the business case. The bureaucracy of the process, the form filling, also serves to dehumanise the procedure. A confused organisational response is again constructed. It is possible to temporarily downshift in this way; there are organisational policies and procedures to enable it. Yet to admit that such a downshift is necessary runs counter to their ideas of academics and what they should do. There are conflicts of interest hidden in these seemingly benevolent employee friendly policies.

Conclusions

This study has sought to contribute to an expanded understanding of downshifting and experiences of this phenomenon in higher education. Although participants were not familiar with the term downshifting, they were each able to provide examples from their own lives, or those of friends, family and colleagues who they considered to have downshifted. Examples included; 'reducing working hours', 'people changing careers', 'not seeking promotions', 'declining promotions', 'going back to practice' and 'preparing for retirement'.

A number of identities arose in discussions of downshifting including that of the parent, the self-governing subject, the older worker, the all-round academic, the selfish downshifter, the professional, and the happy employee. These identities and the discourses used to legitimate them at times provide space for people to discuss the deleterious effects of work on their bodies, health and minds and to challenge the institutionalisation of long hours and flogging oneself, but at others are used to disqualify downshifting as a desirable option.

The discourses of work, work-life balance and the ideal academic collide and contradict one another. The work-life balance discourse creates desires for holistically balanced lives; whilst discourses of work and the ideal academic suggest that academics should be totally committed to their work and the university and therefore accepting of long hours. Each creates expectations regarding appropriate behaviours and actions and can be experienced as a form of surveillance as individuals judge themselves and others in relation to them.

The analysis suggests that the university, understood in this case to be senior managers and HR personnel and policies, is confused about how it should

respond to downshifting requests. As I have previously proposed (Chapter 2), employers are interested in the rolling back of work in the interests of their organisation. This is indicated by the requirement of a business case for academics wanting to take a sabbatical, in which they must detail the likely productivity implications. However, to accept that an academic should want/need to downshift is problematic, because it challenges the notion of the ideal academic. One way in which this is resolved is to individualise grievances, as is the case with stress management. Thus the problematic experiences of work are due to an individual's deficiency, there is something wrong with them.

The definition that I began with was:

Downshifting essentially involves slowing down at work in order to improve other areas of life. Downshifters employ an array of strategies to achieve their desired balance, including but not limited to; declining promotions or not seeking them, reducing working hours, changing careers or withdrawing from the workforce (Laabs, 1996).

Many of the critiques of work-life balance initiatives can be applied to downshifting, the term still constructs a parental identity as one for whom work-life balance is important and legitimate. However, it does also allow for others to be constructed as legitimate downshifters, including the older worker. However, there is a sense that to downshift, and to claim an identity as a downshifter, there has to be something wrong with the downshifter; they are ill/their body is failing, they are unable to cope with the demands of work, or they are selfish. Particular discourses are drawn on to support these understandings, many of which, such as the discourse of research, construct the individual not only as a free and choosing subject, whose experiences of overwork, self-discipline and surveillance are voluntary, but as the sole beneficiary of their choices. Thus the employer benefits of their choices, which might include; reputational benefits, reduced absence, retention of staff and consequent reductions in recruitment or training costs, and improved staff morale, remain in the background, masked by the articulations of employee benefits.

For some Principal Lecturers downshifting involved a change in thinking, however, this psychological disengagement can actually operate as a form of surveillance, as the downshifter continues to perform their job in such a way

that the institution is unaware that anything has changed and continues to benefit from their efforts. Thus the downshifter becomes a more effective master of their body, its monitoring and control as they separate their mind further from their bodily experiences of work. The consequences of the reconnection when this happens may well be overwhelmingly negative.

It would appear that downshifting for my participants was a response to workplace practices; the denial of the body, the institutionalisation of long hours and invisible working and the damaging effects of work. These practices are legitimised by discourses of flogging oneself, professionalism, and the psychologising of grievances. These operate in such a way as to position problematic workplace experiences as an individual's responsibility and fault. So that complaining about working conditions and practices becomes illegitimate. Therefore, whilst downshifting appears to offer employees control, enabling them to contain work, it can also operate as a silencing strategy, as changes to workplace practices and conditions are taken off the table. The current focus of the discourse of downshifting on its potential to improve other areas of life, as opposed to its potential for improving working life (as was the occurrence for the downshifters in my study), is a continuation of work-life balance initiatives to ignore the need for changes in working conditions.

Despite the significant personal implications of engaging in the practice of long hours suggested by the Principal Lecturers, the cost to the organisation is minimal, as it experiences little resistance to its continuation. This suggests the high level of rationalisation that this system of institutionalisation enjoys, as it is engrained as a 'normal' experience for academics. Ageing is used to challenge this institutionalisation, but this is understood as declining bodies limiting their capacities for work, as opposed to a challenge on the necessity and occurrence of these conditions. Therefore, this represents only a minimal challenge to the long hours experienced, as the structural conditions of work continue to be confronted only at the level of the individual.

Critiques of work-life balance debates challenge the inherent limited conception of work (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007; and Chapter 2). Both its tendency to ignore the damaging effects of work as well as the enjoyment that work can bring. In this regard I will leave the last words to Daphne:

But actually I really enjoy work I think I just want to you know leave it in work, and not have to think about it at home, or do extra stuff at weekends (Daphne)

Chapter 6: Discourses of the individual and their consequences

Introduction

I proposed in Chapter 2 that one of the dominant work-life balance discourses is that of the ideal worker (Ellem, 2005; and Fujimoto, Azmat and Hartel, 2013). This constructs the ideal worker as a 'man' who is fully committed to his pursuit of paid work, unencumbered as he is by familial responsibilities (Aluko, 2009, p2100). A similar identity of the ideal academic is also created, an individual who is so dedicated to their work, that they have no time for life beyond the academy (Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra, 2013; and Anaporte, 1993). The ideal academic life, Ylijoki (2013) characterises as solitary scholarly activity, and total commitment to one's subject. The ideal academic, I shall argue in this chapter, is a form of institutionalisation (Foucault, 1982), which operates to regulate behaviours, to discipline academics in relation to this norm (Foucault, 1978).

The ideal academic

Within my own data, the total commitment demanded by academic life is most evident in the institutionalisation of long hours which was at various times experienced by all of the Principal Lecturers and is discussed in Chapter 5. Despite significant differences in their roles and responsibilities as Principal Lecturers, the discourse of research is clearly important to their identities and their notions of the ideal academic, and for those who engage in research a particular contributor to experiences of overwork. The discourse of research, as utilised by the group, and discussed in Chapter 5, constructs research as a personal pursuit, thus it is understood in terms of the personal benefits derived, be that; pleasure, satisfaction, intellectual stimulation, external recognition or career advancement. This individualisation creates a sense of personal responsibility for doing research and accepting the conditions within which this work is completed; 'I end up doing the research at the weekend partly because I might be slightly more relaxed but also that's almost the only place where I'll have the time to do it' (Alan). Thus research is invisible extra work (Archer, 2008a), hidden from immediate view, done at home, in the evenings and at weekends; 'on top of the job really it's not part of the job' (Louise), (Sikes, 2006).

What is striking in this discourse is the general absence of talk about the institutional benefits of academics engaging in research. Alan, mentioned the reputational benefits derived from academics engaging 'in meaningful scholarship' in his interview just once. In the second interpretations focus group Pete, described the benefits of engaging in research and being identified as participating in the UK's REF, at both a subject group and institutional level. However, the tensions surrounding those who are identified as researchers, is clear in his description:

> a couple of weeks ago one of my colleagues in [department] was saying that one of their colleagues who's sort of got a designated more of a research role, they all felt quite unhappy really that this person was just doing their own research and stuff and really they ought to be and you know they're in the team they're in the subject group really they ought to be more involved. So I think that's quite an interesting.

> ... but then that example that I gave you earlier, a few weeks ago a colleague was saying actually you know we don't really like that it's good in terms of the team when you talk about REF for example, when someone's you know identified as participating in the REF OK that's great for like the subject group in that we've got sort of good REF works but in terms of like as a team and working together that's another matter (Pete)

The REF is a national research audit, which takes place every few years and is designed to measure and evaluate research outputs, the outcome of which determines research funding for the years until the next audit (Leathwood and Read, 2013). The REF is a complex 'means of bringing power relations into being' (Foucault, 1982, p223), mobilising individual and organisational responses. It enables comparison between individuals, departments, faculties, and institutions.

Participation in the REF is influential at an individual, department, faculty and institutional level. 'The outcomes are public and bring reputational as well as material rewards to those seen to achieve in this system' (Leathwood and Read, 2013, p1163). Being 'seen to achieve' within this system therefore, brings significant benefits for the institution. Even outside this system, the institution gains from income and reputational generating research projects. These activities can have significant implications for the standing of the institution within the competitive league table environment. Yet, in Pete's description of the benefits of engaging in the REF we see the positioning of researchers as

outside their teams. This is seemingly in conflict with the participants' views of the status of research within the institution. Pete for example, considers that academics who engage in research have the highest status within the institution. In addition, Iris recognised a status differential between research and teaching, as discussed in Chapter 4. Despite proclamations of the value of teaching, her experiences were of priority being given to those pursuing research publications rather than those developing teaching innovations or national teaching awards. She also recognised a requirement for publishing, if she was to be promoted. Louise also recognised this status differential and the reduced status she had because of not publishing more widely. She also indicates what counts/not as research at Acorn; writing for students is out, as is supervision.

The Principal Lecturers appear to be contradicting the system of differentiation that operates between institutions, which positions one group of universities as superior to the other, and posits that Acorn is a 'teaching university', in which a teaching identity will be most significant (Chapters 1, 2 and 4). Their experiences suggest that this is not the case, and indicate that a status differential between teaching and research also exists within this institution, in which research is associated with privilege.

> I suppose in an educational institution if you're not so research orientated then back to the status thing.....at the heart of it in the core is the sort of professors and staff who have got a a strong research background and then you've got sort of the this is all notional of course but then you've got academics out there who do do research but not to the same extent and then you've got say non-academics who don't do an academic role etc and then you move further out (Pete)

> I know there's discussions that there might be progression routes on teaching, but I'm a PL now, and I can't imagine that there's going to be much going on above which is based on someone's ability to teach as opposed to based on their status in the world of you know research or publications on their CVs or getting invited to do talks and that sort of thing I think that has to be there in order to move on really (Iris)

> because I don't really have any role you know I supervise PhD and EdD students but I don't actually have any other kind of official role within the kind of research world other than you know I can attend lots of things and participate in lots of things but I don't really so I don't have any kind of status or standing within the university and although I have kind of written quite a lot for students it's not really that's got a different kind of status

that's more of a kind of a professional status than an kind of academic status (Louise)

It seems that the focus of this discourse of research is again on the individual, (their status and promotional opportunities), not the institutional benefits. Perhaps because of the way in which it is done, where and how it is completed, the act of doing research is hidden from others and so they don't understand what doing research means, which serves to alienate those individuals in particular who are designated as having a research role, in the way that Pete describes.

So the ways in which the Principal Lecturers do research, at a physical distance from the institution in their homes, and when it is done, at evenings and weekends, constructs research as an individual pursuit and reinforces the view of research as beneficial for the individual as opposed to the institution. This personalisation of the benefits of research, serves to mask the institutional benefits, in a similar fashion to the ways in which work-life balance discourses hide the organisational benefits of people engaging in seemingly benevolent employee-friendly working practices (Chapter 2). Here research is being constructed as an employer-friendly practice; Principal Lecturers who wish to engage in research are compelled to do so 'on top of the job' and encouraged to accept this. The self-governing subject, as discussed in Chapter 5, provides the means through which this is achieved. Those who choose not accept this find that doing research becomes impossible (as Sally discussed).

The perceived status differential between research and teaching within the institution was not universal. Both Kate and Nina felt that this did not exist. However, as discussed in Chapter 4 Nina described the ways in which externally, others position less research active academics as inferior and the profound implications this had for her identity as an academic.

> Umm yeah I think what probably happens is that you make a choice I'm going to be a good researcher and get published and blah de blah de blah or I'm going to be a good teacher and do that exceptionally well and I don't think I think here probably at [institution] I know there's pressure on getting academic colleagues to publish but I think with the introduction of the inspirational teaching awards it's not I don't perceive it as teaching is a you know the poor cousin in all that that there is the scope for being a good teacher or being a good researcher I think those more involved

with it might disagree with me but that's my perception from where I'm sitting (Kate)

The notion and use of choice occurred again and again throughout the course of this research. Kate's response to the challenges and pressures facing academics, when confronted with the 'enormous amount of time and energy' it takes to do teaching and/research is to propose an individually based solution; individuals must make a choice to do one or the other. The implication being that if you choose not to do this, then you are responsible for the consequences, it's your fault you are working such long hours for example. Yet even within Kate's proposal she recognises an institutional 'pressure to publish' which suggests that choosing is itself 'bounded within existing cultures and structures' (Small et al, 2011, p24). You are not free to choose whatever you wish, despite Kate's proposition otherwise. The notion of choice was also evident in the talk of those engaged in research; they felt compelled to accept the long hours and impacts on their lives beyond the academy because 'it felt like a choice'. The construction of the voluntariness of the levels of work required helps the Principal Lecturers to reconcile these demands and the negative effects on the rest of their lives.

Research is a key aspect of the university strategy, which talks about the importance of the economic and social benefits of research. This functional imperative of knowledge, (Whitchurch, 2012), is linked to neoliberalist ideals and its profit subtext (Ball, 2012b; and Chapter 1). A number of performance monitoring indicators are identified including: publications and citations; income; postgraduate research completions; and numbers of research active staff. The strategy has been operationalised by the faculties who have produced their own plans.

At the faculty level we see the first mention of the REF. In Engineering, for example, the numbers of REF eligible staff and volume and quality of research outputs are key performance measures. In Health, research active staff are expected to produce at least one 3* output per year. In Business, all staff with doctorates are expected to produce one publication per year. In Social Science, the priority is increasing the number and quality of REFable research outputs. Within these plans, we also see the personalisation of research, with

researchers 'encouraged to achieve their personal research goals' (Acorn University, 2014c, p3).

The 'disciplinary, analytical-practical grid' (Foucault, 1978, p84), is clearly in action. Academics have been broken down into research active or not. Being research active is determined by publications. As Teelken (2012) also concluded, it is both the number of publications produced *and* the journal in which they are published that determines whether the academic is suitable or not. Research active staff are constructed within this very prescriptive framework. Their expected behaviours don't end with publications but also include income generation and postgraduate supervision.

What is required of the ideal academic is becoming more tightly prescribed as it is colonised by this particular institution. The notion of what it means to be research active, which is a key aspect of the ideal academic life, is being constricted and confined to particular tasks. These are described as 'personal goals', but what is required is driven by institutional and faculty agendas designed to achieve clear outcomes with regards to social and economic benefits and monitored according to sets of indicators.

Based on these current prescriptions none of the Principal Lecturers that took part in my study could have been considered research active at the time. Given that those who identified as research active, discussed doing that work in their evenings, weekends and holidays, it begs the question, when will the work needed to achieve these new goals be done? As desires to do research were also indicated as one reason for downshifting (Chapter 5), this would suggest that increasing demands on academic staff struggling to meet their own research goals might accelerate calls for downshifting. Or alternatively it might cause others to pursue non-research careers, as many of the Principal Lecturers discussed (see Kate's comments above). This suggests that these institutional policies designed to discipline academic staff, may contribute to the continuing uncoupling of the research and teaching roles of academics, as discussed by Clegg (2008a), Gale (2011), Harris (2005), Sikes (2006), and in Chapter 1.

The confused organisational response that Alan and Louise described with regards to downshifting, (Chapter 5), is likely to continue as the institution draws

on the notion of the ideal academic as researcher, to mobilise and discipline academics, whilst being confronted by increasing requests for flexible working. One way in which this is likely to continue to be resolved is to individualise grievances, such that the problematic experiences of work are constructed as a problem with the individual, as opposed to the workplace (Chapter 5).

Changing expectations, with regards to research and teaching were identified as a source of tension, particularly by Iris and Pete.

> I think there is a lot of tensions at the moment between you know are we going to excel at teaching are we going to excel at research and there's clearly a push towards getting more researchers which will impact and you know according to the NSS scores satisfaction with teaching has gone down and I've no idea if there's a direct correlation but I just think it's interesting that the more people we get in whose primary concern is getting good research rather than being good teachers I think we run the risk of struggling in other areas of the NSS if we're all you know going to concentrate on one (Iris, interview)

In this extract Iris expresses the teacher or researcher dualism. According to which, one necessarily excludes the other (Chapter 1). Iris draws on the NSS as an indicator of 'good' teaching. Yet there were plenty of opposing views as described by Louise (Chapter 3) and Grayson:

> Well I think if you put the NSS as a survey in the context of the last 20 years I suppose all it does is reflect an obsession with monitoring, targets and being in some league tables. So the NSS is just part of a whole series of league tables, which exist in the health service, the school system, they exist everywhere. And in a sense what are you measuring I suppose. So we need them and we need to in a sense adapt our practice and we have to come across in a way that we will get the results that we need. So it's very, very instrumental isn't it? (Grayson, Interview)

These examples highlight the contradictory practices of neoliberalism as the discourse of managerialism is used to effect different outcomes (Chapter 1). Iris uses the NSS as a measure of teaching performance, which supports her calls for the need for greater focus on teaching as opposed to researcher academics. Whereas Grayson, uses it to critique current competitive practices taking place across the public sector. Grayson recognises the potentially performative nature of the NSS, as people change their practices to achieve desired results. Yet despite his reservations he cannot think beyond, the NSS is still necessary. The notion of the imagined market and its associated competitive practices is taken-for-granted. Archer's (2008a) words again echo in

228

my ears; 'the power of managerialism lies in its capacity to appear as the only 'thinkable context" (p272).

The following extracts explore experiences of the tensions between research and teaching.

> at Acorn I think that one of tensions that is most noticeable to me anyway, is this tension between being REFable and the whole research culture as opposed to the historical traditions of being a poly and you know getting people out into the world of work and employability and certainly within the department it's, it's almost turned full circle because it used to be that those of us with a practitioner background were very much the poor relatives and didn't have as much to offer as you know the people who've gone the school route all the way through umm and got the PhD and now that's gone full circle but you know as I was mentioning before I think the fear that that instils is difficult to manage (Iris, Focus group 2)

> this is part of the problem I think cos we're trying to be research you just gave an example there we need to do at least one paper so we're sort of trying to do that but at the same time we're trying to be vocationally focused and all of these sorts of things and it all sloshes around and this big pool of mixed up sort of identities and so I'm not sure if we'll ever be able to deal with that (Pete, Focus group 3)

> one of the things I do sort of think is changing is quite actually a lot ironically really you're doing a PhD is I think there's a danger particularly in the really vocational areas like hospitality management that there's a move or could potentially be a move too much towards that side of things i.e. the academic side which I think is important I'm not saying otherwise but we lose that level of sort of real strong industry experience which I feel is critical for the student experience so for example colleagues and I, I would say have got really strong international experience worked in quite a few countries and top quality institutions and very different roles and can draw on quite a lot of expertise….I think there is a danger of losing that which I feel that pre-1992 institutions tend to have suffered from a little bit in that they're very much research based which as I've said I'm in favour of I think research is essential but often you know taught by someone who hasn't necessarily got that level of experience which for some subjects is not so important so for example something like Finance, Financial Management you know a good grasp of that you know whether you can do that it doesn't seem to be as important as maybe the more vocational areas (Pete, interview)

Pete and Iris both engage in the breaking down of academics into groups, which privilege different kinds of knowledge, practitioners/vocational academics and researcher academics. Within Pete's subject discipline, practitioners' knowledge is based on their strong industrial experience, working in top quality institutions internationally. For Iris, practitioners' knowledge of the world of work

229

offers students opportunities which researcher academics could not, for example, they understand the challenges students are likely to face at work and can create specific teaching experiences such as simulation modules based on their own working lives.

Pete distinguishes between vocational and other subjects. He is drawing disciplinary boundaries, for example he suggests that colleagues in Finance do not necessarily need experience. Perhaps he is attempting to re-ascribe disciplinary boundaries, which are challenged when those outside educational institutions influence what counts as knowledge (Nicoll, 2008). The irony being that both he and Iris have been engaged in influencing what counts, based on their working backgrounds.

In their discussions, both Pete and Iris drew on the historical superior-inferior status differential between institutions, but they use it in an alternative way. Rather than casting their institution in an inferior light, they suggest that their post-1992 status is positive; it distinguishes them as superior in regards to teaching and the student experience. In doing so they also attempt to subvert the traditional status differential between teaching and research, in which research is attributed greater privilege and status than teaching (Chapters 1, 2 and 4). The notion of the ideal academic is being challenged, why must it be associated with research? They are trying to create space to be other kinds of academics, and other kinds of leaders, bringing into question the traditional academic leadership model, which is based upon subject expertise, research and publications (Chapter 2). To do this they utilise managerialist agendas, attaching a superior status to the operation of the business world and knowledge gained therein, compared with academia (Chapter 4). The discourse of managerialism offers these academics a way to challenge power relations which are brought into being through systems of differentiation utilised to maintain networks of privilege and to position academics from post-1992 universities such as Iris and Pete as inferior (Chapters 1 and 4). As I suggested in Chapter 1 managerialism can be used to serve a variety of interests. Yet, even in their attempts to challenge power relations, they are also captured by them, as with Sikes's (2006) study, they still consider research as essential to being a university, it is as Sikes pointed out, (writing about experiences in a post-1992 university of the precursor to the REF, the Research Assessment

Exercise), 'that people now felt pressurised to produce RAE returnable publications on top of everything else that was in contention' (Sikes, 2006, p565).

Others however, experienced the research strategy differently:

> I did read the new university strategy a couple of days ago and there's a huge emphasis on improving teaching and less I, and it might just be my reading of it, my interpretation was that there was talk in there on improving research outputs and improving the quality of the research that as a university we do but I didn't feel it was as big an aspiration as excellence in teaching and, and for somebody like me that's very encouraging cause that makes me think I'm in the right kind of university (Nina, interview)

> I was at a day yesterday with our faculty around the university strategy our faculty response, and it seems clear to me that although the university is pursuing a research agenda it's the applied nature of it that characterises Acorn's approach to it so I feel comfortable in that I'm interested in the practical the d bit of r and d. There is, publishing stuff, so it's being quite creative looking to publish some of my previous assignments that I did with my course in the [faculty] but my new boss did point out that yeah but they're not about [discipline]. But my research interest is that and I need to publish. So there's that issue as well. I'm making the link as best I can it's a bit artificial, it's around [topic] so [discipline's] part of that, but it's not distinctly [discipline] so I just have to fudge on that. If this was a red brick university then possibly that could be a bit more challenging, but it's yeah it's going to be interesting to see where the new strategy finally ends up (Sally, interview)

Nina and Sally are both based in the health faculty, and as I described earlier, the university strategy is operationalised by each faculty, which means that there are differences in interpretations, specifically in the key performance measures identified. However, in health there are still REF publishing requirements for research active staff and the 'disciplinary, analytical-practical grid' (Foucault, 1978, p84), analysis above remains applicable. Perhaps, for Nina, as someone who does not identify as research active, she still sees space to be her own type of academic within the institution. From this extract you might think that this would be as a teacher and yet she went on to describe her feelings of a loss of expertise, of 'deprofessionalisation' (Trowler, 1997). She responded by enrolling on an external MBA course to re-professionalise her work, in a new direction, away from her health background. She acted in keeping with the demands of the flexible neoliberal subject (Archer, 2008a), to adapt herself and her knowledge, positioning her existing knowledge as inferior.

231

Game (1997) articulates Nina's feelings when she writes 'feelings of intellectual insecurity and fearfulness are so familiar: fear of loss on the part of those supposedly in possession of knowledge and fear that self-possession will never be attained on the part of those without' (p390).

Sally is upbeat about the research strategy. She recognises the need to publish, but also indicates that it's not a matter of simply publishing, but about where and what she publishes. Her boss has indicated the importance of publishing in her discipline; this is a clear suggestion of the nature of the REF to create competition within institutions, as faculties compete with each other for research prestige. What she is being required to do is to fit with her particular faculty agenda for research; she is not free to pursue her 'personal goals' as the strategy suggests, but will have to 'fudge' her publications to comply. The strategy is a means of 'bringing power relations into being' (Foucault, 1982, p223). The rules and systems of surveillance, (Alan described check points), which it mobilises operate to get academics to comply and conform to expected behaviours.

I propose that the notion of the ideal academic is being colonised by this particular institution; whilst the ideal academic life is characterised by solitary scholarly activity, (Ylijoki, 2013), Acorn University, are prescribing what research is. Thus in order to be considered research active, an important aspect of the ideal academic life, one must publish, but where and about what must be designed to fit, both with the institutional and faculty requirements.

The ideal academic and the call of collegiality

The notion of collegiality was used by Pete, in the second interpretations focus group, to challenge the notion of the ideal academic, characterised by a life of solitary scholarly activity and total commitment to one's subject.

> But characterised by solitary scholarly activity, so there may be other views of it, and what do you mean by solitary, you know because there is this thing about academia involving you know collegial, the collegiate system so you know what does that mean? (Pete)

Interestingly, his descriptions of engaging in research are of long hours spent working on his own, but he draws on the idea of collegiality to present an alternative view. The notion of the collegial academic was important to Pete

who talked about the changes that had occurred within Acorn University which he understood to be detrimentally impacting on collegiality. He described these as 'invisible' and they included the increasing use of technology in place of face-to-face discussions, the lack of physical spaces to enable discussions to take place, the gradual erosion of regular informal meetings and the allocation of time to have them.

> there's the invisible things I think that technology has got a massive impact on it...everything virtually everything is online or online forms I think it significantly impacts on collegial discussions and I do think that's one of the things that affects this that academics are struggling to be academics a lot of the time you know that scholarly discussion and things like that

> I think what we're seriously lacking...suitable space those collegial spaces, when I was in the (building name) there were like little breakout rooms and sort of in the middle of the corridor there was these wide spaces with sofas and stuff and or chairs and you could sit and sort of informally discuss things there was a lot more of that

> the Wednesday afternoon sports things where there was always a gap where you could everyone knew that they were available then or that if you wanted to arrange something that that was generally a really good time to do it, that doesn't seem to exist anymore this is what I was talking about earlier these things under the surface sort of gradually disappearing and you just don't notice it you just don't notice it because you see it every day (Pete)

Similarly Iris talked about the erosion of opportunities for discussions with colleagues and in particular raised the changes to external moderation procedures as an example:

> the most important thing as far as I'd always been aware was when you had the board was to get your external there and have a discussion about your pass rates and "oh they were really bad what have you done?" And "oh they were really good" or "I really liked your assessment" that sort of peer support peer guidance from someone who was not affiliated with you other than being the external also opened up opportunities for across the staff group to engage with discussions about your pedagogies or however else you want to flower it up but your teaching and I think when that went and there didn't seem to be anything in place in order for that to happen...(Iris)

It became:

> all about getting numbers into spreadsheets and certainly as module leader you go you didn't even have to take any module reviews you just had to literally agree that the marks that were on the board on the slide were the ones that were on BlackBoard so there was certainly no

opportunity to discuss the experience or the experience of the students or you know if you'd done a module evaluation with the students did they like it? Nothing all of that went and it was only because we arranged it at a local level that it happened (Iris)

For Pete and Iris an important aspect of being an academic is engaging in face-to-face discussions with colleagues. Yet both describe how opportunities for these discussions and learning have been eroded. Diminished interaction between colleagues and the replacement of collegiate environments with competitive and individualistic conditions was a finding of Ogbonna and Harris's study (2004) of UK academics. But Tapper and Palfreyman (1998) write that:

> The emphasis upon collective governance and commensality can create the false impression of a collegial world in which social harmony reigns and individual competitiveness is conspicuous by its absence.
>
> What collegiality does is contain and channel conflict and competition rather than attempt to construct an idealised world in which neither are meant to exist (p148).

They challenge the notion that competition and individualism are absent from collegial environments. As I suggested in relation to the traditional academic leadership model, these principles aren't necessarily a function/outcome of managerialism but already existed in higher education (Chapter 2). Perhaps managerialism is simply another means by which these practices are encouraged and legitimised.

For Pete and Iris collegiality is a desire for a way of being. It is about providing opportunities for, and engaging in, particular types of face-to-face interactions with colleagues, 'scholarly discussions' about research, teaching, and pedagogies. This is perhaps their evolution of Tapper and Palfreyman's (2002) notion of intellectual collegiality? Whilst Iris took responsibility as an individual, to try and maintain one mechanism which provided the chance for the collegial academic to exist, the institution had slowly moved away from facilitating this way of being, through the use of technology and the 'gradual moving of bureaucratic, administrative type tasks towards the individual academic' (Pete), the reconfiguration of space, the student timetable and external moderation policies and procedures.

So whilst Pete might not like the view of the solitary scholar it is more a hope and desire for alternative ways of being that he longs for, as opposed to his own

234

experiences. Pete and Iris desire to be collegial academics but the institutional conditions suggest that this has become increasingly difficult as academics have become progressively isolated from one another and being an academic is constructed as an individual pursuit. Iris's formal position within the university hierarchy enabled her to keep the external examiner relationship going in the way that she thought was appropriate, without her level of authority this may have been far more difficult to maintain. Thus providing formal opportunities for collegial relationships to develop and these identities to be maintained is perhaps not open to everyone.

There is a lot written about traditional academic identities and their basis in collegiality. Garratt and Hammersley-Fletcher (2009) for instance propose that these emerged 'from traditional elite positions whose bearers were mostly white, male and middle class' (p315). Similarly, Spiller's (2010) study of chairpersons in New Zealand found that collegiality was used to sustain particular groups and maintain power differentials. She found that a belief in collegiality was heightened by the perception of it being under threat from managerialism, a position that Chandler, Barry and Clark (2002) also support. Whitchurch (2012) discusses this dynamic as a split between an implied 'academic autonomy and freedom, underpinned by the contribution of higher education to the advancement of knowledge and functional activity that is geared to institutional and socio-economic goals' (p102).

I don't think either Pete or Iris' responses can simply be understood as a reaction to the threat of managerialism. Chandler, Barry and Clark (2002) describe managerialism as associated with:

> greater disaggregation; enhanced competition; the use of management practices drawn from the private sector; greater stress on discipline and parsimony in resource use; a move towards more hands-on management; a concern for more explicit and measurable standards of performance; and attempts to control according to pre-set output measures (p1054).

Pete and Iris, as we have seen both in this chapter and in Chapter 4, argue for the translation of business practices and knowledge into academia, particularly in relation to the organisation of manager-managed reporting structures and mechanisms. In this they are both advocates of the managerialist agenda and calls for accountability and formal reporting structures. Yet, they challenge their

experiences of increasing isolation and the individualistic construction of what it means to be an academic, which have been noted as conditions resulting from managerialism in higher education (Ogbonna and Harris, 2004; Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002; and Rowland, 2008), by calling on the notion of collegiality. The complexity with which individuals interact with the demands of neoliberalism and the managerialist agenda and the tensions and contradictions this creates for their identities is illustrated here. As Chandler, Barry and Clark (2002) found, staff are 'engaged in emotional struggle, sometimes to control colleagues, sometimes to support them - in an attempt to preserve the vestiges of collegiality in the face of pressure to change' (p1065).

Spiller (2010) proposes that collegiality 'is a tired and even crippling narrative' (p689), as the various interpretations of the notion compete, making the job of the chairperson more challenging, particularly where collegiality is set in opposition to managerialism. The tendency for managerialism to seek unifying perspectives is evident in Spiller's argument (Winter, 2009; and Churchman and King, 2009). Her proposition is that because it is difficult to deal with, and 'can be a very confusing message' (p689), that it should be abandoned as the myth it is. In some senses my data could be used to support this abandonment, the notion of collegiality is potentially another means by which academics can monitor themselves, survey their activities and behaviours to determine whether they are meeting the requirements of collegiality. Given that others have suggested that collegiality is also about maintaining the power of privileged groups both within and between institutions, (Garratt and Hammersley-Fletcher, 2009; Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002; and Chapter 2), and my own data suggests that opportunities for developing and maintaining collegial identities within institutions are perhaps not open to everyone, another reason for cautiousness in calling for collegiality is raised. A reluctance to call for collegiality due to its association with gender bias and elitism has also been noted (Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002).

However, it is also important to recognise the position from which Spiller (2010) is writing, she accepts the current conditions of neoliberalism and the market orientation of the higher education sector and the requirements of 'accountability and performance' (p689). For her the real limitation of collegiality

is its inability to be useful to academics; it 'can no longer help academics and those in positions of academic leadership to stay afloat' (Spiller, 2010, p689).

This conception of knowledge, in which ideas are judged on the basis of their usefulness, is consistent with a technicist approach to learning and education (Grey and Mitev, 1995). Spiller (2010) is therefore, making a broader claim about the purpose of universities and higher education. She is articulating a managerialist view of education, and of the academic, in which universities and academics are positioned as 'producers' of knowledge which they impart to 'customers' or 'consumers' (Grey and Mitev, 1995). The anti-intellectualism that sustains such views corrupts the relationships between academics, and academics and students, collaborative relationships are challenged by the demands of individualistic endeavors, (Rowland, 2008). I suggest therefore, that collegiality troubles the academic manager/leader, (Spiller, 2010), because it has the potential to undermine the managerial purpose. This is the struggle that Pete and Iris articulate, between a desire for greater authority and control measures to hold other academics accountable, (to manage them), and a desire for greater collegiality supported and developed by the institution through various mechanisms, including the reconfiguration of space and altered policies and practices. This may well be complex as Spiller (2010) suggests, but in contrast to her, the understanding of collegiality that they articulate is one which has the capacity to improve the working lives of academics and themselves as leaders.

Conclusions

I have proposed that the identity of the ideal academic is a form of institutionalisation (Foucault, 1982), which operates to regulate behaviours and discipline academics in relation to this norm (Foucault, 1978). Ylijoki (2013) characterises the ideal academic life as solitary scholarly activity, and total commitment to one's subject. The total commitment demanded, was most apparent in the long hours which were experienced by all of my Principal Lecturers (Chapter 5).

My own data suggests a nuanced image of the ideal academic. As discussed in Chapter 5, discourses of age construct a particular body as suitable for academic work. One which is young, but doesn't appear too youthful and is fit

and healthy, which means it can't be too old, and is male, or is worked on so that it doesn't appear too feminine.

In this chapter I have proposed that the notion of the ideal academic is being colonised by Acorn University. Research is a key aspect of the ideal academic life and the institution is prescribing what research is. Thus in order to be considered research active, one must publish, but where and about what must be designed to fit, both with the institutional and faculty requirements. One of the potential consequences of these institutional policies designed to discipline academic staff, may be the continuing uncoupling of the research and teaching roles of academics, as suggested by my participants and discussed by Clegg (2008a), Gale (2011), Harris (2005), Sikes (2006), and in Chapter 1.

The discourse of research operates in such a way as to individualise the benefits of engaging in research, which include; career advancement, intellectual stimulation and external recognition. A sense of personal responsibility is fostered, which encourages acceptance of the adverse conditions of doing this work (at home in evenings, weekends and holidays). But doing research at a distance from the university reinforces the view that research primarily benefits the individual, rather than the institution.

This personalisation of the benefits of research, serves to mask the institutional benefits, and research is constructed as an employer-friendly, as opposed to employee-friendly, working practice. The damaging effects of doing this work come to be experienced as personal as opposed to organisational problems (Chapters 2 and 5). The self-governing subject provides a means through which this is achieved, as academics engage in self-surveillance and discipline themselves and others in relation to the norm of the ideal academic life.

Pete and Iris both challenged the centrality of research to the notion of the ideal academic, drawing on the discourse of managerialism to do so. This enabled them to challenge systems of differentiation utilised to maintain networks of privilege. However, even in their attempts to challenge power relations, they were also captured by them, and struggled to think beyond the necessity of research to a higher education institution. In writing this, I am aware of the possibility for misinterpretation. So I will try to be as clear as I can. When the practices of research, are being as tightly constrained as I suggest, we must be

aware of what we are arguing for when we say research is integral to higher education. Louise and Sally both described what counts or not as research at Acorn; writing for students is out, as is supervision, (Louise), publishing is in, but it must be within the discipline within which you sit (Sally). The university strategy and its faculty operational plans, clearly spell out what research is considered to be, primarily REF outputs in particular star rated journals. It is not the research that is valued, but 'the *signs* of academic activity' (Davies, 2008, p474) or 'the commodified form of that in terms of the output - the product that can be measured' (Leathwood and Read, 2013, p1170).

Whilst none of my participants argued for a change to understandings of research, perhaps as a result of their embeddedness in power relations, and their struggles to think beyond, I am compelled to do so. If we can work to expand what is considered 'research' then we can also challenge other networks of privilege. By virtue of their history and the many ways in which they overlap and interlink this will be a difficult struggle.

Pete used the idea of collegiality to challenge the characteristics of the ideal academic life. For Pete and Iris the notion of collegiality is a desire for a different way of being, which is understood to be in contrast to their increasing isolation as academics, and the institutional construction of an academic as an individual pursuit, in keeping with the solitary scholar, and conditions that have been noted by Ogbonna and Harris (2004), Chandler, Barry and Clark (2002), and Rowland (2008), as resulting from managerialism in higher education. However, I suggest that individualism and competition are not necessarily outcomes of managerialism, for it seems that these have been inherent in higher education for a long time. Managerialism perhaps provides a different means by which these practices can be encouraged and legitimised.

The complexity with which individuals interact with the demands of neoliberalism and the managerialist agenda and the tensions and contradictions this creates for their identities is illustrated by Pete and Iris. On the one hand they challenge the individualistic construction of an academic, calling for greater collegiality supported by institutional mechanisms, whilst on the other; they embrace managerialist calls for accountability and greater control mechanisms.

I have argued that collegiality has the potential to disrupt the managerial purpose for education, in which academics are 'producers' of knowledge which is imparted to 'customers' (Grey and Mitev, 1995). I recognise the reluctance to call for collegiality due to its association with gender bias, elitism and the maintenance of privileged groups both within and between institutions (Garratt and Hammersley-Fletcher, 2009; Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002; and Chapter 2). However, the understanding of collegiality articulated by Pete and Iris, which is fundamentally about building relationships with others; having the time and space for interaction with colleagues and discussions about what they do/would like to do, 'scholarly discussion' (Pete), and 'pedagogies' (Iris), rather than about the problems with data (Chapter 4), is one which has the capacity to improve the working lives of academics and themselves as leaders.

Chapter 7: Our version, your version

Introduction

Deem and Brehony (2005) argue that rhetoric is often compared and contrasted to reality, as if one is more real than the other. Thus they raise three questions; is language changing? Is reality changing? Or is language 'constitutive of reality'? A Foucauldian interpretation distinguishes between language and discourse; 'discourse is the conditions under which certain statements are considered to be truth' (Ball, 2013, p19). Thus discourse constrains or enables what can be thought, practiced, spoken and written (Ball, 2013).

In the analysis which follows I have attempted to be mindful of the above, to offer a discourse analysis of both the institutional 'points of contact' (Ball, 2014), specifically, university, faculty and departmental strategies and the results of the employee opinion survey, as well as of the data offered by my participants. To be attentive to that which isn't said, or written, as well as to that which is presumed natural and unquestionable, 'the right order of things', to uncover the truths through which these Principal Lecturers are encouraged to recognise themselves and others. In doing so, I do not wish to suggest that one version is more real than the other, but that discourses converge and collide, and that the site of struggle is the body, the subjectivities of the Principal Lecturers.

Stuck in the middle

Throughout this research project the participants discussed the conflicts and tensions which exist between their understandings of what it means to be an academic and a Principal Lecturer and the institutional requirements and exhortations of their roles. This is perhaps best described as a pervasive sense amongst the Principal Lecturers that they were 'stuck in the middle', between management and academic staff:

> We are kind of jammed in between you know the sort of directives from above but also the pressures at the chalk face and so on and so we're kind of in-between that so I suppose that does have an interesting leadership problem in the sense of you know if we're just seen as delivering directives to the people that we're working with that probably has quite negative results so you know we're in quite an invidious position whereby you know we obviously have to you know take notice of what we're being told to do and what the various directives are but we've

also listen very carefully to how people are objecting and experiencing those things at the ground and being sympathetic to those things at the same time so I imagine all of us are feeling some of that (Alan)

In the interpretations focus group Pete's response to Alan's statement was:

I would say that's being quite diplomatic I would say that actually causes tensions and problems because you know and frustrations, cause you're trying to do that but you can't actually influence it to the extent that you want, and therefore you're sort of reliant to a certain extent on people doing things as you would like it to be done and that's a problem but there seems to be sort of concern about upsetting people or you know "oh no you can't do that you have to go via that" and all of that sort of stuff (Pete)

A discourse of management is being utilised, in which conflict between management and 'those on the ground' is seen as inevitable. This discourse positions Principal Lecturers as both within and outside of management. The sense of being 'stuck in the middle' enables the Principal Lecturers to think of themselves as a distinct group, both from those in management and from Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. The institutionalisation, (Foucault, 1982), of hierarchy discussed particularly in Chapter 4, is again evident, as is the desire for a manager-managed relationship between them and Lecturers/Senior Lecturers.

The Principal Lecturers see themselves in a mediator role, what is particularly interesting about this, is that the literature talks about those in more senior roles, such as heads of departments (Bryman and Lilley, 2009; and Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002), experiencing this same issue. Is this an effect of neo-liberalism? The pushing of responsibilities downwards, (without authority), so that Principal Lecturers feel like they're in the middle rather than the more senior figures discussed in the literature?

Writing in 2005, Deem and Brehony, describe an increasing divide between 'manager-academics and academics not in management roles' (p226). They found that 'manager-academics were seen by non-managerial staff of all kinds as a distinctive social group with interests quite different to those of other staff' (p231). Daphne described her experiences as having 'one foot in the dark side' (of senior management) and 'one foot in the light side' (of academics). The university strategy positions management as a distinct group with particular

expectations regarding leading and monitoring performance (Acorn University, 2014b). This notion of a divide between management and academics was also described by Bobby from HR as he discussed peoples' perceptions of Principal Lecturers:

> in terms of community I think there's disconnect there and yeah so I suppose they may see themselves as they're the end of a policy decision rather than at the beginning of it I don't think they would feel involved in generally speaking I don't think they would feel involved in sort of strategic leadership within their faculty

> in terms of self-perception I'd say at head of department level there's a, there's a self-perception that you are a leader within the university certainly in the faculty and therefore see themselves in that role whereas I think Principal Lecturers still see themselves fundamentally as a, as a fellow academic a fellow member of staff who has this sometimes a burden of of management to reconcile with with their sort of academic responsibilities see themselves as part of that peer group within that group whereas I think head of department level would see themselves more on the other side of the fence (Bobby)

Being at 'the end of a policy decision' is resonant of my group of Principal Lecturers' experiences. 'Implementing directives' is how Alan described it. Yet, there is a difference between Bobby's interpretation and those of the Principal Lecturers. The Principal Lecturers see themselves as a distinct group, but recognise that perhaps their colleagues do not see them in the same way, (in keeping with Deem and Brehony, 2005), as described by Daphne:

> sometimes it's hard because you've got to be a bit of a corporate bee, cause you have to toe the line and my, my colleagues say I've gone to the dark side but I think, I think that's a line that sometimes I don't always believe in (Daphne)

This discourse of management is one in which management are understood to be delivering institutional requirements (Deem and Brehony, 2005) whilst everybody else (particularly academics) are not, or are at least resisting them. This posits that institutional requirements are always legitimate and attempts to resist are illegitimate (does this not remind you of functionalist understandings of power discussed in Chapter 2?). Thus as Bobby described, academic staff are sometimes seen as 'running wild doing their own thing, out of control', for which the response is more management and control, as Pete desires. We have seen in Chapter 4, the aspiration amongst some of the Principal Lecturers for greater control mechanisms. Yet we have also seen how the Principal

Lecturers understand senior management as being disconnected and distant from the challenges of implementation (Chapter 4). For some, the inevitability of becoming a distant leader if promoted, disconnected from operational challenges, was a reason not to seek promotion, i.e. to downshift (Chapter 5). Despite this, the necessity of management and manager-managed relationships is taken-for-granted. To suggest that management is un-necessary/un-needed or that alternative forms of relationship are possible is unsayable. In this we have an example of the constraining nature of power, which acts to limit the Principal Lecturers' ability to think of themselves and others in alternative ways, it 'imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him' (Foucault, 1982, p212). To be manager, to manage others and to be managed oneself, (by others and to be self-managed), is critical to their understandings and recognition of themselves and others. Without these categories their identities become illogical and unrecognisable.

Here I wish to insert a note regarding collegiality, as this is sometimes offered as an alternative form of relationship. In Chapter 6, Pete and Iris discussed the ways in which they understood opportunities for collegiality had/are being reduced. However, as others have acknowledged, the performative relationships that they wish to have with Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are implicated in the individualisation of academia and the reduction of collegial space (Ogbonna and Harris, 2004; Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002; and Rowland, 2008). Thus there are conflicts and tensions between their desires for greater managerial control and for greater collegiality.

The discourse of management being used is an adversarial one in which staff are divided and differentiated according to the institutionalisation of hierarchy and understood as picking sides. This is in keeping with Chandler, Barry and Clark's, (2002), description of managerialism. This discourse emphasises the 'primacy of management above all other activities' (Deem and Brehony, 2005, p220).

Bobby describes a 'burden of management', yet none of my participants described management as a burden. Their roles were burdensome, exhausting and isolating (as discussed in Chapters 5 and 6) but in various ways they found

enjoyment and satisfaction in many of the management activities that they undertake.

> working with individual staff around the whole kind of appraisal cycle, so or appraisal and work planning, so that's like supporting individual staff in terms of thinking about their own career development needs, and where they kind of try to ally the needs of courses and our provision for students with actual staff's own kind of desire for you know career development and progression in their own career to take on opportunities and develop new skills so that would be one whole area that I do quite enjoy (Louise)

The management activities per-say were not necessarily identified as the problem, indeed these were desirable for the pleasure they gave as well as the opportunities for promotion with which they were associated (Iris). The productive nature of the discourse is evident as management is constructed as desirable and aspirational, at the same time as senior managers are understood to be distant and disconnected from the operational challenges facing the university (Chapter 4).

What is highlighted is the Principal Lecturers' struggle for legitimation, to be understood as leaders, as managers, and as academics by those around them; to be recognised (in Foucault's, 1982, words). The site of struggle is that of their bodies, their identities, 'the individual is the site of power' (Ball, 2014, p3); as they each wrestle with their desires to embrace management and the enjoyable aspects of this work, including the desire to be productive, (discussed particularly in Chapter 5), inherently linked with the neoliberal discourse (Ball, 2014), whilst at the same time resisting and refusing, the identity of a distant leader. An identity which is maintained by senior managements' use of power relations, including, processes of consultation, surveillance, and data, which contribute to the Principal Lecturers' feelings of powerlessness and construction of their own leadership as lacking in authority and influence (Chapter 4).

I have found working with and thinking about the data in which the Principal Lecturers express their feelings of powerlessness most difficult and challenging to deal with. In Chapters 4 and 5 I discuss the power relations which operate to support and sustain these feelings. Their continued expressions of powerlessness demonstrate the strength of these power relations to maintain order, in particular hierarchies, which is a clear, if hidden objective of senior management, as well as of the Principal Lecturers themselves. However, even

in their exclamations of 'disempowerment' (Iris), their discussions, at times, demonstrate their engagement with and refusal of power relations. For example, in Chapter 6, Iris explains how she has managed to maintain collegial relationships within external moderation procedures, in the face of institutional changes. This demonstrates the importance of individual behaviours and actions and the potential that they bring for resistance and refusal, for they are the 'basic molecules of power relations' (Ball, 2013, p31). Yet, there are many instances where opportunities for refusal are unrecognised, or deemed too hopeless, perhaps the construction of themselves as powerless encourages them to consider their individual practices and behaviours irrelevant. Even though they are in formal positions in which their actions do have implications for those around them, particularly Lecturers and Senior Lecturers.

In their discussions of the disjuncture between their understandings of what it means to be an academic and a Principal Lecturer and the institutional expectations of their roles the participants talked about the changing nature of their posts. The significant alterations to their roles and changes within their faculties, particularly staffing at senior management levels, meant that for some, they neither understood what they did anymore, as Sally, (who had been a Principal Lecturer for more than four years at the time of her interview), describes, or how to guide Senior Lecturers to promotion to Principal Lecturer level:

> But yeah I suppose I've got a new boss I had a one to one with her the other week. She said what do you do? I said that's a really good question a lot of people ask me that and I'm asking that myself and I explained that I felt my role hasn't been fully defined this is what I thought it could do but it depends on the direction of travel and she's identified things about lack of vision in the department and you know stuff so I said I'm really willing to work where you want me to work, she said business as usual I'm still observing (Sally)

> And then in that situation it's then very hard to give leadership and guidance to SLs who want your job. You know they want to know how to get in your position but my position has been changed so much that I don't know if I'd recommend it to anyone anymore and I wouldn't know how to tell them to go about it because whatever I've done clearly hasn't been what's required by the current head of department (Iris)

The ontological insecurity which Ball (2012a) and Angervall and Gustafsson (2014) write of, is apparent in these extracts, as Sally and Iris struggle to

understand what they do, why they do it and what's important in what they are doing. Ball (2012a) writes:

> The first order effect of performativity is to re-orient pedagogical and scholarly activities towards those which are likely to have a positive impact on measurable performance outcomes and are a deflection of attention away from aspects of social, emotional or moral development that have no immediate measurable performative value (p20).

In this we see something of Iris's predicament; she recognises that whatever she is doing, it doesn't meet with the performance measures that her current head of department requires. We also see the importance of hierarchy and the surveillance practices of those in more senior roles to influence what is expected, and to ensure compliance and monitor performance. Iris's challenge of supporting other staff, to achieve success and recognition was also a finding of Clegg's (2008a) study. Clegg (2008a) concluded that this was 'because the university itself sends out ambiguous messages about what is valued at any particular time' and 'that institutional agendas, enshrined in actions such as promotion, were difficult as they constantly shifted, and that espoused and actual values did not seem to match' (p336). The shifting agendas and ambiguous messages, which contribute to ontological insecurity, are resonant of these Principal Lecturers' experiences.

Points of contact - strategies

University strategies and faculty operating plans are another way in which the Principal Lecturers received messages regarding their role and expectations of them. That Principal Lecturers are a key point in the chain of dissemination is recognised in some of the more detailed departmental strategies, such as those for the Humanities (Acorn University, 2014d). The university strategies and faculty operating plans are written documents available for all staff to access via the intranet. In addition, a one page summary of the university strategy is available on the external website. These strategies and plans are promoted on the staff intranet, faculty sharepoint sites and via emails initiated by the executive teams in the faculties. The current university strategy has a dedicated intranet page which details; how the strategy has been shared across the university, provides access to a discussion board, and videos of the Vice Chancellor and individual executive members discussing the strategy. At the time of writing the discussion board, which is accessed via submission of your

university log-in, had received a total of five comments made by four individuals over a period of 14 months. Each video has been viewed approximately 100 times, although there is no way for me to know if these were all unique users, or whether they watched the videos in their entirety. In addition to these dissemination methods five question and answer sessions were held by the vice-chancellor and attended by 580 members of staff (Acorn University, 2014e). In September 2014 the university had more than 3400 staff members; so less than 17% of all staff attended a question and answer session and (a generous estimate) less than 3% have viewed the videos.

Our version; collaborative partnerships

The university strategy talks about supporting 'personal and professional development', 'in the context of clear expectations, high performance and producing results that contribute to our goals' (Acorn University, 2014b). A particular environment is valued, one which is; intellectually stimulating, supportive, inclusive, collaborative, flexible, innovative and honest. Relationships are discussed in terms of collaboration and partnership. As Deem and Brehony (2005) point out partnerships, signify the language of managerialism. Collegiality is not mentioned. This absence from the discourse, and the use instead of managerialist notions of relationships, is in keeping with the experiences of Pete and Iris, of their increasing isolation as academics and the removal of opportunities for collegiality (Chapter 6). In my interview with Bobby, from HR, he discussed the strategy in the following way:

> If you look at the strategy I think there's an emphasis around collaboration and empowerment and a sort of focus on career development and I suppose trust for professional, professionalism of the staff so I suppose my own view is within a, sort of a university context such as ours the best the best leadership approach is one that is sort of coaching, empowering, trust based approach. Even sort of service leadership type area others may disagree with that others may and the reason would be is because they would see some academic staff as being running wild doing their own thing, out of control and therefore they need to be more closely managed and controlled that isn't my belief. I think in those examples that's more a reflection of the, of the neglect that their manger's have you know have created and I think the appropriate response is, is a better relationship between leaders and those who they lead in the first instance but also ensuring that particularly academic staff feel trusted and empowered to do the job they're paid to do and the reason why I say that is because what we want our staff to do is to do good teaching, and research, and consultancy work and in my

experience that's what they want to do anyway so it's kind of allowing that to happen and creating the conditions where sort of academic staff can do that with support that they need and when there are performance issues then the relationship exists with their leaders to address them before they become to difficult to manage (Bobby)

Bobby's description illuminates tensions. Academics are considered by some as dangerous, 'doing their own thing', 'out of control'. The adversarial managerial discourse is in operation, performance is what is ultimately valued, both by himself and his colleagues. But performance to what end is the question. There is no room to consider within this discourse the notion of performance itself. To question who is determining what counts and why? To consider what is changing for those who are labelled as 'wild' or 'unsuitable' to use Foucault's (1978) term. Or to contemplate what they might be resisting. The managerial purpose is paramount.

If you look at the strategy then I think there is clear messages in there around creating environments for higher performance innovative attitudes through an enabling, empowering culture so I think there is there is I think the strategy is veered more towards that sort of empowering trust based approach to leadership that I described earlier on maybe away from the sort of managerialist sort of directive approach that certainly is has been feared in some quarters as where the university is going in response to the more competitive environment that we find ourselves in. I think there has been a recognition that the move towards more authoritarian leadership actually is at odds to what to what sort of model leadership is all about I think it's, it's I'm quite positive about what the strategy is saying actually around I mean it doesn't talk about leadership actually funnily enough particularly but it does talk about people and environments and cultures and, and, and commitments which has implications for leadership (Bobby)

Bobby's understanding of the strategy is that it represents a change in approach, a move away from managerialist approaches to leadership. However, what counts, is still performance, a key concern of managerialism (Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002). But the stakes are even greater, as the university strives for 'higher performance'. The notion of performance is integral within this discourse, and presumed to be natural and unquestionable.

Even as he talks of moving away from managerialist practices, Bobby describes moving towards greater levels of managerialism, albeit a revised version of managerialism. The discourse of managerialism is being repurposed, as opposed to greater 'hands-on management' (Chandler, Barry and Clark, 2002,

p1054) Bobby describes a much more nuanced and subtle approach, one which seeks to establish positive identification through the alignment of individuals to organisational goals and values (Fleming and Spicer, 2003). What Bobby is describing is the 'moral system' of performativity, which operates to 'make us responsible for our performance and for the performance of others' (Ball, 2012a, p19) academics in effect become their own 'hands-on' managers.

Bobby also draws on the economic discourse of competition to argue for the necessity of a response/reaction from the university to the external environment, commensurate with the imagined market conditions. Thus, he went on to talk about the changes which had occurred at another regional university and the successes that they had had with what he viewed was a similar approach.

The change that Bobby describes, I would suggest, is less of a change than he imagines. Who is doing the managing might be different, but what is ultimately being valued is the same, performance, and academics must learn to be better measurers of themselves and each other.

Your version; control and surveillance

In Chapter 4, Sally, Alan and Louise discussed the increasing use of surveillance to bring power relations into being and maintain hierarchies. This surveillance enabled by technology uses data to monitor compliance. Such experiences are indicative of a changing environment moving towards more control not less. This subject was also discussed by Nina and Daphne in their interviews. Their views are in stark contrast to Bobby's interpretation of a change towards greater trust in staff.

> I have seen a change I don't know if other people have said this but I think there's been a change in the last couple of years or so that as a manager you are expected to keep a closer eye on the people that are working under you. And we don't really like that as academics

> Interviewer: You said that you feel like it's changed and you have to more closely observe the people that you manage

> I think there's pressure to do that I don't think I do I think I, I resist it and I think my boss has resisted that pressure as well. Sometimes I've said things to him about what I'm going to be doing I mean an example recently was ..... and he said "well no I don't need to know that" and that

250

for me is really valuable feeling that somebody isn't checking up on me cause he knows that I probably put more hours in the rest of the time.

Interviewer: So are there any particular things that the university have done to create that feeling of change?

What have they done? I'm struggling to think of anything if I'm honest it's more of a it's more of a kind of an atmosphere I think that's creeping in and I think it's, it's more prevalent in perhaps some departments than others and I'm fortunate in that it's not really happening in mine. I do think the opposite happens though and I do think it gets abused by a lot of academics of course and there are people who we never see and are difficult to get hold of. But I think as if you're in a fairly senior position it's, it's difficult well if you're not around you miss things and people don't tell you things cause so much happens spontaneously when you happen to bump into somebody in a corridor or on a staircase and you have a conversation then and that if you're not around or you're sat at home all the time working in your kitchen then you miss all that and I think you it detracts from your ability to do your job then (Nina)

Nina talks about an atmosphere of greater control and surveillance, empowerment and trust are a long way from her experiences of pressure to 'keep a closer eye' and 'check-up' on staff. Tensions in understandings emerge, for Nina is also advocating an accountability agenda, in order to counter what she sees as 'abuse' of the system. Her description of 'abuse' is reminiscent of Bobby's account of his colleagues' views. But perhaps this 'abuse' is a form of resistance. In chapters 4 and 6 we have seen the importance and use of physical space as a 'means of bringing power relations into being' (Foucault, 1982, p223); to maintain hierarchies, through physical distance (Chapter 4), and to reduce opportunities for collegial discussions (Chapter 6). By being physically removed, not 'being seen', perhaps these academics are attempting to resist the advances of control and surveillance that Nina describes, to make it more difficult to be governed in such a way? Perhaps they are engaged in practices of psychic disengagement (Archer, 2008a) to enable them to cope with the demands of work? (Chapter 5). It is not necessarily that they are not working, as Nina's and Bobby's extracts imply, but that they are attempting to create the space, physically and mentally to be other than that which is being prescribed. As Whitchurch (2012) suggests 'low visibility and/or ambiguous positioning could be an advantage, allowing more scope for autonomous activity' (p115). Yet, it is a risky strategy, visibility of academics and their work, is equated with success and professionalism (Anaporte, 1993), as is indicated both by Nina and

Bobby. Performativity, demands visibility (Ball, 2012a), to shy away from this, risks the person being labelled as 'unsuitable'.

Daphne also talked about how the requirements of her role were changing, as she was being asked to engage in more managerialist oriented behaviours:

> But I'd say in the last 12, 18 months I think there is an expectation that we keep closer tabs on people. Cause I think you know coming from a health service background there's something about we want our students to be responsible so I expect staff to be responsible so I get a little bit frustrated that staff don't take responsibility for, for that and I think I'm quite good at being quite I don't know inclusive and you know people say I'm easy to work with so I think I bring that to it but I don't like the sort of checking up on, on people cause I expect them that they are professionals and they will have done it but then I also appreciate that a lot of staff are part-time, you know student face stuff is the, is the important stuff for them and other things like the quality processes do go by the by (Daphne)

> Interviewer: You said that you think it has changed over the last 18 months and becoming more about control

> Yeah I think umm I think the I understand from a quality point of view it's about QAA and it's about our governance and you know I totally understand that and I don't have a problem with that cause that's my job and I wouldn't have been interested in the job if I didn't see the point of it. But I think what has gone is the creativity in what people do and people feel a little bit constrained by things and we don't and I don't know whether it's just our faculty and probably not but people don't like to conform we you know we were told by our PVC you know that it's about consistency and conformity and I think people understand the consistency bit where there needs to be but conformity didn't go down well [laughter] and you know we don't want one size fits all really so it's sometimes negotiation with staff where that consistency is and where it, where it can't be so the nice bit of my job is I do get involved in curriculum design with course leaders and I feel that there's still some creativity within that but I think people get, it does feel like it's very top down and staff who I work with feel that there's too many managers and I'm a, as a PL I suppose I'm classed as that although I don't have any direct line management responsibility but that's part of the challenge is that I can't make anyone do anything it's all by influence really (Daphne)

In Daphne's descriptions we see an example of the re-orienting of 'pedagogical and scholarly activities' (Ball, 2012a, p20), as academics are asked to concentrate on quality issues, and 'deflect their attention' (Ball, 2012a, p20) from 'student facing' activities, which are more important to them. Daphne draws on the notion of professionalism to indicate why they should do so, and yet there is also some recognition that this is a re-orientation of priorities, a

recrafting of what it means to be a professional in academia. Ball, (2012a), writes that 'the second order effect of performativity is in the possibilities it creates to replace commitment with contract' (p20) and Daphne's use of professionalism appears to be in this vein, it's their job, they should take responsibility and just do it.

It is clear from Daphne's account that academics are resisting, I suspect however, that as with research, (Chapter 6), what is being resisted are the increasing demands being placed upon individual academics to comply with QAA processes on top of everything else, as opposed to the re-orientation of the academic role.

Daphne talks about the requirements for her to engage in greater surveillance of staff, echoing Chandler, Barry and Clark's (2002) description of managerialism. Daphne describes this as a fairly new change; perhaps, this is managements' response to increasing resistance, greater control and compliance, which necessitates increased surveillance.

As we saw with Pete and Iris in Chapter 6, her response is not a simple rejection of managerialism, she accepts the external pressures of QAA and governance and the need for compliance with these, and raises concerns about her lack of authority, as is discussed in Chapter 4. She is a 'performative professional' (Ball, 2012a) accepting the remaking of the academic, both herself and others, in line with these new visibilities. In fact this remaking is the reason that she has a Principal Lecturer role, the changes to external accountability meant the creation, across the university, of a whole new set of policies, practices and roles to implement them, including her own. She is a beneficiary of the 'growth industry' of quality (Filippakou and Tapper, 2008, p88), and therefore, has reason to be committed to the remaking of academics, whether she is fully aware of this consequence of performativity or not.

However, she also recognises some of the problems that this creates, the stifling of creativity, which is in direct contrast to the innovative, intellectually stimulating environment set out in the university strategy and the 'enabling, empowering culture' discussed by Bobby. Writing in 1993, of her experiences as an American academic, Anaporte stated that 'a scarcity of human concern and creative energy is built into the present structure of academia' (p446). This lack

of space for creativity is recognised by Daphne and was raised by other Principal Lecturers as a reason for choosing/wanting to downshift (as discussed in Chapter 5).

This small piece of analysis suggests that there is much more at stake than a move towards and dislike for control and surveillance, that what is occurring, with little acknowledgement, is the reorientation of what it means to be an academic. Achieved through the introduction of new activities and processes, which render academic performance measurable (Ball, 2012a).

The top down management that Daphne describes resonates with Grayson's understanding and experiences:

> So if you look at the annual operating plans if you look at the long term strategy for the University and its core mission statements, the sort of four areas it wants to develop student engagement for example, um, you know in terms of the student experience NSS is a very big aspect of what we do, and the only way they think they felt they could ensure that they'd get the feedback and the good responses and move us up the league table which is what it's about of course is that we would have to put more responsibility onto the academics. I don't see personally any leadership here, I see control, I see authority, I see dictates and I see things being imposed (Grayson, interview)

There is clearly a fissure between Bobby's HR interpretation and understanding of the university strategy and the experiences of the Principal Lecturers. The emphasis as Grayson sees it is on increased responsibility and pressure on academics. When pushed Nina couldn't really think of anything specific the university had done to create the atmosphere of greater control and surveillance that she felt was happening, but consideration of Bobby's comments suggests that this could be because of the change in tactics and the move away from more visible signs of control, towards greater self-discipline. As discussed in Chapter 5, the Principal Lecturers felt that management hides behind talk of the value of staff. Indeed one of the ways in which it was felt that they did this was to invoke the strategy as evidence of their concern. The happy staff member identified in this talk legitimates another level of surveillance as staff are required to produce a particular bodily performance to meet its demands (Chapter 5).

Our version; difficult and less engaged

It is only as I have undertaken this research that I have come to realise that Principal Lecturers as a group, are of interest to the university executive. I have been made aware of this interest, through discussions with my participants and others who were invited (throughout the summer of 2014) to explore issues of Principal Lecturer leadership in a variety of meetings with their various faculty executive teams.

This interest appears to stem from a sense of disquiet amongst the university executive, uneasiness perhaps, in that they find them 'a difficult group to influence and access' (Bobby, HR). In a recent employee opinion survey, Principal Lecturers were identified as being 'significantly less positive' in terms of their engagement and satisfaction (Acorn University, 2011). Engagement within this report is described as 'the extent to which they feel pride and loyalty, are affective advocates and give of their discretionary effort' (p8). Within the same report senior staff are described as highly engaged. The idea of positive identification, the investment of self because of alignment with organisational goals and values (Fleming and Spicer, 2003) is clear within this statement of engagement. Engagement in this sense is also about regulating employees 'feelings and identifications' (Alvesson and Willmott, 2002, p622).

This regulation and requirement for an investment of self are evident in the university strategy which was published three years after the employee opinion survey results. In it, employees are defined as; 'skilled, successful and committed' (p4), enthusiastic and passionate about their subject (p7), 'acknowledged experts in their field' (p13). Values are explicitly stated designed to 'orient identity in a specific direction' (Alvesson and Willmott, 2002, p630). Particular identities are being cultivated and signalled as desirable.

Doing the job, isn't enough, more is needed, the giving of emotions, additional time and energy. What is particularly significant is that whilst the Principal Lecturers are according to this definition by default less engaged and therefore not understood to be giving of their discretionary effort, it is the academic staff, including Principal Lecturers, for whom heavy workload is identified within the report as a problem and who are regularly working additional hours (Acorn University, 2011). If overtime is considered as giving of their discretionary effort,

then this group could be considered to be highly engaged. Interestingly workload was not identified as a problem for senior staff, nor a university wide issue, which given that academic staff make up less than 40% of the total number of employees, makes sense. Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra (2013) found that academic staff are 'more negative about their workload and work-family balance than other university staff' (p287) a finding which suggests that this is not just a problem for Acorn.

Your version; over-worked

The institutionalisation (Foucault, 1982) of long hours experienced by my group of Principal Lecturers and explored in Chapters 5 and 6 are born out in the results of the employee opinion survey. The giving of their discretionary effort, working evenings, weekends and holidays has significant negative implications for these Principal Lecturers as described by Louise:

> I actually had virtually no time to myself to relax, spend time with family, do other things at all, really (Louise)

Work consumes their whole lives, the idea of a separation between work and life is nonsensical, as they constantly feel like they are 'on call' (Nina). Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra (2013) suggest that defining work as a lifestyle enables academics to 'escape the fact that the work tends to drown both their families and their private lives' (p293). Within this study, we see the notion of professionalism being used in a similar way, to explain the total commitment and long hours demanded by the job and the surveillance of self and others to maintain appropriate behaviours (Chapter 5).

The Principal Lecturers felt the demands placed upon them to be the all-round academic; described by Louise as the university presenting 'the image you can almost have it all' (Chapter 5). But there was recognition that this was impossible, particularly given the demands of the Principal Lecturer role (Chapter 6). Morley (2013b) and Small et al (2011) have suggested that leadership positions in higher education are undesirable because of their all-consuming nature. In this latter paper, the authors discuss their own responses, as doing more, working harder. Performativity is clearly in action (Ball, 2012a). This study supports the assertion that these roles are all-consuming, and there are clear examples of these Principal Lecturers engaging in similar actions.

That this makes their leadership roles undesirable is indicated by their desires to downshift (Chapter 5) and the frustrations that they express.

Alan described how his 0.4 Principal Lecturer role did in fact take up 'between a 0.5 and a 0.6 in my time actually in the hours that I put in'. The consequent reduction in time available for his other responsibilities meant that he felt 'a sense of frustration' with regards to his teaching and research, which he ends up doing 'on weekends by and large' (Alan):

> I would like to spend more time preparing and renewing and reviewing and sometimes that doesn't I don't feel I'm doing enough of that and so I sometimes don't feel that my quality or commitment to teaching is as much as it really ought to be but it's hard to get around that when there's such a diverse range of calls on my time (Alan)

Sally echoed this frustration and describes the problems created by taking on Principal Lecturer roles which are only partial contracts:

> It seems I don't know if it can work, trying to be Tuesday and Wednesday I'm an academic Thursday I'm a business development lead Friday I'm an education how does that work and I think that's where this intensification of work or that perhaps the sense sometimes that you're, you're so overworked because you're trying to be so many different things when you actually perhaps just want to be one thing (Sally)

Pete described this as compartmentalisation; 'the necessity to be quite good at being able to do different roles' and being able to switch between, from morning to afternoon. Going from 'deep thinking and working and working on drafts', to; addressing the specific demands of the Principal Lecturer role, organising student representative events, taking practical sessions, or 'general teaching' and all the requirements and resourcing of that. As discussed in Chapter 5 we see the physical and mental exhaustion that were the consequences of this for Pete.

The compartmentalisation discussed by Pete and Sally, is indicative of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1978), as the role of the Principal Lecturer is broken down into various elements, each of which can be monitored and modified according to their associated 'markers of development' (Ball, 2013, p50). Ball (2012a) describes how performativity demands that we 'spend increasing amounts of our time in making ourselves accountable, reporting on what we do rather than doing it'. 'In regimes of performativity experience is

nothing, productivity is everything' (p19). Markers of development are central to this process, enabling academics to account and report on what they do.

In terms of teaching, markers of development include (but are not limited to); the completion of the Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education; achievement of Higher Education Academy Fellowship, Senior Fellowship or Principal Fellowship; receipt of a university inspirational teaching award; module leadership, course leadership; programme leadership; and external examiner positions. In terms of research, markers of development include; completion of a doctorate, number of research outputs, number of REFable research outputs, level of REFable research outputs (the journal's star rating), doctoral supervisions, and research income (Chapter 6).

Sally describes the marker of her business development role as money/income; 'covered half my salary this week so I'm happy about that' (Sally). Nina similarly described her role (Chapter 4). The profit subtext of neoliberalism (Ball, 2012b; and Chapter 1), is integral to their activities as they are required to meet the institutional demands for establishing diversified income streams.

Once these markers have been established, Foucault writes, that discipline then 'classifies the components thus identified according to definite objectives. What are the best actions for achieving a particular result: What is the best movement for loading one's rifle, what is the best position to take? What workers are best suited for a particular task?' (1978, p84). And so, in higher education we have a plethora of workers; Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Principal Lecturers, Readers, Professors, Heads of Department and so on, each distinguishable from the next. This 'system of differentiation' (Foucault, 1982), divides us from each other, according to differences in experience, competence and suitability. These divisions determine and limit what people in these roles can do, as they seek legitimation, to be recognised by others; 'every relationship of power puts into operation differentiations which are at the same time its conditions and its results' (Foucault, 1982, p223). Norms are constructed and markers of development assigned.

Discipline then 'establishes optimal sequences or co-ordinations: How can actions be linked together?' 'How can schoolchildren be distributed hierarchically within classifications?' (Foucault, 1978, p85). How can lecturers

provide excellent teaching? As required by the university strategy. The markers of development then come into operation, to classify lecturers and to modify them accordingly; they are 'means of bringing power relations into being' (Foucault, 1982, p223), of surveying and recording development and requiring, through appraisal and other processes, change. Principal Lecturers have key responsibilities in terms of managing both their own and others performance according to these associated markers. Indeed we have seen that there is a desire for greater responsibility for monitoring the performance of others (Chapter 4), a clear indication of Ball's (2012a) description of performativity. As achieving appropriate performance becomes central, as opposed to consideration of what that performance is designed to achieve.

Finally 'discipline fixes the processes of progressive training (dressage) and permanent control' (Foucault, 1978, p85), and so the norm of progression for academics is Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer, and so on. Yet there are only a limited number of Principal Lecturer roles, not everyone can be considered 'suitable', there must be some who are 'unsuitable or incapable', dividing 'the normal from the abnormal' (Foucault, 1978, p85). We have seen the importance of this optimal model of progression within this institution, senior management are concerned with maintaining it (Chapter 4), and the Principal Lecturers argue for greater hierarchical distinctions (Chapter 4). This speaks to its level of rationalisation (Foucault, 1982), and its effectiveness as an accepted means of governing, as individuals survey themselves and others, measuring performance against markers of development and seeking to introduce ever more elaborate refinements to sustain this form of disciplinary control. It is considered natural, the right order of things. As Deem and Brehony (2005) proposed, greater differentiation between academics helps to maintain relations of power, and managers to maintain power over.

In the following extract from the second interpretations group we see these disciplinary techniques in action:

> Grayson: What we have a problem with, and why some of these stresses and concerns might be bubbling up is because the way we appoint people into roles and the way people apply for these roles isn't in a systematic well-defined process, are you the right person for this role? Is this what you want to do? Oh no, no I've got to have some time I must have a role. Take this role nobody else has applied for it, do you want it?

You take the role it then you find actually it's not the role you really wanted you've got a commitment to it you don't understand it and then things start coming up because you can't cope.

Pete: That's right

Grayson: I suspect we've got people in roles who really aren't up to it and therefore the stresses and the bodily problems come out the fact that they can't do their jobs. Because not because it's their fault but because the way we define what a role is and how you should be appointed to that role doesn't do what it should do

Grayson and Pete, are discussing the unsuitableness of people in particular roles, this they believe is because the managerial processes aren't working, job descriptions aren't up to scratch, so people can't be prevented/prevent themselves from attaining these roles. The disciplinary techniques have failed, the markers of development haven't been defined well enough, the most suitable type of worker hasn't been identified, nor has the optimal set of actions demanded by the role. The proposed solution is to refine the disciplinary techniques, in order to reduce the instances of people failing to meet or resisting expected behaviours and actions, to manage out problems or critiques of the system.

Disciplinary power, as indicated by this example, results in the attribution of personal faults to those who don't fit, just as Kate and Grayson described in Chapter 5 where people who work long hours are considered as lacking in skills, or knowledge. Problems with workplace practices are at least less relevant than the individual themselves, and so critiques of the system can be managed out and explained.

Compartmentalisation and the continuous refinement of what and who counts; which markers of development need to be achieved, and by whom, are processes actively engaged in by this group of Principal Lecturers. They tend to consider this process as externally implemented, and yet their own practices, such as their desires for greater hierarchical distinctions (Chapter 4), and calls for professionalism from Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in complying with various markers of development, such as in the case of QAA processes (Daphne), or physical visibility (Nina), all indicate their investment and involvement. Thus, the overwork that they are experiencing, is not only externally imposed, by the practices and policies of senior management, but by

their own self-regulation, as they discipline themselves and others in relation in particular to the norm of progression.

Conclusions

An adversarial managerial discourse is used both by the Principal Lecturers and Bobby. This discourse is divisive, separating management from everyone else, particularly from academics, who are often considered to be 'unfit' or even 'running wild'. In this discourse, management are considered to be delivering institutional requirements whilst everyone else is not, or are at least resistant to them. This is problematic for the Principal Lecturers, who on the one hand consider themselves as separate from management, who they consider are distant and disconnected and they therefore desire opportunities to more greatly influence them (Chapter 4). Whilst on the other, they embrace the primacy of management and wish to enjoy greater levels of managerial control to reinforce the manager-managed relationships that they have with Lecturers and Senior Lecturers.

Despite their own views of being distinct from management, there was some recognition that perhaps their colleagues, the Lecturers and Senior Lecturers around them, do not see this distinction. The Principal Lecturers construct themselves as both within and outside management, as they seek recognition from those differently located within the institutional hierarchy.

There are a number of differences between the versions presented within the university strategy, by Bobby in his interview, and that of the Principal Lecturers. Bobby is hopeful with regards to the new strategy, seeing it as a positive move away from a managerialist model of leadership, to one based on trust. The experiences of the Principal Lecturers in contrast are of increasing levels of control and surveillance, which they are being asked to participate in.

The significant similarity between these perspectives is their investment in the notion of performance. This is integral to Bobby's understanding of the new strategy, which is striving for ever higher levels of performance, and to the Principal Lecturers' desires for greater managerial control and accountability mechanisms, and their calls for professionalism from staff in meeting the demands of the various markers of development.

It is performance which is ultimately valued by both. Performance is a taken-for-granted imperative. There is no room to consider within this discourse the notion of performance itself. To think about performance to what end? To question who is determining what counts and why? To consider what is changing for those who are labelled as 'wild' or 'unsuitable'. Or to contemplate what they might be resisting. The managerial purpose is paramount.

The analysis suggests that what it means to be an academic is being reoriented. Achieved through the introduction of new activities and processes, which render academic performance measureable (Ball, 2012a). These activities, illustrated by the numerous markers of development, which are being continuously refined, that academics within this institution are being measured against, divert attention from 'pedagogical and scholarly' (Ball, 2012a, p20) concerns.

Whilst resistance to increasing demands and experiences of control and surveillance is occurring; resistance is risky, as people are labelled 'unsuitable' and subjected to moral reprove. However, sustained engagement with, and understanding of how, what it means to be an academic is changing is not happening, at least not with this group of Principal Lecturers. Perhaps the ever increasing levels of performance and its measurement demanded of and by this group, is also designed to achieve a collective misrecognition, as people battle workloads, but fail to recognise, what that work does.

Chapter 8: Concluding thoughts

In this chapter I provide a summary of the work undertaken in this thesis and discuss how this makes an original contribution to knowledge. I will argue that the study contributes to an expanded understanding of the role of power in the formation of identities and provides an illustration of how power relations might be investigated in other organisations. In addition I have introduced the literature on downshifting to a new context, that of higher education. The analysis of this hither-to straightforward concept demonstrates its applicability and relevance to higher education. The data contributes to an expanded understanding of the concept of downshifting, and attests to the complexity with which people engage with this idea, and the implications that this has for their identities, their relations with each other and the organisations within which they work. Finally, the closing section of this chapter discusses the impact on knowledge and practice and how I hope to develop this work in the future.

I set out to explore the power relations which result in the formation of academic identities, specifically those of a group of Principal Lecturers, from across the faculties at one university. The Foucauldian interpretation of power and identities which has guided this study considers identities to result from interactions with discourses. Given this, I considered two discourses in particular, leadership and downshifting. I have been driven by an emancipatory effects agenda, a desire to illuminate what discourse does; how it constrains or enables identities. I hoped that the doing of the data collection might provide opportunities for the Principal Lecturers to question their identities, to explore how power relations both create possibilities and limitations. I also hope that this thesis might extend the emancipatory effects to others, who through reading this study, might begin to explore their own identities and find ways to refuse and reimagine their identities and the identities they require of others (Foucault, 1982).

The analysis of the data drawn from focus groups, interviews, strategy documents and the results of the employee opinion survey, suggests the significance of a managerial discourse operating within Acorn University. To many this would hardly be surprising; indeed for leadership authors such as Bolden et al (2009) it is a taken-for-granted assumption. But developing a

detailed understanding of how this discourse functions and is evolving offers insights into the processes by which; academics are becoming increasingly separated from one another, and the reorientation of what it means to be an academic is achieved, with relatively little resistance.

This is a discourse in which everyone is found to be problematic and 'unsuitable' to use Foucault's (1978) term. It is preoccupied with the notion of performance and no-one is satisfied, either with the performance of others or even sometimes with themselves. The Principal Lecturers expressed an understanding of senior managers as distant and disconnected, and Lecturers and Senior Lecturers as 'not conforming to what needs to be done' (Pete). Bobby (HR) described an understanding of academics (including Principal Lecturers) amongst non-academic staff as 'running wild', 'doing their own thing', and Principal Lecturers as 'a difficult group to influence and access' for the university executive. The results of the employee opinion survey identify Principal Lecturers as 'significantly less positive' in terms of their engagement and satisfaction (Acorn University, 2011). Individual Principal Lecturers expressed dissatisfaction with their own performance:

> I think I felt so frustrated that I wasn't producing useful things for people that's more about me rather than the job perhaps (Sally)

> I would like to spend more time preparing and renewing and reviewing and sometimes that doesn't I don't feel I'm doing enough of that and so I sometimes don't feel that my quality or commitment to teaching is as much as it really ought to be (Alan)

> maybe I could be a programme leader and actually only know a little bit about one of the kind of courses within it. But I would feel that I wasn't doing my role. So some of it's probably coming from inside as well (Louise)

> I personally find that hard to just put things down at 5 o'clock or something, it's just impossible (Daphne).

Individuals struggling with the demands of work position their experiences as a personal fault/character deficiency; these rules are also applied to measuring the performance of others:

> I suspect we've got people in roles who really aren't up to it and therefore the stresses and the bodily problems come out the fact that they can't do their jobs. Because not because it's their fault but because the way we define what a role is and how you should be appointed to that role doesn't do what it should do (Grayson)

264

I don't think anybody trying to be a perfectionist is ever going to really achieve anything. I think that's about going to back to what I said about emotional intelligence and having that self-awareness (Kate).

Problems or a failure to meet expected behaviours are considered to lie with the individual, there is something wrong/deficient with them. They are considered 'unsuitable', to be lacking in some way, be that in management or organisational skills, or in understanding the demands of the job. This was pertinent to the discussions of downshifting in which the psychologising of grievances enabled damaging workplace practices to remain fundamentally unchallenged (Chapter 5).

The managerial discourse being utilised, is, we have seen, highly divisive, separating management from everyone else (Chapter 7). The importance of hierarchy is integral to this discourse and maintaining distinctions is, according to the Principal Lecturers, central to their relationships with senior management and their use of space, processes of consultation, surveillance, and data (Chapter 4).

Similarly, a desire for maintenance or even further separation between Principal Lecturers and Lecturers/Senior Lecturers is apparent in the earlier chapters (Chapters 4 and 7). The Principal Lecturers draw on the notion of the manager-managed relationship to both separate and measure academics. Their calls for professionalism from Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in complying with various markers of development such as quality processes (Daphne) or visibility (Nina), demonstrate their own investment and involvement in practices of disciplinary power, and the taken-for-granted nature of the norm of progression as the right order of things (Chapter 7). There is an understanding, apparent in job descriptions, university documents, and the Principal Lecturers' talk, of Principal Lectureship as a 'special job' (Sally), this understanding is maintained by disciplinary power. The Principal Lecturers, it seems, are as invested in the notion of performance as Bobby. As they seek to discipline themselves and others and distinguish between those who are suitable or not. What this enables, is the attribution of personal faults to those who don't fit. Problems with workplace practices are at least less relevant than the individual themselves, and so critiques of the system can be managed out and explained (Chapter 7).

In this managerial discourse management are understood to be delivering institutional requirements, and this legitimates their actions (Chapter 7). But institutional requirements are always in a state of flux. Take research, I have suggested that what research is considered to be is being colonised by Acorn University (Chapter 6). Thus, to be considered research active, one must publish, but where and about what must be designed to fit, both with the institutional and faculty requirements. Each faculty has different requirements and markers of development for their academics. Given the current strategies, none of my participants could be considered research active, despite research being integral to some of their identities. Suddenly some who were once considered suitable find themselves lacking. This perpetual ambiguity is likely to contribute to the feelings of ontological insecurity expressed by the Principal Lecturers (Chapter 7).

In this discourse in which everyone is striving for ever higher levels of performance, attention is diverted from 'pedagogical and scholarly' (Ball, 2012a, p20) concerns. The notion of professionalism was at times utilised in this way, to re-orient the priorities of academics, often from the student facing activities which were more important to them (Chapter 7). The discussions regarding collegiality in Chapter 6 can also be considered in this manner. Iris's description of external examiner arrangements, exemplify a changing approach from one based on pedagogical development to one based on 'measurable performance outcomes' (Ball, 2012a, p20), as it became 'all about getting numbers into spreadsheets' (Iris). There was some recognition that a re-crafting of academic identities was occurring and evidence of resistance. But there appeared to be no sustained engagement with this issue, rather, what is suggested is that people, (Principal Lecturers, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers), are resisting work intensification and the ever increasing and highly refined demands on their time. This is important, but I urge an alteration in focus to consider; what is it that our performance does?

Foucault (2007c) reminds us that our analysis is always in the process of beginning again. We can never reach a complete understanding. The managerial discourse at work in Acorn University has and will continue to evolve. In the preceding chapters I have excluded data and analysis which was just as important as that which has made it in. Such as the notion of the

autonomous academic, which given its individualistic nature one might expect to find preserved by neoliberalism. Yet, in all of the Principal Lecturers' discussions they describe the ways in which their autonomy 'in terms of your ability to influence what you do' (Grayson), is being eroded, which is perhaps indicative of the primacy of the managerial purpose above all else. This is an obvious place to continue this work. Similarly, there are threads which run throughout this thesis, which could have been the focus of an entire study on their own, such as the gendering of academic life, that not only deserves but demands greater attention. But to create a coherent, integrated account, within the parameters prescribed by the traditions of doctoral studies, and the institutional policies for theses submissions, some things have had to be left undone. In this, I am a neoliberalist subject. I am bounded by the expectations of the disciplines, the faculty and my supervisors, to provide a very particular account of the last three years, so that I might be measured, to allow others to judge me as 'suitable' or not. The doctoral process itself could and should provide a fascinating and challenging (for both students and faculty) site for the study of power relations.

At a conference where I presented some initial ideas arising from my analysis, particularly around the importance of the manager-managed relationship, the audience suggested that this would not be the case in a non-post-1992 university. However, I suggest that this is an oversimplification, and perhaps has more to do with the continuing discursive positioning of one group of universities as superior to another rather than anything else, tied as it is to implicit assumptions regarding collegiality (Chapter 2) that are challenged by this research.

You have read in the data chapters my analysis of the power relations which contribute to the feelings and experiences of powerlessness that were frequently expressed by my participants. However, I have found this data particularly challenging and have, at times, found myself feeling angry with my participants. This has stemmed from a sense that the subject position of powerlessness, can be used to shy away from challenge and acknowledgement of the importance of their own behaviours and choices, which form the 'basic molecules of power relations' (Ball, 2013, p31). I explored this in my research diary:

What I have found most discouraging and challenging is the way in which this group (of Principal Lecturers) passively accept the conditions of their work, in the main little attempt is made to respond in any other way than to work harder, work longer, work more efficiently. Yet they are in positions of influence, despite their contention that they are not, and they have a responsibility not only for themselves but also for the people below them, this makes me really cross. Why should people like me be 'standing up' for people with more money, status, privilege, influence, control over their own and the working lives of others. It just seems like such a waste of my own time and energy! Being 'without authority' enables them to renege responsibility, to step back and do little, to accept/acquiesce. It makes me angry and sad all at once (Cockman, 01/12/14).

This is an overly simplistic response, I am considering them as one, and I am demanding one account/one participant voice, one 'thing' to rage against. I have slipped back into yearning for 'lost certainties' and 'authoritative knowledge' and consequently narrowed my vision (Holland, 1999). I am failing to account for the practices of resistance and refusal, and examples of behaving differently that were also expressed. I am also failing to acknowledge the risky nature of resistance (Chapter 7), and ironically, demonstrating a managerialist/functionalist understanding of power in which the Principal Lecturers are understood to be powerful simply because of their formal hierarchical positioning. I wonder now, is their sense of powerlessness a function of the managerial discourse? As the requirement for them to focus on measurement and performance replaces 'commitment with contract' (Ball, 2012a, p20) and constructs them as highly responsible and accountable, but only for their 'little bit'? Is my response, also a function of the discourse, as I articulate dissatisfaction with them/their performance, as they did of others?

Perhaps I am angry that these people who I had implicitly positioned as 'research object' and 'expert' didn't live up to my expectations? (Chapter 3). Ballamingie and Johnson (2011) discuss the 'unarticulated presumption that critical research should be focused on marginalized populations' (p721). Perhaps I am also struggling with this aspect of the knowledge-power nexus within which I research?

I am also making an implicit assumption, that they should be able to see how they are being formed and reformed and therefore should be able to do something about it. Yet this is a naïve understanding of knowledge and I am reminded again, of Foucault's contention that knowledge cannot free you from

power, as knowledge is itself a product of power relations (Foucault, 1980; and Clegg and Hardy, 1999).

This anger I initially found overwhelming and shocking and also experienced as Hubbard, Backett-Milburn and Kemmer (2001) describe, feelings of guilt, because I was and am angry with people whom I am also grateful to, for generously giving their time, energy, thoughts and feelings, an act, which itself could be viewed as a refusal of the individualistic ways of being described in earlier chapters.

Holland (2007) writes that researchers might want to suppress negative emotions with regards to their participants, to protect their own sense of identity. But for me exploring these negative emotions has solidified the importance of Foucault's ethical self-formation, to open up ways for me to be and do differently. I wrote in Chapter 3 about becoming more political and finding outlets for that. Do I feel I have managed this? No. But I have tried things out, with varied success, seeking out others, friends and allies and along the way finding enemies too. Do I feel like I'm doing enough? No. I feel suffocated. Yet I am aware how individualistic and neoliberalist ideals pervading higher education contribute to my feelings of hopelessness, however I cannot shrug them off. Having said all this, I recognise that the feelings of anger and frustration I have towards my participants I also have towards myself and my own attempts/lack of them to do differently, to take seriously the microphysics of power (Ball, 2013).

Mayo (2000) argued that Foucauldian theorists exploring identities need to combine an examination of normalizing power with an examination of resistances to this power. Ball and Olmedo (2013) urged an empirically based approach to the study of the specifics of resistance, focusing on its complexities and subtleties so that power relations might be examined. Alvesson and Kärreman (2011) suggested that empirical studies using Foucauldian principles are lacking. Deetz (1998) and Mumby (2011) similarly argued for detailed empirical investigations of how discourses are enacted within a particular organisational sites, which recognise the complexity and embeddedness of organisational members in discourses. This study responds to these calls. The detailed exploration of the power relations which operate within the discourses

of leadership and downshifting, achieved through the utilisation of Foucault's (1982) framework and his notions of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1978) and technologies of the self (Foucault, 2007a) enabled me to explore empirically how particular identities become important whilst others become marginalised, in practice, within the specific organisational site of Acorn University. The methods used and Foucauldian inspired methodology adopted provides an illustration for other researchers of how to empirically explore the power relations which operate within discourses within organisational sites. To develop an (if following Foucault, always partial) understanding of 'the structures and rules that constitute a discourse' (Ball, 2013, p19) and how these influence identities.

This study recognises the activities or agency of the Principal Lecturers in the formation of their identities whilst simultaneously acknowledging their embeddedness in power. Foucault (1980a) argues, and this thesis demonstrates, that identities are vehicles for power, creating the conditions of their existence (Harding, Lee and Ford, 2014). But Foucault (1976) also reminds us that discourses are never complete, therefore identities which result from interactions with discourses are also partial and unstable creating spaces for people to be 'other' (Foucault, 1976; and Foucault, 1986). This study has shown that people can and do find spaces to resist and refuse.

This study demonstrates how power relations within this institution contribute to experiences and feelings of isolation, and overwork, and the negative implications this has for those concerned, for their bodies, and whole lives (Chapter 5). But it also shows how we are all embroiled, embedded and invested in the mechanisms by which we are subjugated and subjugate others (Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7). This is not about apportioning blame. It is about creating collective recognition. We are all implicated. Our own actions do matter.

But as the struggles of these Principal Lecturers demonstrate, agency is constrained by power relations, power relations which make thinking beyond to other possibilities so profoundly difficult. Thus, even in resisting the leadership discourse they were constrained by heroic constructions of leaders and leadership (Chapter 4) as described by Ford, Harding and Learmonth (2008),

Cope, Kempster and Parry (2011), and Morley (2013b). As Foucault (1982) contends, and this thesis demonstrates agency is a site of struggle (Mayo, 2000), the Principal Lecturers are both complicit and resistant in the formation of their identities (as suggested by the work of Foucault, 1980a; Archer, 2008a; Hanson, 2009; Collinson, 2006; and Harding, Lee and Ford, 2014). Recognition of these complexities and the challenges that face people in trying to be 'other', enables me to support the calls of Harding, Ford and Gough (2010) for researchers to acknowledge these difficulties in the lives of those they research, to be alert to the struggles that exist in their workplaces and sensitive to the ways in which peoples' identities are constrained by their organisations (Ford and Harding, 2010) and therefore the difficulties that change entails, irrespective of how much we (as researchers) might want change to take place.

My study adds to our understandings of leadership as 'an identity' (Ford, Harding and Learmonth, 2008) in higher education. It expands leadership research which has typically focused on those at the top or close to the top of institutions (Bryman, 2007) by adding to it the experiences of Principal Lecturers and supports Gronn's (2009) contention that we should consider leadership 'as hybrid' (p392), for both collective and solo formations of leadership are understood to coexist within this institution. Both the traditional model of academic leadership, described by Rowley (1997), Askling and Stensaker (2002), Yielder and Codling (2004), and de Boer and Goedegebuure (2009) and the managerialist model of leadership described by Askling and Stensaker (2002), Morley (2013b), Lumby (2012) and Bolden et al (2009) are influencing how people think about and do leadership in this university. Providing empirical support for the existence of the traditional academic leadership model in a post-1992 university is an important contribution to theoretical understandings of leadership which at the very least infer that this model is unimportant in such contexts (Bolden et al, 2009; Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009; Askling and Stensaker, 2002; and Yielder and Codling, 2004).

Unlike leadership the phenomenon of downshifting represents an under-explored topic for research. Whilst there are various classifications of downshifting common to them is an understanding of its voluntary nature as an individual choice designed 'to change aspects of their lives' (Hamilton and Mail, 2003, p6). The benefits of which are understood to be personal, in their lives

outside of work (Laabs, 1996; and Kennedy, Krahn and Krogman, 2013). In this study, I acknowledge the centrality of the concept of work-life balance to the idea of downshifting thus exploring both theoretically and empirically something which is missing from most current understandings.

What this study adds to understandings of downshifting is firstly, recognition of the relevance of this concept to the experiences of academics. Secondly, an understanding of the other identities (beyond that of a parental identity) for whom downshifting and work-life balance are constructed as legitimate and the negative associations of claiming these identities. Thirdly, it illustrates the particular discourses and forms of institutionalisation (Foucault, 1982) drawn on to support these understandings. Some of which, such as long hours, the psychologising of grievances, and professionalism are pertinent to other contexts. Whilst others, appear to have a particular significance to the higher education setting, such as the denial of the body (Bell and Sinclair, 2014; and Sinclair, 2005b), and the discourses of research and flogging oneself which construct the individual not only as a free and choosing subject but also as the sole beneficiary of their choices. Downshifting then, like work-life balance initiatives more broadly (Eikhof, Warhurst and Haunschild, 2007; Ford and Collinson, 2011; and Wise et al, 2007) operates to hide the employer benefits of this practice, legitimating 'employee unfriendly working practices' (Fleetwood, 2007, p396). Therefore, whilst downshifting is currently understood as offering employees the ability to control and contain their working lives (Hamilton, 2010; and Laabs, 1996) this research illustrates how it can also operate to delegitimise challenges to workplace practices. To this I also add the observation that downshifting may not involve explicit actions, (as is inherent in all existing definitions), but psychological disengagement from work, in a way which might be hidden from the organisation, but which nevertheless influences the downshifters relationship with it.

In this study I have explored empirically how a group of Principal Lecturers wrestle with power relations in the formation of their academic identities. Crucially, this work proposes that there is much more at stake than uncomfortableness with governance and managerial arrangements, of increasing control, surveillance and disciplinary (power) measures. What it means to be an academic is being re-oriented, and this study suggests that the

272

overwhelming focus on performance reduces awareness of, and resistance to, this re-crafting. Perhaps that is what it is designed to achieve? This has implications not only for academics, but for HR practitioners who are tasked with the development and implementation of policies in relation to the Flexible Working Regulations 2014, stress management, work-life balance, leadership development, and so on that are intricately linked with the notion of downshifting. It opens up new possibilities for both HR practitioners and academics to think and talk about their experiences and engage with the challenges that are being expressed. Building on the work undertaken in this thesis, future research will explore the contradictory nature of academic positions and look for opportunities to support academics in creating organisational change. It will also examine how taken-for-granted understandings of organisational life emerge and importantly how they can be challenged and alternative possibilities for identities made imaginable.

References

ACKER, Sandra and ARMENTI, Carmen (2004). Sleepless in academia. *Gender and Education*, **16** (1), 3-24.

ACORN UNIVERSITY (2011). *Employee Opinion Survey 2011*. Unpublished.

ACORN UNIVERSITY (2013a). *Human Resources Job Description*. Unpublished.

ACORN UNIVERSITY (2013b). *Human Resources Stress Management*. Unpublished.

ACORN UNIVERSITY (2014a). *Acorn Business School Consultation Paper: SSG Leadership Roles*. Unpublished.

ACORN UNIVERSITY (2014b). *Acorn University Strategy*. Unpublished.

ACORN UNIVERSITY (2014c). *Faculty Planning for Acorn Business School*. Unpublished.

ACORN UNIVERSITY (2014d). Operating Plan for the Department of Humanities. Unpublished.

ACORN UNIVERSITY (2014e). *The University Strategy*. Last updated April 2014. Staff Intranet. Unpublished.

AGAR, Michael and MACDONALD, James (1995). Focus groups and ethnography. *Human Organization*, **54** (1), 78-86.

AINSWORTH, Susan and HARDY, Cynthia (2008). The Enterprising Self: An Unsuitable Job for an Older Worker. *Organization*, **15** (3), 389–405.

ALASZEWSKI, Andy (2006). Diaries as a source of suffering narratives: A critical commentary. *Health, Risk & Society*, **8** (1), 43-58.

ALBAN-METCALFE, John and ALIMO-METCALFE, Beverly (2007). Development of a private sector version of the (engaging) transformational leadership questionnaire. *Leadership & organization development journal,* **28** (2), 104-121.

ALIMO-METCALFE, Beverly and ALBAN-METCALFE, John (2005). Leadership: Time for a new direction? *Leadership,* **1** (1), 51-71.

ALIMO-METCALFE, Beverly and LAWLER, John (2001). Leadership development in UK companies at the beginning of the twenty-first century: Lessons for the NHS? *Journal of Management in Medicine*, **15** (5), 387-404.

ALLEN, Louisa (2005). Managing masculinity: young men's identity work in focus groups. *Qualitative Research*, **5** (1), 35-57.

ALUKO, Yetunde A. (2009). Work-family conflict and coping strategies adopted by women in academia. *Gender & Behaviour,* **7** (1), 2096-2124.

ALVESSON, Mats (2002). *Postmodernism and Social Research.* Buckingham, Open University Press. Understanding Social Research.

ALVESSON, Mats and KÄRREMAN, Dan (2000). Varieties of discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis. *Human Relations,* **53** (9), 1125-1149.

ALVESSON, Mats and KÄRREMAN, Dan (2011). Decolonializing discourse: Critical reflections on organizational discourse analysis. *Human Relations*, **64** (9), 1121-1146.

ALVESSON, Mats and WILLMOTT, Hugh (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies*, **39** (5), 619-644.

ANAPORTE, Jean (1993). Out of Balance: Theory and Practice in Academia. *Written Communication*, **10** (3), 445-456.

ANDERSSON, Svante and TELL, Joakim (2009). The relationship between the manager and growth in small firms. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, **16** (4), 586-598.

ANGERVALL, Petra and GUSTAFSSON, Jan (2014). Becoming an Academic Researcher. *Policy Futures in Education*, **12** (2), 191-199.

APPLE, Michael W. (1995). *Education and power.* 2nd ed., London, Routledge.

ARCHER, Louise (2008a). The new neoliberal subjects? Young/er academics' constructions of professional identity. *Journal of Education Policy,* **23** (3), 265-285.

ARCHER, Louise (2008b). Younger academics' constructions of 'authenticity', 'success' and professional identity. *Studies in Higher Education*, **33** (4), 385-403.

ARMSTRONG, Felicity and MOORE, Michele (2007). *Action research for inclusive education: changing places, changing practice, changing minds.* 2nd ed., London, RoutledgeFalmer.

ASKLING, Berit and STENSAKER, Bjorn (2002). Academic leadership: Prescriptions, practices and paradoxes. *Tertiary Education and Management*, **8** (2), 113-125.

BACON, Edwin (2014). *Neo-collegiality: restoring academic engagement in the managerial university.* London, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, Stimulus paper series.

BALL, Stephen J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, **18** (2), 215-228.

BALL, Stephen J. (2012a). Performativity, Commodification and Commitment: An I-Spy Guide to the Neoliberal University. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, **60** (1), 17-28.

BALL, Stephen J. (2012b). Show Me the Money! Neoliberalism at Work in Education. *FORUM*, **54** (1), 23-28.

BALL, Stephen J. (2013). *Foucault, Power, and Education.* Abingdon, Routledge.

BALL, Stephen J. (2014). *Subjectivity as a site of struggle: refusing neoliberalism?* Unpublished. 1-22.

BALL, Stephen J. (2015). Accounting for a sociological life: influences and experiences on the road from welfarism to neoliberalism. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* **36** (6), 817-831.

BALL, Stephen J., MAGUIRE, Meg and BRAUN, Annette (2012). *How Schools do Policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools*. Abingdon, Routledge.

BALL, Stephen J. and OLMEDO, Antonio (2013). Care of the self, resistance and subjectivity under neoliberal governmentalities. *Critical Studies in Education*, **54** (1), 85-96.

BALLAMINGIE, Patricia and JOHNSON, Sherrill (2011). The Vulnerable Researcher: Some Unanticipated Challenges of Doctoral Fieldwork. *The Qualitative Report,* **16** (3), 711-729.

BARRY, Jim, BERG, Elisabeth and CHANDLER, John (2006). Academic Shape Shifting: Gender, Management and Identities in Sweden and England. *Organization,* **13** (2), 275–298.

BEAVER, Graham and JENNINGS, Peter (2005). Competitive advantage and entrepreneurial power: The dark side of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development,* **12** (1), 9-23.

BEBBINGTON, Diane (2009). *Diversity in Higher Education: Leadership Responsibilities and Challenges*. London, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, Research and Development Series, Series 2: Publication 2.

BEECH, Nic (2008). On the Nature of Dialogic Identity Work. *Organization,* **15** (1), 51-74.

BEHSON, Scott (2014). Work-family pioneer/ceo chooses fatherhood over career. *The Huffington Post,* 8 August. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/scott-behson-phd/workfamily-pioneer-ceo-chooses-fatherhood-over-career_b_5656120.html

BELL, Emma and SINCLAIR, Amanda (2014). Reclaiming eroticism in the academy. *Organization,* **21** (2), 268-280.

BELZILE, Jacqueline A. and OBERG, Gunilla (2012). Where to begin? Grappling with how to use participant interaction in focus group design. *Qualitative Research*, **12** (4), 459-472.

BENSON, Michaela and O'REILLY, Karen (2009). Migration and the search for a better way of life: a critical exploration of lifestyle migration. *The Sociological Review*, **57** (4), 608-625.

BIESTA, Gert (2008). Encountering Foucault in lifelong learning. In FEJES, Andreas and NICOLL, Katherine (eds.). *Foucault and Lifelong Learning: Governing the Subject*. Abingdon, Routledge, 193-205.

BILECEN, Başak (2014). On the Tide Between Being an Insider and Outsider: Experiences from Research on International Student Mobility in Germany. In VOLODER, Lejla and KIRPITCHENKO, Liudmila (eds.). *Studies in Migration and Diaspora: Insider Research on Migration and Mobility*. Farnham, Ashgate, 53-68.

BILLING, Yvonne and ALVESSON, Mats (1989). Four ways of looking at women and leadership. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **5** (1), 63-80.

BILLOT, Jennie (2010). The imagined and the real: identifying the tensions for academic identity. *Higher Education Research & Development*, **29** (6), 709-721.

BLACKMORE, Jill and SACHS, Judyth (2000). Paradoxes of leadership and management in higher education in times of change: some Australian reflections. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, **3** (1), 1-16.

BOLDEN, Richard (2001). *Leadership Development in Small and Medium Sized Enterprises Final Report*. Exeter, Centre for Leadership Studies. http://businessschool.exeter.ac.uk/documents/discussion_papers/cls/SME2.pdf.

BOLDEN, Richard, GOSLING, Jonathan, O'BRIEN, Anne, PETERS, Kim, RYAN, Michelle and HASLAM, Alex (2012). *Academic leadership: Changing conceptions, identities and experiences in UK higher education*. London, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

BOLDEN, Richard, PETROV, Georgy, GOSLING, Jonathan (2008). *Developing Collective Leadership in Higher Education Final Report*. London, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, Research and Development Series.

BOLDEN, Richard, PETROV, Georgy and GOSLING, Jonathan (2009). Distributed Leadership in Higher Education Rhetoric and Reality. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, **37** (2), 257-277.

BOLDEN, Richard, PETROV, Georgy, GOSLING, Jonathan, BRYMAN, Alan (2009). Leadership in Higher Education: Facts, Fictions and Futures – Introduction to the Special Issue. *Leadership*, **5** (3), 291-298.

BOTTERY, Mike (2004). *The Challenges of Educational Leadership*. London, Paul Chapman Publishing. Leading Teachers, Leading Schools Series.

BRUNDRETT, Mark, BURTON, Neil and SMITH, Robert (eds.). (2003). *Leadership in Education*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd. Educational Management: Research and Practice.

BRYMAN, Alan (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, **32** (6), 693-710.

BRYMAN, Alan and CASSELL, Catherine (2006). The researcher interview: a reflexive perspective. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, **1** (1), 41-55.

BRYMAN, Alan and LILLEY, Simon (2009). Leadership Researchers on Leadership in Higher Education. *Leadership,* **5** (3), 331- 346.

BUTLER, Judith (1995). Collected and Fractured: Response to *Identities*. In: APPIAH, Kwame A. and GATES Jr., Henry L. (eds.). *Identities*. London, The University of Chicago Press, 439-447.

BUTLER, Judith (1997a). *The Psychic Life of Power. Theories in Subjection*. California, Stanford University Press.

BUTLER, Judith (1997b). *Excitable speech. A Politics of the Performative*. London, Routledge.

BUTLER, Judith (2001). Giving an account of oneself. *Diacritics*, **31** (4), 22-40.

CASEY, Catherine (1995). *Work, Self and Society: After Industrialism.* London, Routledge.

CASSELL, Catherine (1996). A fatal attraction? *Personnel Review*, **25** (5), 51-66.

CASSELL, Catherine (2005). Creating the interviewer: identity work in the management research process. *Qualitative Research*, **5** (2), 167-179.

CASSELL, Catherine, BISHOP, Victoria, SYMON, Gillian, JOHNSON, Phil and BUEHRING, Anna (2009). Learning to be a Qualitative Management Researcher. *Management Learning*, **40** (5), 513-533.

CHANDLER, John, BARRY, Jim and CLARK, Heather (2002). Stressing Academe: The Wear and Tear of the New Public Management. *Human Relations*, **55** (9), 1051-1069.

CHEN, Chao and MEINDL, James R. (1991). The Construction of Leadership Images in the Popular Press: The Case of Donald Burr and People Express. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **36** (4), 521-551.

CHHETRI, Prem, KHAN, Asad, STIMSON, Robert and WESTERN, John (2009). Why bother to 'downshift'? The characteristics and satisfaction of downshifters in the Brisbane-South East Queensland region, Australia. *Journal of Population Research*, **26** (1), 51-72.

CHOULIARAKI, Lilie and FAIRCLOUGH, Norman (2010). Critical Discourse Analysis in Organizational Studies: Towards an Integrationist Methodology. *Journal of Management Studies*, **47** (6), 1213-1218.

CHREIM, Samia (2015). The (non)distribution of leadership roles: Considering leadership practices and configurations. *Human Relations*, **68** (4), 517-543.

CHURCHMAN, Deborah and KING, Sharron (2009). Academic practice in transition: hidden stories of academic identities. *Teaching in Higher Education*, **14** (5), 507-516.

CLEGG, Sue (2008a). Academic identities under threat? *British Educational Research Journal*, **34** (3), 329-345.

CLEGG, Sue (2008b). Femininities/masculinities and a sense self: thinking gendered academic identities and the intellectual self. *Gender and Education*, **10** (3), 209-221.

CLOSE, Paul and WAINWRIGHT, Jonathan (2010). Who's in Charge? Leadership and Culture in Extended Service Contexts. *School Leadership & Management*, **30** (5), 435-450.

COFFEY, Amanda (1999). *The Ethnographic Self Fieldwork and the Representation of Identity.* London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

COGLISER, Claudia C. and BRIGHAM, Keith H. (2004). Review The intersection of leadership and entrepreneurship: Mutual lessons to be learned. *The Leadership Quarterly*, **15**, 771-799.

COLLINSON, David (2006). Rethinking Followership: A Post-structural Analysis of Follower Identities. *The Leadership Quarterly*, **17** (2), 172-89.

COPE, Jason, KEMPSTER, Steve and PARRY, Ken (2011). Exploring Distributed Leadership in the Small Business Context. *International journal of management reviews,* **13** (3), 270-285.

CROWTHER, Philip and SAVAGE, Susan M. (2008). The changing role of universities and flexible course re-development. In: *CIB W89: International Conference in Building Education and Research*, Sri Lanka, February 10th - 15th 2008. http://eprints.qut.edu.au/

CUNLIFFE, Ann L. (2002). Reflexive Dialogical Practice in Management Learning. *Management Learning*, **33** (1), 35-61.

CUNLIFFE, Ann L. (2003). Reflexive inquiry in organizational research: Questions and possibilities. *Human Relations*, **56** (8), 983-1003.

CUNLIFFE, Ann L. (2011). Crafting Qualitative Research: Morgan and Smircich 30 Years On. *Organizational Research Methods*, **14** (4), 647-673.

CUNLIFFE, Ann L. and KARUNANAYAKE, Geetha (2013). Working Within HyphenSpaces in Ethnographic Research: Implications for Research Identities and Practice. *Organizational Research Methods*, **16** (3), 364-392.

CUTHBERT, Rob, MØLLER, Jorunn and OZGA, Jenny (2013). Leadership and the reform of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, **34** (2), 281-294.

DANAHAR, Geoff, SCHIRATO, Tony and WEBB, Jen (2000). *Understanding Foucault*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

DAVIES, John, HIDES, Michael T. and CASEY, S. (2001). Leadership in higher education. *Total Quality Management*, **12** (7-8), 1025-1030.

DAVIES, Martin L. (2008). Institutionalized nihilism: An outline of the academic function, Rethinking History. *The Journal of Theory and Practice*, **12** (4), 463-481.

DAY, Melissa and THATCHER, Joanne (2009). "I'm Really Embarrassed That You're Going to Read This ..." Reflections on Using Diaries in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, **6** (4), 249-259.

DE BOER, Harry and GOEDEGEBUURE, Leo (2009). The Changing Nature of the Academic Deanship. *Leadership*, **5** (3), 347-364.

DEEM, Rosemary and BREHONY, Kevin J. (2005). Management as ideology: the case of 'new managerialism' in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, **31** (2), 217-235.

DEETZ, Stanley (1996). Describing Differences in Approaches to Organization Science: Rethinking Burrell and Morgan and Their Legacy. *Organization Science*, **7** (2), 191-207.

DEETZ, Stanley (1998). Discursive Formations, Strategized Subordination and Self-surveillance. In: MCKINLAY, Alan and STARKEY, Ken. (eds.). *Foucault, Management and Organization Theory*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 151-172.

DEETZ, Stanley (2003). Disciplinary Power, Conflict Suppression and Human Resources Management. In: ALVESSON, Mats, and WILLMOTT, Hugh. (eds.). *Studying Management Critically*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 23-45.

DEMARRAIS, Kathleen and TISDALE, Kit (2002). What Happens When Researchers Inquire Into Difficult Emotions?: Reflections on Studying Women's

Anger Through Qualitative Interviews. *Educational Psychologist,* **37** (2), 115-123.

DENIS, Jean-Louis, LANGLEY, Ann and SERGI, Viviane (2012). Leadership in the Plural. *The Academy of Management Annals*, **6** (1), 211-283.

DEVLIN, Kate (2013). Labour MP Harris puts family first as he quits shadow ministerial role. *The Herald Scotland*, 13 June. http://www.heraldscotland.com/politics/political-news/labour-mp-harris-puts-family-first-as-he-quits-shadow-ministerial-role.21331979

DEX, Shirley and SMITH, Colin (2002). *The nature and pattern of family-friendly employment policies in Britain*. Bristol, The Policy Press/Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

DICK, Penny (2004). Discourse Analysis. In CASSELL, Catherine and SYMON, Gillian, (eds.). *Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 203-213.

DICKSON-SWIFT, Virginia, JAMES, Erica L., KIPPEN, Sandra and LIAMPUTTONG, Pranee (2006). Blurring Boundaries in Qualitative Health Research on Sensitive Topics. *Qualitative Health Research*, **16** (6), 853-871.

DIDION, Joan (1976). *Why I Write*. http://genius.com/Joan-didion-why-i-write-annotated

DIDION, Joan (1978). The Art of Fiction No. 71, Interviewed by Linda Kuehl. *The Paris Review*, Fall-Winter, No. 74. http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/3439/the-art-of-fiction-no-71-joan-didion

DIDION, Joan (2005). After Life. *The New York Times,* 25 September. http://www.nytimes.com/2005/09/25/magazine/25didion.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

DOHERTY, Liz and MANFREDI, Simonetta (2006). Action research to develop work-life balance in a UK university. *Women in Management Review,* **21** (3), 241-259.

DRAKE, Pat and HEATH, Linda (2008). Insider research in schools and universities. The case of the professional doctorate. In Sikes, Patricia and Potts, Anthony (eds.). *Researching Education from the Inside. Investigations from within*. London, Routledge, 127-143.

DREW, Glenys (2010). Issues and Challenges in Higher Education Leadership: Engaging for Change. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, **37** (3), 57-76.

DREYFUS, Hubert L. and RABINOW, Paul (1982). Introduction. In: DREYFUS, Hubert L. and RABINOW, Paul. (eds.). *Michael Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Hemel Hempstead, Harvester, xvii-xxvii.

DUNCOMBE, Jean and JESSOP, Julie (2002). 'Doing rapport' and the ethics of 'faking friendship'. In: MAUTHNER, Melanie, BIRCH, Maxine, JESSOP, Julie and MILLER, Tina, (eds.). *Ethics in Qualitative Research*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 107-122.

DURST, Susanne and WILHELM, Stefan (2012). Knowledge management and succession planning in SMEs. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **16** (4), 637-649.

EIKHOF, Doris R., WARHURST, Chris and HAUNSCHILD, Axel (2007). Introduction: What work? What life? What balance? Critical reflections on the work-life balance debate. *Employee Relations,* **29** (4), 325-333.

ELKINGTON, Sam and LAWRENCE, Lesley (2012). Non-specialism and shifting academic identities: a sign of the times? *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, **49** (1), 51-61.

ELLEM, Bradon (2005). Putting work in its place: The making of ideal workers and social contracts. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, **43** (2), 238-251.

EPITROPAKI, Olga and MARTIN, Robin (2005). From Ideal to Real: A Longitudinal Study of the Role of Implicit Leadership Theories on Leader-Member Exchanges and Employee Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **90** (4), 659–676.

ETZIONI, Amitai (1998). Critical Essay/Commentary Voluntary simplicity: Characterization, select psychological implications, and societal consequences. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, **19**, 619-643.

FAIRCLOUGH, Norman (2013). Critical discourse analysis and critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies*, **7** (2), 177-197.

FAIRHURST, Gail T. (2008). Discursive Leadership: A Communication Alternative to Leadership Psychology. *Management Communication Quarterly*, **21** (4), 510-521.

FAIRHURST, Gail T. (2009). Considering context in discursive leadership research. *Human Relations*, **62** (11), 1607-1633.

FAIRHURST, Gail T. and PUTNUM, Linda (2004). Organizations as Discursive Constructions. *Communication Theory*, **14** (1), 5-26.

FARNSWORTH, John and BOON, Bronwyn (2010). Analysing group dynamics within the focus group. *Qualitative Research,* **10** (5), 605–624.

FEJES, Andreas and NICOLL, Katherine (2008). Preface. In FEJES, Andreas and NICOLL, Katherine (eds.). *Foucault and Lifelong Learning: Governing the Subject*. Abingdon, Routledge, ix-xiv.

FLEETWOOD, Steve (2007). Why work–life balance now? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **18** (3), 387-400.

FLEMING, Peter and SPICER, Andre (2003). Working at a Cynical Distance: Implications for Power, Subjectivity and Resistance. *Organization,* **10** (1), 157-179.

FLEMING, Peter and SPICER, Andre (2004). 'You can checkout anytime, but you can never leave': Spatial boundaries in a high commitment organization. *Human Relations*, **57** (1), 75–94.

FILIPPAKOU, Ourania and TAPPER, Ted (2008). Quality Assurance and Quality Enhancement in Higher Education: Contested Territories? *Higher Education Quarterly*, **62** (1/2), 84-100.

285

FILIPPAKOU, Ourania and TAPPER, Ted (2015). Mission Groups and the New Politics of British Higher Education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, **69** (2), 121-137.

FORD, Jackie (2005). Examining leadership through critical feminist readings. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, **19** (3), 236-251.

FORD, Jackie (2010). Critical Leadership Theorizing and Local Government Practice. In CURRIE, Graeme, FORD, Jackie, HARDING, Nancy and LEARMONTH, Mark (eds.). *Making Public Services Management Critical*, London, Routledge, 157-175.

FORD, Jackie, HARDING, Nancy and LEARMONTH, Nancy (2008). *Leadership as Identity Constructions and Deconstructions*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

FORD, Jackie and HARDING, Nancy (2010). Conclusion: What is to Be Done? On the Merits of Micro-Revolutions. In: CURRIE, Graeme, FORD, Jackie, HARDING, Nancy and LEARMONTH, Mark (eds.). *Making Public Services Management Critical*. London, Routledge, 250-258.

FORD, Jackie and COLLINSON, David (2011). In search of the perfect manager?: Work-life balance and managerial work. *Work, Employment Society*, **25** (2), 257-273.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1976). *The History of Sexuality: 1. The Will to Knowledge*. Reprint, London, Penguin Books, 1998.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London, Penguin Books.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1978). Three 25 January 1978. In: SENELLART, Michel (ed.). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 83-110.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1980a). Two Lectures. In: GORDON, Colin (ed.). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. New York, Pantheon Books, 78-108.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1980b). Prison Talk. In: GORDON, Colin (ed.). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. New York, Pantheon Books, 37-54.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1980c). Body/Power. In: GORDON, Colin (ed.). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. New York, Pantheon Books, 55-62.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1982). The Subject and Power. In: DREYFUS, Hubert L. and RABINOW, Paul. (eds.). *Michael Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Hemel Hempstead, Harvester, 208-226.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1984a). *The History of Sexuality: 2. The Use of Pleasure*. Reprint, London, Penguin Books, 1992.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1984b). *The History of Sexuality: 3. The Care of the Self*. Reprint, London, Penguin Books, 1990.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1984c). What Is an Author? In RABINOW, Paul. (ed.). *The Foucault Reader*. London, Penguin, 101-120.

FOUCAULT, Michael (1986). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London, Tavistock Publications.

FOUCAULT, Michael (2007a). Subjectivity and Truth. In: LOTRINGER, Sylvère (ed.). *The Politics of Truth*. Los Angeles, Semiotext(e). Semiotext(e) Foreign Agents Series, 147-168.

FOUCAULT, Michael (2007b). Christianity and Confession. In: LOTRINGER, Sylvère (ed.). *The Politics of Truth*. Los Angeles, Semiotext(e). Semiotext(e) Foreign Agents Series, 169-192.

FOUCAULT, Michael (2007c). What is Enlightenment? In: LOTRINGER, Sylvère (ed.). *The Politics of Truth*. Los Angeles, Semiotext(e). Semiotext(e) Foreign Agents Series, 97-120.

FOUCAULT, Michael (2007d). What is Critique? In: LOTRINGER, Sylvère (ed.). *The Politics of Truth*. Los Angeles, Semiotext(e). Semiotext(e) Foreign Agents Series, 41-82.

FUJIMOTO, Yuka, AZMAT, Fara and HÄRTEL, Charmine, E. J. (2013). Gender perceptions of work-life balance: management implications for full-time employees in Australia. *Australian journal of management*, **38** (1), 147-170.

FULLAN, Michael (2003). *The Moral Imperative of School Leadership*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

GALE, Helen (2011). The reluctant academic: early-career academics in a teaching-orientated university. *International Journal for Academic Development*, **16** (3), 215-227.

GALLAGHER, Michael (2008). Foucault, Power and Participation. *The International Journal of Children's Rights.* **16** (3), 395-406.

GAME, Ann (1997). Sociology's Emotions. *Canadian Review of Sociology,* **34** (4), 385-399.

GARCIA, Louise (2009). Employability and higher education: contextualising female students' workplace experiences to enhance understanding of employability development. *Journal of Education and Work*, **22** (4), 310-318.

GARCIA, Primo and HARDY, Cynthia (2007). Positioning, similarity and difference: Narratives of individual and organizational identities in an Australian University. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **23**, 363–383.

GARRATT, Dean and HAMMERSLEY-FLETCHER, Linda (2009). Academic Identities in Flux: ambivalent articulations in a post-1992 university. *Power and Education*, **1** (3), *307-318.*

GOODSON, Ivor and SIKES, Patricia J. (2001). *Life History Research in Educational Settings: Learning from Lives*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

GORDON, Raymond D. (2002a). Conceptualizing leadership with respect to its historical–contextual antecedents to power. *The Leadership Quarterly.* **13** (2), 151-167.

GORDON, Raymond D. (2002b). Viewing the dispersion of leadership through a power lens. Exposing unobtrusive tensions and problematic processes. In: PARRY, Ken W. and MEINDL, James R. (eds.). *Grounding Leadership Theory*

and Research: Issues, Perspectives and Methods. Buffalo, Information Age Publishing, 39-56.

GRAHAM, Linda, J. (2011). The Product of Text and 'Other' Statements: Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, **43** (6), 663-673.

GRANT, Barbara (1997). Disciplining Students: the construction of student subjectivities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, **18** (1), 101-114.

GRAY, Judy H. DENSTEN, Iain L. and SARROS, James C. (2003). Executive leadership in Australian small business: Beyond entrepreneurial vision. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, **4** (1), 37-45.

GREAT BRITAIN, Department for Business Innovation & Skills (2012). *Leadership & Management in the UK - The Key to Sustainable Growth. A summary of the evidence for the value of investing in leadership and management development.*

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/32327/12-923-leadership-management-key-to-sustainable-growth-evidence.pdf

GREAT BRITAIN, Department for Business Innovation & Skills (2014). *Costs and Benefits to Business of Adopting Work Life Balance Working Practices: A Literature Review.*

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/323290/bis-14-903-costs-and-benefits-to-business-of-adopting-work-life-balance-working-practices-a-literature-review.pdf

GREAT BRITAIN, Parliament, House of Commons (2009). *Innovation, Universities, Science and Skills Committee - Eleventh Report Students and Universities*. London, The Stationery Office. HC 170-II (2008-2009). http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmdius/170/17002.htm

GREY, Christopher and MITEV, Nathalie (1995). Management Education A Polemic. *Management Learning*, **26** (1), 73-90.

GRINT, Keith (2005). Problems, problems, problems: The social construction of 'leadership'. *Human Relations*, **58** (11), 1467-1494.

GRONN, Peter (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership quarterly*, **13** (4), 423-451.

GRONN, Peter (2003a). Leadership: who needs it? *School Leadership & Management,* **23** (3), 267-290.

GRONN, Peter (2003b). *The new work of educational leaders: changing leadership practice in an era of school reform*. London, Paul Chapman Publishing.

GRONN, Peter (2008). The future of distributed leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, **46** (2), 141-158.

GRONN, Peter (2009). Leadership Configurations. *Leadership*, **5** (3), 381-394.

GRONN, Peter (2010). Leadership: its genealogy, configuration and trajectory. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, **42** (4), 405-435.

GRONN, Peter (2015). The view from inside leadership configurations. *Human Relations,* **68** (4), 545-560.

GRONN, Peter and HAMILTON, Andrew (2004). 'A Bit More Life in the Leadership': Co-Principalship as Distributed Leadership Practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools,* **3** (1), 3-35.

GROVE, Jack (2014). Redundancy metrics too 'simplistic'. *Times Higher Education,* 16 October, 11.

GÜVEN, Gökhan, SÜLÜN, Yusuf and ÇAM, Aylin (2014). The examination of elementary preservice teachers' reflective diaries and epistemological beliefs in science laboratory. *Teaching in Higher Education*, **19** (8), 895-907.

HAAKE, Ulrika (2009). Doing Leadership in Higher Education: The gendering process of leader identity development. *Tertiary Education and Management*, **15** (4), 291-304.

HAMILTON, Clive (2010). Consumerism, self-creation and prospects for a new ecological consciousness. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **18** (6), 571-575.

HAMILTON, Clive and MAIL, Elizabeth (2003). *Downshifting in Australia A sea-change in the pursuit of happiness*. The Australia Institute Discussion Paper Number 50. Canberra, Australia Institute

HANSON, Janet (2009). Displaced but not replaced: the impact of e-learning on academic identities in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, **14** (5), 553-564.

HARDING, Nancy, FORD, Jackie and GOUGH, Brendan (2010). Accounting for ourselves: Are academics exploited workers? *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, **21**, 159–168.

HARDING, Nancy, LEE, Hugh and FORD, Jackie (2014). Who is 'the middle manager'? *Human Relations*, **67** (10), 1213-1237.

HARDY, Cynthia and CLEGG, Stewart R. (1999). Some Dare Call It Power. In: CLEGG, Stewart R. and HARDY, Cynthia (eds.). *Studying organization: Theory and method.* 2nd ed., London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 368-387.

HARDY, Cynthia and CLEGG, Stewart R. (2006). Some Dare Call it Power. In: CLEGG, Stewart R., HARDY, Cynthia, LAWRENCE, Thomas B. and NORD, Walter R. (eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Organization Studies*. 2nd ed., London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 754-775.

HARRIS, Suzy (2005). Rethinking academic identities in neo-liberal times. *Teaching in Higher Education*, **10** (4), 421-433.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE, (2014). *What is stress?* http://www.hse.gov.uk/stress/furtheradvice/whatisstress.htm

HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND (2003). *The Flexible Employment Options Project*. HEFCE.

http://www.staffs.ac.uk/assets/00%20FEO%20Phase%20One%20Final%20Proj ect%20Report%202003_tcm44-77312.pdf

HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND (2010). *Staff employed at HEFCE-funded HEIs Trends and profiles 1995-96 to 2008-09.* HEFCE, 6.

http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/hefce1/pubs/hefce/2010/1006/10_06.pdf

HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND (2012). *Staff employed at HEFCE-funded HEIs Trends and profiles 1995-96 to 2010-11.* HEFCE, 7.

http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/hefce/content/pubs/2012/201214/Staff%20emplo
yed%20at%20HEFCEfunded%20HEIs%20trends%20and%20profiles%201995-
96%20to%202010-11.pdf

HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND (2014). *Glossary.* HEFCE. http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Glossary/

HOLBROOK, Bev and JACKSON, Peter (1996). Shopping Around: Focus Group Research in North London. *Area,* **28**, 136-142.

HOLLAND, Janet (2007). Emotions and Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology,* **10** (3), 195-209.

HOLLAND, Ray (1999). Reflexivity. *Human Relations,* **52** (4), 463-484.

HOLLIGAN, Christopher (2011). Feudalism and academia: UK academics' accounts of research culture. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* **24** (1), 55-75.

HUBBARD, Gill, BACKETT-MILBURN, Kathryn and KEMMER, Debbie (2001). Working with emotion: issues for the researcher in fieldwork and teamwork. *International Journal Social Research Methodology,* **4** (2), 119-137.

JACKSON, Brad and PARRY, Ken (2009). *A very short, fairly interesting and reasonably cheap book about studying leadership.* London, Sage Publications Ltd.

JACKSON, Tim (2008). The Challenge of Sustainable Lifestyles. In: *State of the World Innovations for a Sustainable Economy*, 45-60. The WorldWatch Institute. www.worldwatch.org

JOHNSON, Julia and BYTHEWAY, Bill (2001). An evaluation of the use of diaries in a study of medication in later life. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, **4** (3), 183-204.

JOHNSON, Phil and DUBERLEY, Joanne (2000). *Understanding Management Research An Introduction to Epistemology*. Reprint, London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 2006.

JONES, Gareth D. (2011). Academic Leadership and Departmental Headship in Turbulent Times. *Tertiary Education and Management*, **17** (4), 279-288.

JUNTRASOOK, Adisorn, NAIRN, Karen, BOND, Carol and SPRONKEN-SMITH, Rachel (2013). Unpacking the narrative of non-positional leadership in academia: Hero and/or victim? *Higher Education Research & Development*, **32** (2), 201-213.

KAZANJIAN, Robert K. (1988). Relation of dominant problems to stages of growth in technology-based new ventures. *Academy of Management Journal.* **31** (2), 257-279.

KEMAVUTHANON, Suvaroj and DUBERLEY, Joanne (2009). A Buddhist view of leadership: the case of the OTOP project. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, **30** (8), 737-758.

KEMPSTER, Stephen (2009). Observing the invisible: Examining the role of observational learning in the development of leadership practice. *Journal of Management Development*, **28** (5), 439- 456.

KEMPSTER, Stephen and COPE, Jason (2010). Learning to lead in the entrepreneurial context. *International journal of entrepreneurial behaviour and research,* **16** (1), 5-34.

KENNEDY, Emily Huddart, KRAHN, Harvey and KROGMAN, Naomi T. (2013). Downshifting: An Exploration of Motivations, Quality of Life, and Environmental Practices. *Sociological Forum*, **28** (4), 764-783.

KENWAY, Jane and MCLEOD, Julie (2004). Bourdieu's reflexive sociology and 'spaces of points of view': whose reflexivity, which perspective? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, **25** (4), 525-544.

KETS DE VRIES, Manfred E.R. (1985). The dark side of entrepreneurship. *Harvard Business Review*, **63** (6), 160-167.

KETS DE VRIES, Manfred E.R. (1993). The dynamics of family controlled firms: The good and the bad news. *Organizational Dynamics*, **21** (3), 59-71.

KIRKWOOD, Jodyanne (2007). Igniting the entrepreneurial spirit: is the role parents play gendered? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, **13** (1), 39 - 59.

KITZINGER, Jenny (1994). The Methodology of Focus Groups: The Importance of Interaction between Research Participants. *Sociology of Health and Illness,* **16** (1), 103-121.

KVALEM, Ingela L. and STRANDBU, Åse (2013). Body Talk-Group Specific Talk? A Focus Group Study of Variations in Body Ideals and Body Talk among Norwegian Youth. *Young,* **21** (4) 327–346.

LAABS, Jennifer J. (1996). Downshifters - workers are scaling back. Are you ready? *Personnel journal,* **75** (3), 62.

LEADERSHIP FOUNDATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION (2014). *Legal status of post 1992 institutions.* http://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/audiences/governance-old/legal/legal-status-of-post-1992-institutions.cfm

LEATHWOOD, Carole and READ, Barbara (2013). Research policy and academic performativity: compliance, contestation and complicity. *Studies in Higher Education*, **38** (8), 1162-1174.

LECLERCQ-VANDELANNOITTE, Aurélie (2011). Organizations as Discursive Constructions: A Foucauldian Approach. *Organization Studies*, **32** (9), 1247-1271.

LEE, Donna (2010). Employability at the business-led university: Towards a student-led and business facing agenda. In: *The Political Economy of University Governance Workshop*, University of Birmingham 24 June 2010.

LEITCH, Claire M., MCMULLAN, Christel and HARRISON, Richard T. (2009). Leadership development in SMEs: an action learning approach. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, **6** (3), 243-263.

LEVIE, Jonathan and LICHTENSTEIN, Benyamin B. (2010). A terminal assessment of stages theory: introducing a dynamic states approach to entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, **34** (2), 317–350.

LIAMPUTTONG, Pranee (2011). *Focus group methodology: principle and practice.* London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

LOMER, Sylvia (2014). Economic Objects: how policy discourse in the United Kingdom represents international students. *Policy Futures in Education*, **12** (2), 273-285.

LUKES, Steven (2005). *Power A Radical View*. 2nd ed., Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

LUMBY, Jacky (2012). *What do we know about leadership in higher education?* London, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, Review Paper Series.

LYNCH, Michael (2000). Against Reflexivity as an Academic Virtue and Source of Privileged Knowledge. *Theory, Culture & Society*, **17** (3), 26–54.

MAC LAVERTY, Bernard (1998). *Grace Notes*. London, Vintage.

MANNION, Kieran (2009). Leadership...for success. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* **30** (7), 639-648.

MAYO, Cris (2000). The uses of Foucault. *Educational Theory*, **50** (1), 103-116.

MCDONALD, Paula, TOWNSEND, Keith and WHARTON, Amy (2013). The legitimation and reproduction of discourse-practice gaps in work-life balance. *Personnel Review*, **42** (2), 205-222.

MCGETTIGAN, Andrew, MALIK, Shiv and DOMOKOS, John (2014). Private sector and students profit at the college they call 'the ATM'. *The Guardian*, 21 May. http://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/may/21/private-sector-higher-education-college-student-loan-lsst

MCSMITH, Andy (2012). Mensch: I quit as MP to spend time with my family. *The Independent*, 7 August.

http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/mensch-i-quit-as-mp-to-spend-time-with-my-family-8010200.html

MCWILLIAM, Erica, HATCHER, Caroline and MEADMORE, Daphne (1999). Developing professional identities: remaking the academic for corporate times. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, **7** (1), 55-72.

MIDDLEHURST, Robin (1999). New realities for leadership and governance in higher education? *Tertiary Education and Management*, **5** (4), 307-329.

MIDDLEHURST, Robin and ELTON, Lewis (1992). Leadership and management in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, **17** (3), 251-264.

MIDDLEHURST, Robin, GOREHAM, Helen and WOODFIELD, Steve (2009). Why Research Leadership in Higher Education? Exploring Contributions from the UK's Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. *Leadership*, **5** (3), 311-329.

MINTZBERG, Henry (1999). Managing quietly. *Leader to Leader*, **12**, 24-30.

MORGAN, David L. (1997). *The focus group guidebook*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

MORGAN, Gareth (1998). *Images of organization*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

MORLEY, Louise (2001). Producing New Workers: quality, equality and employability in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, **7** (2), 131-138.

MORLEY, Louise (2013a). The rules of the game: women and the leaderist turn in higher education. *Gender and Education*, **25** (1), 116-131.

MORLEY, Louise (2013b). *Women and Higher Education Leadership: Absences and Aspirations*. London, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

MUMBY, Dennis K. (2011). What's cooking in organizational discourse studies? A response to Alvesson and Kärreman. *Human Relations*, **64** (9), 1147-1161.

NADIN, Sara and CASSELL, Catherine (2006). The use of a research diary as a tool for reflexive practice. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, **3** (3), 208-217.

NICOLL, Katherine (2008). Discipline and e-learning. In: FEJES, Andreas and NICOLL, Katherine. (eds.). *Foucault and Lifelong Learning: Governing the Subject*. Abingdon, Routledge, 164-177.

NIKUNEN, Minna (2012). Changing university work, freedom, flexibility and family. *Studies in Higher Education*, **37** (6), 713-729.

NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY (2014). *Principal Lecturer in Interior Architecture and Design*. https://vacancies.ntu.ac.uk/displayjob.aspx?jobid=590

OGBONNA, Emmanuel and HARRIS, Lloyd C. (2004). Work Intensification and Emotional Labour Among UK University Lecturers: An Exploratory Study. *Organization Studies,* **25** (7), 1185-1203.

OGBOR, John O. (2000). Mythicizing and reification in entrepreneurial discourse: ideology-critique of entrepreneurial studies. *Journal of Management Studies,* **37** (5), 605-635.

OKSALA, Johanna (1998). Cyberfeminists and women: Foucault's notion of identity. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, **6** (1), 39-47.

OXFORD DICTIONARIES (2015). *Hobby.* http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/hobby.

PARRY, Ken W. and BRYMAN, Alan (2006). Leadership in Organizations. In: CLEGG, Stewart R., HARDY, Cynthia, LAWRENCE, Thomas B. and NORD, WALTER R. (eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Organization Studies*. 2nd ed., London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 447-468.

PEEK, Lori and FOTHERGILL, Alice (2009). Using focus groups: lessons from studying daycare centers, 9/11, and Hurricane Katrina. *Qualitative Research,* **9** (1), 31-59.

PERREN, Lew and GRANT, Paul (2001). *Management & Leadership in UK SMEs Witness Testimonies from the World of Entrepreneurs and SME Managers.* London, The Council for Excellence in Management and Leadership.

PIRRIE, Anne, ADAMSON, Kevin and HUMES, Walter (2010). Flexing Academic Identities: speaking truth to power. *Power and Education,* **2** (1), 97-106.

RAFNSDÓTTIR, Gudbjörg L. and HEIJSTRA, Thamar M. (2013). Balancing Work-family Life in Academia: The Power of Time. *Gender, Work & Organization,* **20** (3), 283-296.

RENOLD, Emma, HOLLAND, Sally, ROSS, Nicola J. and HILLMAN, Alexandra. (2008). `Becoming Participant' Problematizing `Informed Consent' in Participatory Research with Young People in Care. *Qualitative Social Work,* **7** (4), 427-447.

ROSENFIELD, Sylvia (2004). Academia: It's a wonderful life-isn't it? *School Psychology Quarterly,* **19** (4), 398-408.

ROWLAND, Stephen (2008). Collegiality and intellectual love. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* **29** (3), 353-360.

ROWLEY, Jennifer (1997). Academic leaders: made or born? *Industrial and Commercial Training,* **29** (3), 78-84.

SCHEIN, Edgar H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Ltd.

SCOTT, John (2001). *Power.* Cambridge, Polity Press.

SHACKLETON, Viv (1995). *Business Leadership.* London, Routledge.

SHAMIR, Ronen (2008). The age of responsibilitization: on market-embedded morality. *Economy and Society,* **37** (1), 1-19.

SIKES, Pat (2006). Working in a 'new' university: in the shadow of the Research Assessment Exercise? *Studies in Higher Education,* **31** (5), 555-568.

SINHA, Paresha N. (2010). The Dramatistic Genre in Leadership Studies: Implications for Research and Practice. *Leadership,* **6** (2), 185-205.

SINCLAIR, Amanda (2004). Journey around Leadership. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. **25** (1), 7-19.

SINCLAIR, Amanda (2005a). Body Possibilities in Leadership. *Leadership,* **1** (4), 387-406.

SINCLAIR, Amanda (2005b). Body and Management Pedagogy. *Gender, Work and Organization*, **12** (1), 89-104.

SMALL, Jennie, HARRIS, Candice, WILSON, Erica and ATELJEVIC, Irena (2011). Voices of women: A memory-work reflection on work-life dis/harmony in tourism academia. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, **10** (1), 23-36.

SMART, Barry (1996). The Politics of Truth and the Problem of Hegemony. In: HOY, David Couzens (ed.). *Foucault: A critical Reader.* Oxford, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 157-174.

SMITHSON, Janet (2000). Using and analysing focus groups: Limitations and possibilities. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, **3** (2), 103-119.

SORENSON, Ritch L. (2000). The Contribution of Leadership Style and Practices to Family and Business Success. *Family Business Review*, **13** (3), 183-200.

SPARKES, Andrew C. (2007). Embodiment, academics, and the audit culture: a story seeking consideration. *Qualitative Research*, **7** (4), 521-550.

SPILLER, Dorothy (2010). Language and academic leadership: exploring and evaluating the narratives. *Higher Education Research & Development*, **29** (6), 679-692.

STOREY, David J. (1995). *Understanding the Small Business Sector.* Guildford, Biddles Ltd.

TAN, Philomena (2000). *Leaving the rat race to get a life: a study of midlife career downshifting.* PhD, Swinburne University of Technology.

TAPPER, Ted and PALFREYMAN, David (1998). Continuity and change in the collegial tradition. *Higher Education Quarterly, 52* (2), 142-161.

TAPPER, Ted and PALFREYMAN, David (2002). Understanding collegiality: The changing Oxbridge model. *Tertiary Education and Management*, **8** (1), 47-63.

TAYLOR, James and MACHADO, Maria de Lourdes (2006). Higher education leadership and management: from conflict to interdependence through strategic planning. *Tertiary Education and Management*, **12**, 137-160.

TEELKEN, Christine (2012). Compliance or pragmatism: how do academics deal with managerialism in higher education? A comparative study in three countries. *Studies in Higher Education*, **37** (3), 271-290.

TIETZE, Susanne (2012). Researching your own organization. In Symon, G and Cassel, C. (eds.). *Qualitative Organizational Research. Core Methods and Current Challenges*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 53-71.

TOMLINSON, Michael (2008). 'The degree is not enough': students' perceptions of the role of higher education credentials for graduate work and employability. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, **29** (1), 49-61.

TOURISH, Dennis (2012). *Leadership development within the UK higher education system: its impact on organisational performance, and the role of evaluation*. London, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

TROWLER, Paul (1997). Beyond the Robbins trap: Reconceptualising academic responses to change in higher education (or ... quiet flows the don?). *Studies in Higher Education*, **22** (3), 301-318.

TUORI, Annamari and VILEN, Tanja (2011). Subject Positions and Power Relations in Creative Organizations: Taking a Discursive View on Organizational Creativity. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, **20** (2), 90-99.

UHL-BIEN, Mary, RIGGIO, Ronald E., LOWE, Kevin B and CARSTEN Melissa K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 83-104.

UNIVERSITIES UK (2012). *Futures For Higher Education Analysing Trends.* Universities UK, Higher Education: Meeting the challenges of the 21st century. http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Documents/2012/FuturesForHigherEducation.pdf

UNIVERSITIES UK (2013). *Patterns and Trends in UK Higher Education.* Universities UK, Higher Education: A diverse and changing sector. http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Documents/2013/PatternsAndTrendsinUKHigherEducation2013.pdf

UNIVERSITY OF EAST LONDON (2014). *Principal Lecturer in Computer Science & Informatics.* http://jobs.uel.ac.uk/Vacancy.aspx?ref=085A2014

USHER, Robin (2000). Deconstructive happening, ethical moment. In: SIMONS, Helen and USHER, Robin (eds.). *Situated ethics in educational research.* London, Routledge, 162-185.

VAN MORRISON (1990). Enlightenment. Universal Music Publishing Group, Exile Productions.

WANG, Yong and POUTZIOURIS, Panikkos (2010). Leadership styles, management systems and growth: empirical evidence from UK owner-managed smes. *Journal of Enterprising Culture,* **18** (3), 331-354.

WATSON, Tony J. (2008). Managing Identity: Identity Work, Personal Predicaments and Structural Circumstances. *Organization,* **15** (1), 121-143.

WAUMSLEY, Julie A, HOUSTON, Diane M. and MARKS, Gillian (2010). What about Us? Measuring the Work-Life Balance of People Who Do Not Have Children. *Review of European Studies,* **2** (2), 3-17.

WEBSTER, Joseph (2008). Establishing the 'Truth' of the Matter: Confessional Reflexivity as Introspection and Avowal. *Psychology & Society,* **1** (1), 65-76.

WEIR, Allison (2009). Who are we? Modern identities between Taylor and Foucault. *Philosophy & Social Criticism,* **35** (5), 533-553.

WESTERN, Simon (2008). *Leadership A Critical Text.* London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

WHITCHURCH, Celia (2012). Expanding the parameters of academia. *Higher Education*, **64**, 99-117.

WHYTE, William F. (1984). *Learning from the field. A guide from experience.* London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

WILKINSON, Sue (1998). Focus groups in feminist research: power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning. *Women's Studies International Forum*, **21** (1), 111-125.

WILLIG, Carla (1999). Discourse Analysis and Sex Education. In: WILLIG, Carla (ed.). *Applied Discourse Analysis: Social and Psychological Interventions.* London, Open University Press, 110-24.

WINTER, Richard (2009). Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, **31** (2), 121-131.

WINTER, Richard P. and O'DONOHUE, Wayne (2012). Academic identity tensions in the public university: which values really matter? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, **34** (6), 565-573.

WISE, Sarah, SMITH, Chris, VALSECCHI, Raffaella, MUELLER, Frank and GABE, Jonathan (2007). Controlling working time in the ward and on the line. *Employee Relations*, **29** (4), 352-366.

WOOLDRIDGE, Ewart (2011). Leadership in higher education: some lessons from other sectors. *International Journal of Leadership in Public Services*, **7** (3), 245-250.

YIELDER, Jill and CODLING, Andrew (2004). Management and Leadership in the Contemporary University. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, **26** (3), 315-328.

YLIJOKI, Oili-Helena (2013). Boundary-work between work and life in the high-speed university. *Studies in Higher Education*, **38** (2), 242-255.

YLIJOKI, Oili-Helena and URSIN, Jani (2013). The construction of academic identity in the changes of Finnish higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, **38** (8), 1135-1149.

ZEMBYLAS, Michalinos (2003). Interrogating "teacher identity": emotion, resistance, and self-formation. *Educational Theory*, **53** (1), 107-127.

ZOLLER, Heather M. and FAIRHURST, Gail T. (2007). Resistance leadership: The overlooked potential in critical organization and leadership studies. *Human Relations*, **60** (9), 1331-1360.